

Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2033

Consultation Statement

Contents

1. Purpose	3
2. Key stakeholders	3
3. Consultation methods	4
4. Consultation undertaken	4
4.1. Neighbourhood planning area application, 1 April 2015	4
4.2. Initial introduction meeting, 23 June 2015	4
4.3. Neighbourhood plan group meeting, 23 July 2015	5
4.4. Leaflet distribution 'Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan - Planning for the future of our parish', 31 July 2015	5
4.5. Questionnaire and letter distribution, 4 August 2015 and 2 September 2015	6
4.6. Housing needs survey distribution, 15 January 2016	8
4.7. Submission of SEA screening opinion questionnaire, 17 February 2016	8
4.8. Consultation on SODC initial screening statement, 29 March 2016	8
4.9. Developer meeting, 18 April 2016	8
4.10. Call for sites exercise, 15 June 2016	9
4.11. NP community meeting, 17 June 2016	10
4.12. Questionnaire on planning policies distribution, 29 June 2016	10
4.13. Consultation on SODC revised screening statement, 4 July 2016	16
4.14. Neighbourhood plan community meeting, 15 September 2016	17
4.15. Consultation on scoping report, 7 and 9 October 2016	17
4.16. Community consultation on the preferred site options, 24 November 2016	17
4.17. Housing infill survey distribution, 9 December 2016	18
4.18. Greenspace allocation survey, 18 February 2017	18
4.19. Other consultation methods	18
4.20. Pre-submission Consultation, 5 May - 16 June 2017	19
4.21. Pre-Submission Consultation Follow-up 19th October 2017-February 2018	19

1. Purpose

1. This Consultation Statement has been prepared as part of the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan (PNP).
2. In accordance with Regulation 15(2) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended), it contains details of the consultation undertaken by the PNP Steering Group, on behalf of the qualifying body Pyrton Parish Council, in preparing the PNP. The requirements of a Consultation Statement are defined as follows:

“(2) In this regulation “consultation statement” means a document which—

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;*
- (b) explains how they were consulted;*
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and*
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood plan.”*

2. Key stakeholders

1. The key stakeholders that have been involved in the preparation of the PNP itself, or have informed the PNP in one way or another, include the following:
 - a. Pyrton Parish Council
 - b. Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
 - c. Residents of Pyrton Parish
 - d. South Oxfordshire District Council
 - e. Oxfordshire County Council
 - f. Terence O'Rourke Limited
 - g. Jeffrey Charles Emmett Planning Consultancy
 - h. Watlington Town Council
 - i. Watlington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
 - j. Residents of Watlington
 - k. Landowners / developers and their agents
 - l. English Heritage
 - m. Natural England
 - n. Environment Agency
 - o. Local Estate Agents
2. In particular it has been prepared by the PNP Steering Group, which is acting on behalf of and representing the parish and its residents, with consultancy assistance from the planning, design and environmental practice Terence O'Rourke Limited.
3. The Steering Group consists of members of Pyrton Parish Council and parish residents. The Steering Group has led on the preparation of the plan and engagement process with residents, which has been critical in ensuring that a plan could be prepared that meets the needs of all members of the local community.

3. Consultation methods

1. To ensure that the PNP reflected what the parish as a whole wanted to use the plan for, a range of consultation was undertaken using various methods.
2. The Steering Group was conscious throughout the plan-making process of the fact that, because it is ultimately residents within the parish who would be voting on the plan at referendum, it is important the views of parish residents were listened to and these were accurately reflected in the decisions made in compiling the plan.
3. To achieve this, the Steering Group reached out to its community, as well as other stakeholders with an interest in the PNP, through various channels from very early in the process. These included meetings, questionnaires / surveys, leaflets, letters, emails, a website, telephone calls, and word of mouth.
4. Full details of the specific types of consultation undertaken are provided later in this statement.

4. Consultation undertaken

As previously explained, the PNP Steering Group has undertaken a wide range of consultation at various points in preparing the PNP. The key consultation exercises used to reach out to all stakeholders with an interest in the PNP are summarised below.

4.1. Neighbourhood planning area application, 1 April 2015

1. An application was submitted on 1 April 2015 to designate the full Pyrton parish boundary as the 'neighbourhood plan area' (**Appendix A**). This related to the parish boundary prior to changes that came into effect on 1 April 2015, therefore including a sports field on the northern edge of Watlington. A decision was made to include this land because it was not covered by Watlington's neighbourhood plan designation, which had been granted at an earlier date, and would have resulted in the sports field not forming part of either NP area.
2. SODC publicised the neighbourhood plan area application from 21 May to 23 June 2015. However, an objection was received from Watlington Town Council. The matter was resolved by SODC concluding that both NPs should reflect the new parish boundary, which led to an amendment to Watlington's designated NP to include the sports field, and Pyrton only needing to include land within its new parish boundary (excluding the sports field).
3. The NP area application submitted by Pyrton Parish Council was subsequently amended by SODC and the whole area of the parish as defined at July 2015 was designated as a neighbourhood area on 2 July 2015 (**Appendix B**).

4.2. Initial introduction meeting, 23 June 2015

1. An introductory meeting was held on the 23 June 2015 in order to provide residents in the parish with an overview of the purpose of a NP and what it can be used to achieve.
2. This meeting included a discussion of local issues that a PNP could address, with a number of residents contributing to the discussions, and was concluded with a question and answer session.
3. The key issues raised by residents related to the following:
 - a. The plan-making process and steps that would need to be taken;
 - b. The timescales associated with preparing a neighbourhood plan;
 - c. The level of turnout at a referendum, which is deemed a good turnout;

- d. How many referenda take place;
 - e. What should happen to the former MoD site (PYR1);
 - f. How to address local traffic pressures;
 - g. It was acknowledged that the future of PYR1 and local traffic pressures were likely to be key aspects that the PNP should address through specific policies, if appropriate.
4. A total of 30 residents attended the meeting.

4.3. Neighbourhood plan group meeting, 23 July 2015

1. A neighbourhood plan group meeting of 11 residents was held with Terence O'Rourke Limited. An initial questionnaire for the parish was discussed, further information on the neighbourhood plan process was given, and a list of tasks for working groups suggested.

4.4. Leaflet distribution 'Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan - Planning for the future of our parish', 31 July 2015

1. Leaflets were distributed to 92 addresses that fall within the parish boundary on 31 July 2015 (**Appendix C**). These leaflets provided the PNP Steering Group with an opportunity to inform all residents of the intention to prepare a neighbourhood plan and provide residents with information about neighbourhood plans and the process generally, as well as the emerging PNP.
2. This included a description of what a NP is, what a NP can include, key initial topics that the PNP Steering Group had identified that the PNP could be used to address, and information about the next stage in the preparation of the PNP.
3. The leaflets also provided information about the role of Terence O'Rourke Limited in assisting the parish in preparing its NP.

4.5. Questionnaire and letter distribution, 4 August 2015 and 2 September 2015

1. Questionnaires were distributed to the same 92 addresses that fall within the parish boundary on 4 August 2015 (**Appendix D**). The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain a range of data from residents, enabling the initial thoughts and opinions of residents to be understood in relation to what they would like to deliver through the PNP.
2. The questions posed within the questionnaire spanned four sections, namely:
 - a. Section A: Built and Natural Environment
 - b. Section B: Development Options
 - c. Section C: Facilities, Services and Infrastructure
 - d. Section D: Additional Thoughts
3. An initial deadline was set for the return of completed questionnaires of 7 September 2015. However, as only a limited number of completed questionnaires had been returned, a letter was sent on 2 September 2015 reminding residents that there was still time to return the questionnaires and highlighting the importance of receiving as many completed questionnaires as possible to ensure that the emerging PNP was representative of local opinion (**Appendix E**).
4. A total of 67 households completed and returned the questionnaire.
5. The analysis of the data obtained from the parish questionnaires is included in **Appendix D** and discussed in the PNP. Some key findings are as follows:
 - a. The key factors that parishioners value about living in Pyrton relate (in order of preference) to its tranquillity, location, landscape and setting (**Appendix D, Q1 responses**).

- b. The most popular options for ensuring the quality of the built and natural environment in Pyrton were (1) conserving the character and appearance of the local area, (2) controlling residential development, (3) controlling traffic movements, (4) protecting heritage features, and (5) ensuring high quality design. The most important factors in terms of first choices were, by a long way, conserving the character and appearance of the local area and controlling residential development (Appendix D, Q2 responses).
- c. Most respondents felt that it was necessary to extend Pyrton's Conservation Area and provided their thoughts as to where and how it should be extended. The complete list of suggestions are provided in **Appendix D (Q3 responses)**, which focuses primarily on protecting the undeveloped open space in the village.
- d. The key features of the character and appearance of Pyrton that parishioners value are its setting and landscape (**Appendix D, Q4 responses**).
- e. The key features and design considerations that were regarded as important to incorporate into parish design principles, in order of preference, were the density and location of development, as well as building materials, height, scale, styles / details and types (**Appendix D, Q5 responses**).
- f. Pyrton residents highlighted a number of buildings and parts of the parish that they would like to see designated as an Asset of Community Value. Topping the list were the Village hall, Charity land, and St Mary's Church; the full list can be found in **Appendix D (Q6 responses)**.
- g. There are a number of aspects of Pyrton that parishioners believe should remain largely unchanged, which generally relate to maintaining the 'rural, quiet, small village' environment and historic character of Pyrton parish (**Appendix D, Q7 responses**).
- h. When asked their preferred use for the redevelopment of the former MoD site (PYR1), a significant proportion of parishioners (32%) preferred a residential scheme, although there was also support for retirement (18%) and care accommodation (10%). 75% of respondents would limit residential development to no more than 15 detached (44%) and semi-detached (30%) homes; 47% supported 6-15 dwellings and 28% supported 1-5 dwellings (**Appendix D, Q8-Q11 responses**).
- i. Pyrton residents indicated that there were some sites within the village that might be available for residential development such as infill locations that did not spoil the open nature of the village and retained rural views (**Appendix D, Q12 responses**). Potential development sites in Pyrton are discussed in a supplementary document entitled **Potential Development Sites**.
- j. To make Pyrton more sustainable, there was a high level of support for the provision of footpaths / enhancement of footpath networks (31%), solar energy generation (27%), and provision of cycle ways / enhancement of cycling networks (26%) (**Appendix D, Q13 responses**).
- k. There was overwhelming opposition (93%) to the preparation of a Neighbourhood Development Order (NDO) for Pyrton (**Appendix D, Q14 responses**).
- l. A range of deficiencies in the existing facilities, services and infrastructure in Pyrton were identified. Although each deficiency would need a specific response, the preferred ways of dealing with them generally related to bringing them up to modern standards (24%), maintenance (24%), replacement (20%) and enhancement (20%). Deficiencies included use of Pyrton as a 'rat run' to the M40, poor mobile phone reception, broadband connection / speed, and surface water drainage among others (**Appendix D, Q15 responses**).

- m. Most Pyrton residents indicated that the most popular improvements they would like to see related to faster broadband connection, mobile phone reception, surface water drainage, provision of a wildlife preserve and a public house (**Appendix D, Q16-Q17 responses**).
 - n. The highways/transport issues identified in and surrounding Pyrton were considerable but primarily focussed on commercial vehicles/HGVs passing through the village, commuter use of Pyrton as a 'rat run' to the M40, too much traffic going too fast and a lack of consideration for pedestrians / dog walkers using the road (**Appendix D, Q18 responses**). Respondents provided an extensive list of suggestions to address these issues such as enhancing footpaths, speed limits and width restrictions.
6. This data proved useful when identifying where to target future consultation and the additional information that would be required to inform the PNP. Potential policy topics were drafted to reflect the key issues raised during this consultation exercise which could be developed as the plan-making process progressed.

4.6. Housing needs survey distribution, 15 January 2016

1. In order to obtain information about the potential level of housing need within Pyrton, a housing needs survey was distributed to 92 addresses within the parish boundary on 15 January 2016 (**Appendix F**). A total of 34 completed surveys were received.
2. As the turnout rate was lower than anticipated, it was decided that for future consultation exercises, there would be a need for greater engagement with residents to encourage a higher proportion of responses. The results of the survey are covered in more detail in the **Potential Local Housing Needs Report**. The PNP was drafted in the context of the survey findings now that it had been established that there was likely to be a need for some additional housing in the parish and there would be a need to allocate some sites.
3. As the housing needs survey provided a further opportunity to gather local opinion on key matters, it was decided to ask two additional questions related to other matters. This included a preferred future use for the Christmas Common mast site as well as a preferred 'buffer' use for the Charity Field and PYR2. The latter two sites had been identified as providing a buffer between Pyrton and Watlington and were therefore important to safeguard.
4. The responses in relation to these questions found that:
 - a. The preferred future use for the Christmas Common mast site was overwhelmingly to re-use it to provide the parish with a faster broadband service.
 - b. The preferred future 'buffer' use for the Pyrton Charity Field and PYR2 was as a local green space or gap and for it to remain as it is. The next preferred use was as a wildlife reserve.
5. A decision to provide a faster broadband service has since been made and, as a result, there is no longer a need for the Christmas Common mast site to be safeguarded for this purpose and it is not addressed in the plan.
6. Regarding a suitable 'buffer' use, a policy has been produced for the PNP that designates the Pyrton Charity Field as a local green space and PYR2 as a local gap for the reasons identified in the plan.

4.7. Submission of SEA screening opinion questionnaire, 17 February 2016

1. After identifying the level of housing that Pyrton residents felt may be needed in the parish, coupled with the amount of housing that they would like to see delivered, a

Screening Opinion Questionnaire for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was completed and submitted to SODC on 17 February 2016 (**Appendix G**).

4.8. Consultation on SODC initial screening statement, 29 March 2016

1. After receiving the Screening Opinion Questionnaire for SEA, SODC prepared a Screening Statement (screening opinion) to determine whether an SEA would be required for the PNP (**Appendix H**).
2. In this statement, SODC identified the environmental impacts that the proposed allocation of around 15 dwellings in Pyrton could lead to and concluded that there was a high probability that this would have significant effects on the environment.
3. In light of this, the Screening Statement noted that *“On this basis the Neighbourhood Plan should be accompanied by an assessment that examines the environmental impacts of allocating each site. The results of the assessment should then be used to determine which sites are appropriate to be allocated for development.”* There was therefore a need for an SEA for the PNP.
4. SODC’s initial screening statement was sent to English Heritage, Natural England and the Environment Agency on 29 March 2016 for their comment on the proposals for the emerging PNP.

4.9. Developer meeting, 18 April 2016

1. On 18 April 2016, members of the PNP Steering Group and Watlington Neighbourhood Development Plan (WNDP) Steering Group met with representatives from Providence Land Limited and Howard Sharp & Partners LLP.
2. During this meeting the representatives from Providence Land and Howard Sharp outlined their proposals for a scheme to the north of Watlington on PYR2 .
3. Members of the Pyrton and Watlington Steering Groups posed a number of questions about the scheme in order to understand the nature of what was being proposed and the representatives from Providence Land and Howard Sharp provided responses to some of these questions but not all.
4. Following the meeting, the PNP Steering Group discussed the proposals and confirmed their initial thoughts about development at this site. It was overwhelmingly concluded that this would not be a site that the emerging PNP could support, because the development would be on land that had an important role in retaining the separate identities of Pyrton and Watlington.
5. Providence Land went ahead with their application to SODC (ref. P16/S2576/O) and in response, Terence O’Rourke prepared a letter of objection on behalf of Pyrton Parish Council (15 September 2016) providing the following conclusions for SODC consideration:
 - a. *“It is clear that the claimed sustainability of the proposed development is highly questionable. The information set out in the application is weak, failing to fully explain how the site will benefit the local area and not result in adverse impacts to the character of the area and an irreversible loss of an open greenfield site. The outline planning application fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF and fails to address the impacts the development will have on a number of important material considerations.*
 - b. *It is strongly felt that the scheme represents an inappropriate form of development within a highly sensitive rural area. Development of the site would fundamentally alter the character of the area, introducing an urban feel to an otherwise tranquil area of open countryside. The outline application is weak in*

demonstrating how the proposal would sustain the town of Watlington and fails to consider fully the adverse impacts on the village of Pyrton.

- c. It is our view that it is of the utmost importance to retain the site as a buffer between the settlements of Pyrton and Watlington and important setting to the adjoining AONB. The assertion that the development of the site is required to meet housing needs is flawed; housing needs for Watlington can be met through the development of alternative sites that fall within the parish of Watlington and not Pyrton. Moreover, the proposal is in disaccord with policy CSR1 and the settlement hierarchy set out within the adopted Core Strategy.*
- d. The proposal does not deliver any benefit with regard to resolving current traffic issues within Watlington town centre. The proposed relief road is reliant on other sites coming forward in order to be effective. Moreover, the proposed road would increase traffic along Pyrton Lane.*
- e. The lack of consideration of the emerging PNP represents unsound planning and fails to address the real concerns and desires of the local community. The proposal is submitted ahead of decisions relating to the scale and location of development in the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan Area, undermining the Neighbourhood plan-making process as set out in the government's National Planning Practice Guidance.*
- f. The current proposals do not represent a sound approach to planning, nor do they represent a sustainable form of development as defined within the NPPF. It is our view that the application has not made a case to support the claim that it represents sustainable development and it should be refused."*

4.10. Call for sites exercise, 15 June 2016

1. To support the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) / Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that was being prepared in support of the PNP, a high-level review of potential development sites within the parish was undertaken.
2. The purpose of this exercise was to ensure that the PNP was able to make appropriate allocations to meet the potential local housing need identified through the housing needs survey and secondary sources.
3. A range of sources were consulted, including the data obtained from the earlier questionnaires (**Appendices D and F**), South Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and discussions within the PNP Steering Group, in order to identify potential development sites.
4. To ensure that all potential development sites had been identified, an article was placed in the local newspaper, the Watlington Times, on 15 June 2016 (**Appendix I**). This related to a 'call for sites' consultation, through which the PNP Steering Group wrote to landowners/developers in Pyrton to encourage them to submit sites that they considered were both suitable and available for development.
5. Members of the public were directed to the PNP website (<http://www.pyrton.org/>), where a 'call for sites' response form was provided in order to gather a range of information about each submitted site.
6. The response form was also emailed to the list of email addresses that the Steering Group had compiled through prior consultation exercises with Pyrton residents. In addition, the developers promoting SHLAA sites PYR1 and PYR2 were directly informed about the consultation.
7. Landowners/developers were provided with one month (from 15 June 2016) to return their completed response forms by post or email. Some responses were received after this deadline and were still considered. A report was prepared following this exercise

entitled *Potential Development Sites*, which forms part of the evidence base in support of the PNP and informed the Sustainability Appraisal process.

4.11. NP community meeting, 17 June 2016

1. The PNP Steering Group and Terence O'Rourke brought residents up to date with the progress of the PNP and work undertaken to date. An explanation of findings from the initial questionnaire 'Planning for the Future' was given and the 'Housing Needs' survey was explained and circulated after the meeting. A list of forthcoming tasks and targets were provided. Task groups, to support the steering group, were discussed and residents were encouraged to get further involved.

4.12. Questionnaire on planning policies distribution, 29 June 2016

1. To further inform the PNP, the Steering Group distributed a questionnaire on 29 June 2016, which sought the views of the parish on the content of the planning policies to be incorporated in the Neighbourhood Plan (**Appendix J**).
2. The questionnaire was emailed to residents and was made available to download online. In addition, members of the Steering Group distributed hard copies of the questionnaire to residents who did not have access to the online version.
3. The questionnaire provided details of the types of policies that a working draft of the PNP contained, or was anticipated to contain. It specifically sought views on the most suitable design of future development in the parish with regard to housing, potential local improvements/facilities and other more general wide ranging questions.
4. A total of 89 separate responses were received from parishioners, which was a very high response rate and was the product of an enormous effort by the PNP Steering Group to reach out to residents. The key points to note from the data obtained through the questionnaire are as follows:
 - a. Design
 - i. Question 1a: *Preferred number of building storeys*. All respondents would prefer any new residential buildings to be limited to no more than two storeys.
 - ii. Question 1b: *Preferred density of development (number of dwellings per hectare)*. For example, there are 6 houses in Hall Close which covers an area of around 0.8 hectares or equates to circa 7.5 houses per hectare (0.13 hectares per house). A clear majority of respondents would prefer the density of new residential development in the parish to be similar to the existing situation in Pyrton village, which is 6 to 10 dwellings per hectare; i.e. 0.1 to 0.17 hectares per dwelling.
 - iii. Question 1c: *Aspects of existing homes or buildings in Pyrton that you think are important and should be taken into account in any future residential development in the parish; e.g., types of materials, colours, etc*. A number of aspects of existing homes or buildings in Pyrton were seen as being important to take into account in any future residential development in the parish, including:
 1. Must be in keeping with the village / existing buildings
 2. Brick or flint roof tiles
 3. Traditional designs and materials
 4. High quality sustainable construction
 5. Red / brown slates
 6. Off-street parking and garages
 7. Gables

8. Dormer windows
 9. Use of wood / timber frames
 10. Sympathetic use of natural materials (stone, timber, thatch)
 11. Chimneys
 12. Maintain the varied architectural style of Pyrton
 13. Gardens of an appropriate and generous size
- iv. Question 1d: Other points that were deemed important to take into account in the design of future residential development included:
1. Adequate off road parking for dwellings;
 2. Spread the development out rather than focus in one area;
 3. Single, detached family dwellings;
 4. Individually designed properties – no estates; i.e. no Hall Close replicas;
 5. Mix of houses and bungalows to encourage mix of ages;
 6. General adherence to scale and character of existing building.
- v. Question 2: *The current styles of housing in the local area are shown in a document attached to the questionnaire. This document also contains a range of other housing styles. If you consider any of these would be appropriate in Pyrton, please state the relevant style numbers.* In terms of the styles of housing that the parish thought would be appropriate in Pyrton, a clear majority of respondents preferred housing styles that reflected those that were already built in Pyrton and Watlington; i.e. more traditional housing styles rather than modern styles of housing.
- vi. Question 3: *Do you have any other thoughts related to design considerations that you would like to see reflected in any future residential development in the parish to maintain the quality of any future development?* The main design considerations that respondents wanted to see reflected in future development in the parish included the following:
1. Traditional designs that reflect the historic nature of the parish
 2. Safe road access and minimal traffic
 3. Small-scale development
 4. Simple, not grandiose dwellings
 5. Individually designed buildings
 6. Adequate greenery / landscaping / central green spaces
 7. Proper provision of infrastructure
 8. Generous plot sizes
 9. Height and scale that reflects the existing buildings
 10. Only infill development
 11. Maintain separation from Wallington
 12. Starter and family homes for younger local residents
 13. No affordable housing
 14. No impact on views of Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Shirburn parkland
 15. Individual designs in the vernacular styles must be continued
 16. Nothing ultra modern
 17. Similar to existing architectural styles
 18. Thought should be given to the individuality of each building (i.e. they should not all look the same); good quality buildings and well built
 19. Off-road parking

20. Minimal artificial lighting so as to reduce light pollution, and proper infrastructure (drains, sewerage, etc.)
 21. Individual houses with a rural character
 22. Communal green area in the middle
 23. Maintain separation from Watlington
- vii. Question 4: *Are there any particular considerations or criteria that you believe are important for any future residential infill developments in the parish to take into account?* The factors that the parish thought were important for any future infill developments in the parish included the following:
1. Infill development only; organic development
 2. Generous plot sizes
 3. No increase in flooding
 4. In keeping with character of Pyrton/ maintain existing sense of place
 5. Low density
 6. Impact on tranquil character of Pyrton – no increase in traffic etc.
 7. Should not encourage suburbanisation; i.e. pavements, street lights, street furniture, traffic lights should not be encouraged
 8. Installation of drains to help reduce surface water flooding
 9. Sufficient off road parking
 10. Market housing only
 11. Individual designs in the vernacular styles
 12. Open space between each plot
 13. Should not fill the entire space available
 14. Conform as closely as possible to the architectural styles and design of neighbouring properties
 15. Sympathetic to neighbouring houses
 16. Should be set back from the road, be linear along the road and have big front and back gardens
 17. No more than a maximum of three houses on an infill plot or fewer depending on plot size; i.e. 6 to 10 dwellings per hectare or 0.1 to 0.17 hectare per dwelling
 18. Very small organic developments
 19. Maintain the sense of space
 20. Houses that are affordable for local people
 21. Variations in density – not identical like in housing estates

b. Housing

- i. Question 5: *Based on the need for 5 to 20 new homes, what proportion of market and affordable housing do you think is needed in Pyrton?* The majority of respondents would like to see a mix of market and affordable housing delivered in Pyrton, generally with a higher proportion of market housing.
- ii. Question 6: *Please rank the following housing types in order based on what you think are most needed in Pyrton? Housing types include detached homes, semi-detached homes, terraced homes, bungalows, and flats.* A clear majority of the parish think that detached homes are required in Pyrton, as opposed to other housing types; as a preference, semi-detached homes ranked second.
- iii. Question 7: *Please rank the following house sizes in order based on what you think are most needed in Pyrton? House sizes include one-bedroom,*

two-bedroom, three-bedroom, four-bedroom, and five or more bedroom homes. The majority of residents felt that there was a need for new houses to provide between two and four bedrooms.

- iv. Question 8: *Is there any other information regarding potential housing needs in Pyrton that you would like to make the Steering Group aware of?*

Other information included the following:

1. Sense of rural community to be maintained
2. Accessible for the elderly and disabled
3. In keeping with character of the village – it should remain an ‘unspoilt haven’
4. Large, detached family homes with ample gardens
5. Attractive to young families (important for future vibrancy and development of Pyrton)
6. Housing for the elderly / disabled
7. Housing for agricultural, teachers, nurses, police, firemen
8. Lack of facilities makes growth unsustainable; e.g., faster broadband, mobile phone service
9. Mitigation of surface water flooding

- c. Local improvements/Provision

- i. Question 9: *If future residential development in the parish is required to mitigate impacts on the local area, please rank the following in order based on the type of areas where mitigation (e.g., improvements or new provision) may be required? The ranking includes local highways (including footpaths) / cycleways, public rights of ways, open space / allotments, play space, sports / leisure facilities, community facilities, education facilities, healthcare facilities, and other.* In terms of aspects within the parish that may need to be improved or new provision provided, a high proportion of responses rated local highways / cycleways as a key area.

- ii. Question 10: *Once the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan is part of South Oxfordshire’s Development Plan, Pyrton will be eligible for 25% of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts arising from development in their area. Do you have any thoughts about how you would like to see this money spent? Areas where respondents thought receipts from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could be spent include the following:*

1. Home care assistance for elderly
2. Community facility (i.e. pub / shop)
3. Drainage and sewerage
4. Leisure area / lake
5. Planting of trees for nature conservation
6. Recreation facilities on the charity land close to Pyrton Lane
7. Safe walking and cycling routes
8. Highway maintenance
9. Defend encroachment into Pyrton Parish
10. Maintenance / enhancement of infrastructure/facilities/services
11. Buried power and telecommunication cables
12. Traffic calming measures
13. Green footpath into Watlington
14. Sorting the surface water drainage
15. Better internet / mobile phone connection
16. Safer walking / cycling routes connecting Watlington/Pyrton

- 17. Connecting the old railway on Station Road with Lewknor Junction 6 of M40 and the Oxford Tube bus service to London/Oxford
- 18. Church maintenance
- 19. Availability of gas in Pyrton
- iii. Question 11: *Do you have any thoughts about how adequate sewerage provision could be made available for any future residential development in the parish, which may be a constraint to future development?*
 Respondents generally felt that sewerage provision for any future residential development in the parish could be dealt with through the provision of septic tanks as the installation of mains drainage was reported as not being popular.
- d. Other
 - i. Question 12: *Do you have any thoughts about potential planning policies that you would like to see included in the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan, or issues that you would like the plan to respond to or address?*
 - ii. Question 12a: *Details of any suggested policies.* Respondents indicated the following:
 - 1. Preserve quietness and character of the village
 - 2. Remain separate from Watlington
 - 3. Pyrton is a village and should remain so
 - 4. Maintain style and landscape of this historic, peaceful and rural area
 - 5. Preserve openness
 - 6. Limit size of houses (not too large)
 - 7. No light pollution / street lighting
 - 8. Maintain small local agricultural feel
 - 9. Take account of proximity to AONB
 - 10. The potential concept of a relief road around Watlington will impinge on Pyrton Parish's rural aspect, its area of outstanding natural beauty, and historic importance as part of the Chiltern Hundreds
 - 11. Warning that Knightsbridge Lane is a single track road with limited passing places
 - 12. Traffic – respondents concerned that proximity to the motorway may impact traffic in Pyrton and character of area
 - 13. Road / traffic - maintenance, speed safety, farm vehicle awareness to be raised, pedestrian awareness, passing places made available
 - 14. Any future development should be designed to blend in with the local environment
 - 15. Access to and from motorway / Watlington
 - iii. Question 12b: *Details of any issues and how they could potentially be addressed* included the following:
 - 1. Conservation area style restrictions on any new buildings
 - 2. Retention of green space between Pyrton and Watlington
 - 3. No one wants extensive development. Pyrton's identity is that of a quiet secluded village. That is its charm and it should be a high priority to keep it this way
 - 4. Through traffic is a major concern in view of the proposal for a huge development at Chalgrove Airfield. Pyrton does not want to become a dangerous rat run. Light pollution - maintain the rural

- atmosphere by not having street lighting
5. Development should be placed in areas that avoid coalescence between small villages and larger towns
 6. Imperative that PYR2 be maintained as open space between Pyrton and Watlington
 7. 'Residents only' traffic through the village
 8. Put in speed bumps or chicanes so traffic is slowed down through the village
 9. Number of cars per household combined with inadequate transport links – how will this impact traffic in local area
 10. Light pollution – no street lighting
 11. Only infill development will allow Pyrton to maintain a traditional South Oxfordshire village; block development will wreck the nature of Pyrton
 12. SODC to provide housing policy which does not impinge on rural communities like Pyrton
 13. Police – number seems to be decreasing
 14. The lane running through the village must not be allowed to become a 'B-road' as most children and older adults use it freely, relying on the passing traffic to be knowledgeable locals who are aware of pedestrians and their dogs
 15. No mains drainage – would limit number of new dwellings in village
 16. How to stop development creeping into the village in the future
- iv. Question 13: *Do you have any other thoughts that you would like to make the Steering Group aware of in relation to the content of the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan?* Other thoughts included the following:
1. Consider unique and special character of area in future development.
 2. Bus service.
 3. Sustainable development.
 4. Appropriate amount of housing.
 5. Development should be minimal, sustainable, and at an appropriate level to meet housing need which is felt to be low in this parish. Any development should take into consideration that the key feature of the parish is that it is primarily rural, and that it includes a conservation area, is of historical / archaeological / architectural significance and is adjacent to an area of outstanding natural beauty. Any housing design should be sympathetic to the surrounding area and architecture and focus on quality of materials and craftsmanship.
 6. The former MoD (PYR1) site is a suitable site for housing - brownfield and an eyesore.
 7. Development of the former MoD (PYR1) site – creating housing here makes it less likely that major housing development will take place elsewhere; we should consider the need and impact on both Watlington and Pyrton as both communities are inextricably linked. Watlington is my community as much as Pyrton.
 8. Watlington's proposal to convert Pyrton lane into a so called relief road would have a significant impact on Pyrton. This traffic issue would be further exacerbated by any development at Chalgrove

- airfield.
9. Maintain rural agricultural atmosphere of the village and parish; therefore, no street lighting, no pavements, no sewerage treatment other than septic tanks.
 10. Concerned about future traffic issues / review traffic measures to ease pressure on B4009.
 11. Should address environmental issues.
 12. Do not want to see creeping urbanisation.
 13. No street furniture, street lighting, traffic calming, cycle lanes, excessive signage, road markings, etc.
 14. Harmonise with adjacent parishes.
 15. Close Junction 6/B4009 (or limit access) toward Watlington.
 16. Fresh review of traffic measures to ease pressure on B4009 in/out of Watlington, including a bypass.
- e. Given the level of data obtained from this exercise, coupled with the data obtained from previous consultations, the parish felt comfortable that it had a good understanding of the main areas that residents wanted to use the PNP to influence or address.
 - f. It was therefore possible to use this data to finalise a first draft of the neighbourhood plan and its policies for consideration by the Steering Group. Review of this draft allows any major additional policies or points to be identified and included in the PNP.

4.13. Consultation on SODC revised screening statement, 4 July 2016

1. Following consultation on its initial screening statement with Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency, SODC's revised screening statement was received on 4 July 2016. This contained response letters from the statutory consultees dated 29 April 2016, 9 May 2016 and 10 May 2016 respectively (**Appendix K**).
2. The revised screening statement concluded that:
 - a. *"15. The Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan will have potential significant effects on Natura 2000 sites and, therefore, requires an Appropriate Assessment.*
 - b. *16. The District Council will ensure that an Appropriate Assessment is prepared that assesses the Neighbourhood Plan proposals either as a separate assessment or as part of the emerging Local Plan 2031. The assessment will be prepared as soon as practically possible and in any event prior to the Neighbourhood Plan being submitted to the Council for examination.*
 - c. *17. The Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan seeks to allocate sites for around 15 houses. There is a high probability that these allocations will have significant effects on the environment, including potential effects on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which is a nationally protected landscape. These effects are not likely to be reversible. On this basis the Neighbourhood Plan should be accompanied by an assessment that examines the environmental impacts of allocating each site. The results of the assessment should then be used to determine which sites are appropriate to be allocated for development.*
 - d. *18. It is determined that, as a result of the screening undertaken by the Council, a Strategic Environment Assessment is required for the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan, particularly to address potential environmental impacts on the AONB. Other impacts that should also be considered are those to the area of flood risk; the Watlington & Pyrton Hills SSSI and Pishill Woods SSSI and the significance and*

setting of the range of important historical assets in the Pyrton conservation area, Shirburn conservation area and Watlington conservation area.”

3. In response to this, the Steering Group explained to SODC that before confirming whether an Appropriate Assessment is required, there would be a need for a shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to be prepared to examine whether European sites would be likely to be significantly affected by the plan.
4. Following this, an updated screening statement was issued on 23 September 2016, following receipt of updated screening responses from the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England dated 12 September, 21 September and 21 September 2016 respectively (**Appendix L**). This updated screening statement concluded that:
 - a. *“Conclusion*
 - b. *11. As a result of the screening undertaken by the Council, the following determination has been reached.*
 - c. *12. Based on the assessment presented in Appendices 1 & 3, the Pyrton NDP is to have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore the Pyrton NDP does require a Strategic Environment Assessment.*
 - d. *13. However, the Pyrton NP is unlikely to have significant effects on Natura 2000 sites, therefore, an Appropriate Assessment for the Example Neighbourhood Development Plan is not required.”*

4.14. Neighbourhood plan community meeting, 15 September 2016

1. The meeting was chaired by John Curtis, Chairman of Pyrton Parish Council, with 31 people in attendance, including the PNP Steering Group and members of the task groups. Providence Land's Outline planning application for the erection of up to 100 residential dwellings (ref. P16/S2576/O) was discussed.

4.15. Consultation on scoping report, 7 and 9 October 2016

1. Following receipt of SODC's updated screening statement on 23 September 2016, the Steering Group then issued the scoping report that it had prepared to the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England on 7 and 9 October 2016 (**Appendix M**).
2. Scoping consultation responses were received from the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England on 18 October, 3 November and 4 November respectively (**Appendix N**) and these were used to inform the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal. This ensured the sustainability of the NP, its policies and site allocations.

4.16. Community consultation on the preferred site options, 24 November 2016

1. At a meeting on 24 November 2016, the Steering Group considered potential options to meet the locally identified potential housing need of circa 5 to 20 new homes for Pyrton Parish.
2. Parishioners were talked through some options for the sites identified through the consultation undertaken to date.
3. It was decided that PYR1 would be allocated about 15 units, but that it would be helpful to carry out a survey of three potential infill sites to understand an appropriate level of housing for each (**Appendix O**).

4.17. Housing infill survey distribution, 9 December 2016

1. The housing infill survey was distributed electronically on 9 December 2016 to Pyrton residents with email access and hand delivered to those without email access. Sixty-five

responses to the survey were received (80% response rate) and to summarise, the conclusions of this consultation exercise were as follows:

- a. Field opposite Pyrton Village Hall (0.4 hectares): 88% of those who responded wanted no more than three houses delivered at the site. However, it must be noted that 42% of respondents wanted no more than two houses at this site.
 - b. Land between Old Vicarage Cottage and The Lodge House (0.3 hectares): 95% of those who responded wanted no more than two houses delivered at the site. However, it must be noted that 35% of respondents wanted no more than one house at this site.
 - c. New Farm (0.1 hectares): 83% of those who responded wanted no more than one house delivered at this site. However, it must be noted that 18% of respondents did not want any houses at this site.
2. The PNP and its proposed site allocations were then updated to reflect the findings from this consultation exercise. It was decided that the first two sites would be allocated for “3 or fewer” and “2 or fewer” new homes respectively, whilst the third site would be allocated “1” new house.

4.18. Greenspace allocation survey, 18 February 2017

1. This survey was intended to revisit one element of the last ‘infill’ development survey completed by the parish in December 2016.
2. The December 2016 survey showed that 87% of those who replied supported the building of three houses or fewer on the field opposite the Village Hall. This was going to be one of three ‘infill’ sites within the core village offered up by the PNP for development.
3. Since the survey, however, an application has been submitted to SODC to build three houses on the farmyard at New Farm (between The Old Forge and New Farm bungalow). As a result of this, SODC has shown the PNP Steering Group pre-application correspondence which includes the site opposite the Village Hall. SODC planners took the view that *“a development on this site would harm the openness and rural character of the village.”*
4. In the light of this, and the fact that with other proposals the PNP offers more housing than SODC requires from a village such as Pyrton, the Steering Group recommended that the proposal for any development on the field opposite the Village Hall was withdrawn and that it be retained as a local green space. It was felt that this would help to maintain the rural character of the village, preserve the setting of the listed buildings nearby and the conservation area and registered parkland to which it lies adjacent.
5. The results show that 90% favour preserving the field opposite the Village Hall as open green space based on a 70% response rate from Pyrton residents.

4.19. Other consultation methods

1. In addition to the above, a number of other consultation methods were employed as part of and in connection with the preparation of the PNP, including the following:
 - a. Steering Group meetings - Regular meetings between members of the PNP Steering Group have been held. During these meetings members of the Steering Group discussed the next steps involved in preparing the PNP, set actions, reviewed the findings from consultation exercises, and continued to discuss local matters of relevance to the emerging PNP.
 - b. Parishioner meetings - Meetings have been organized at key times to inform the residents of Pyrton Parish of ongoing progress on important issues related to the PNP, including:

- i. Introduction to the need for neighbourhood planning, 23 June 2015
 - ii. Update on initial questionnaire responses and housing needs survey results, 17 June 2016
 - iii. Review Providence Land application (ref. P16/S2576/O) and Pyrton's response, 15 September 2016
 - iv. Discuss preferred site options, 24 November 2016
- c. Emails - Email correspondence has proven the most effective method of spreading awareness of consultation exercises, the progress made in preparing the PNP, and informing Pyrton residents of local planning matters. The PNP Steering Group has collated an extensive list of circa 80 email addresses of residents that live in the parish (circa 53% of all households) and has been able to use this channel to progress the PNP. Email exchanges have also been the most effective method of liaising with a range of organisations, as well as landowners / developers and their agents.
- d. Website - The PNP has its own dedicated website to provide information about the emerging PNP and consultation exercises (<http://www.pyrton.org/>). This provides a resource to those who wish to find out more information about the PNP.
- e. Word of mouth and telephone calls - Further awareness of the PNP and consultation exercises has been spread via word of mouth and telephone calls between residents in the parish. This has taken place as part of the everyday lives of residents.

4.20. Pre-submission Consultation, 5 May - 16 June 2017

1. Pyrton Parish Council invited all relevant statutory consultation authorities and other interested parties from the wider community to make comment on the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan. The six-week consultation period began on Friday 5 May 2017 and concluded on Friday 16 June 2017. During this period, display copies were made available in the Pyrton Village Hall and St Mary's Church located in the heart of the village. In addition, the PNP and sustainability assessment could be viewed or downloaded from the Pyrton website www.pyrton.org by following the link to the 'Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan'.
2. All comments were welcomed and feedback could be submitted by email to the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group at info@pyrton.org or the Pyrton Parish Council at pyrtonparishcouncil@gmail.com. Alternatively, a letter could be posted to John Curtis, Chairman of the Pyrton Parish Council, Lothlorien, Pyrton OX49 5AP or Genevieve Young, Clerk to the Pyrton Parish Council, Christmas Cottage, Pyrton OX49 5AP.
3. **Appendix P** provides contact details for all consultation bodies invited to review and comment on the Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, all residents of Pyrton were invited to make comments.

4.21. Pre-Submission Consultation Follow-up 19th October 2017-February 2018

1. Following the expiration of the statutory 6-week consultation on the pre-submission PNP documents, the Steering Group undertook a number of actions including:
 - a. Meet as a Steering Group (19 Oct 2017, 23 Nov 2017, and 19 Dec 2017) to review consultation responses received (**Appendix P**) and agree on any required amendments or revisions to the PNP.
 - b. Undertake the agreed amendments to the PNP documents in preparation for final submission of the PNP to SODC for their review and independent examination.
2. The actions taken by the Steering Group in response to the consultation responses are

recorded in the table attached to this statement.