

Consultation Statement

Chinnor Parish Council

1. This Statement has been prepared by Chinnor Parish Council (the Parish Council) to accompany its submission to the local planning authority, South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) of the Chinnor Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011 - 2034 (the Neighbourhood Plan) under Regulation 15 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
2. The regulations state that where a qualifying body submits a plan proposal to the local planning authority, it must include a consultation statement. A “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 development plan.
3. The Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2034 is a review of the made Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan (October 2017). The 2017 neighbourhood plan did not contain a site allocation or development boundary. In 2018, the Neighbourhood Plan steering group decided that it would be prudent and necessary to update the made plan to take account of recent planning appeals and decisions that would allow significant new housing developments to be built in Chinnor.
4. Accordingly, the plan went into review with the sole purpose of allocating sites so that the policies would reflect the existing development context. Andrea Pellegram Ltd. (the consultant) was commissioned by Chinnor Parish Council to undertake the task.
5. The consultant worked closely with South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) officers in the preparation of the site allocation assessment, Appendix 6 to the plan. SODC officers provided practical advice on how to undertake the assessment, and the monitoring officer provided information on planning permissions. The methodology for the site assessment was also discussed in detail and was agreed with the planning officers.
6. The site allocation was based on existing planning decisions and appeals and was therefore entirely factual. It was therefore not consulted upon, other than with the planning authority, because the results were not subject to interpretation.
7. The revised NDP differs from the original made 2017 NDP in the following ways:
 - a. It now contains a site allocation in a new policy CH H6 which allocates 5 sites for housing developments, a total of 507 dwellings;
 - b. It now contains a development boundary around Chinnor village in a new policy CH H7;

- c. Made policies were slightly reworded to make them clearer and more precise but their meaning was not changed nor were any other new policies added;
 - d. Facts were updated as appropriate to cover the intervening time from October 2017.
8. The limited review did not require further community consultation since the plan remained largely unchanged except for the allocation and development boundary. Therefore, the consultations undertaken for the October 2017 plan remain the primary engagement methods. **The original Consultation Statement is attached for information.**
9. The reviewed Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan was subject to a Regulation 14 consultation with the community, key stakeholders statutory consultees and the planning authority. The consultation period was from 24th May 2019 – 5th July 2019.
10. A copy of the text of the notification is attached in **Appendix 1**.
11. The consultation was advertised on the Parish Council newsletters which is emailed to anyone who registers to receive one and printed copies were made available from The Library, Dr's Surgeries, The Village Centre and the PC Office. The consultation was put in the Chinnor Pump – a monthly newsletter distributed freely to every household in our parish. Notices were placed on every public notice board. An open meeting was held.
12. Individual notifications were sent to statutory consultees as follows:
 - Oxfordshire County Council
 - South and Vale Council
 - South Oxfordshire District Council
 - Vale of White Horse District Council
 - The Coal Authority
 - Homes England
 - Natural England
 - Environment Agency
 - Historic England
 - Network Rail
 - Highways England
 - Marine Management organisation
 - British Telecom
 - EE
 - Vodaphone
 - Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group
 - NHS England
 - National Grid
 - Scottish and Southern Energy
 - UK Power networks
 - Thames Water
13. In addition, the following bodies were also consulted:
 - Adjoining parish councils: Sydenham, Aston Rowant, Lewknor and Towersey Parish Council

- Voluntary bodies, groups and organisations listed on the PC website
- Three known religious groups in the parish area
- All known local business within the parish.

14. Local groups and organisations were consulted. These are listed in **Appendix 2**.
15. The parish council is not aware of any groups in the parish that represent the interests of disabled persons or the interest of different racial, ethnic or national groups. However, the Chinnor Parish Council is an inclusive council and believes that every resident regardless of their ethnicity or race will have received this information.
16. People and organisations who had originally been invited to comment on the original neighbourhood plan were consulted again and additional contacts were added.
17. All responses to the Regulation 14 consultation were considered. These have been summarised in **Appendix 3** which also summarises how the representations were addressed.
18. **Appendix 4** is a table setting out how the representations from SODC were addressed. The letter is attached as a separate document.

Appendix 1: copy of email/letter sent to advertise Regulation 14 Consultation

Regulation 14 consultation on the Reviewed Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2034

The Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan was made in October 2017 following a successful referendum.

At the time that the neighbourhood plan was in preparation, there were changes proposed in a Ministerial Statement which provided certain flexibilities for neighbourhood plans that allocated sites. At that time, the plan was almost completed, and the steering group decided that it would be better to proceed with the plan, but without a site allocation, and then to go into an immediate review to allocate sites.

This is what we have done in this revision of the 2017 neighbourhood plan. We have commissioned a planning consultant who has worked with us and the planning authority to agree site allocations for the reviewed plan. As you will see, we have allocated sites that have already received planning permission and no “new” sites. This approach regularises the existing situation where many of the sites that were allowed on appeal are now part of the plan. This provides the village with more certainty that we can resist further housing development in the future.

The current modifications therefore include site allocations and make changes to the development boundary and are therefore a substantial and significant modification to the 2017 plan. Policy H6 allocates 5 previously permitted (or allowed) sites which will provide over 900 homes. Policy H7 amends the development boundary to accommodate these sites.

We have updated the 2017 plan to account for these changes and have slightly reworded some of the policies. We do not believe that the meaning of the adopted policies has changed – we have tried to make them clearer and more effective.

We are seeking your views on the revisions under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Parish Council must consult the people who live, work or carry on business in Chinnor Parish.

We welcome your comments on the reviewed draft and we will make changes where they are necessary. You may comment on any aspect of the plan.

Your comments should be made in writing or by email to Chinnor Parish Council Office at The Community Pavilion, Station Road, Chinnor OX39 4PU or chinnorpc@btconnect.com

We will then submit the revised draft to the planning authority, and they will undertake further consultation. The plan will then be amended again and will be considered by an independent Examiner who will recommend any necessary changes to the planning authority. The examiner will also consider whether the changes proposed in the revised plan are significant. If the examiner determines that the changes are significant, the plan will come back to the community to be judged in a Referendum.

Copies of the reviewed plan can be found at:

Chinnor Parish Council Offices
Chinnor Library
Chinnor Village Hall
Chinnor Village Centre
The Peacock Hotel, Henton

You can download an electronic copy from: www.chinnorparishcouncil.org.uk and www.chinnorneighbourplan.com

The Regulations allow for you to respond electronically or in writing to the Parish Council.

The consultation period of six weeks is between **24th May 2019** and **5th July 2019**. Please comment within that period.

An open session to meet the Review Committee has been arranged for 1st June 2019 from 10am to 12 noon in the Council Chamber, Community Pavilion, Chinnor – no appointment is needed – please just go along.

The Planning Authority has advised us that the plan does not require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or a Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA). These are reports that consider whether the policies in the plan are likely to have significant environmental effects or impacts on important habitats. The planning authority must consult on their recommendation whether SEA and HRA is required in a separate 4-week consultation aimed mainly at Statutory Consultees.

To save time, we will be running the two consultations (neighbourhood plan and SEA/HRA) at the same time. We hope that the planning authority's advice on SEA and HRA is correct and that assessments are not required. However, should the SEA and HRA consultation show that we need to produce a SEA or HRA, we will need to run the Regulation 14 consultation again. If that should happen, we will retain your comments to this version and use them where we can. However, we will need to consult on the entire plan and the required environmental report again.

Regards

Liz Folley

Clerk, Chinnor Parish Council

Community Pavilion
Station Road
Chinnor
Oxfordshire
OX39 4PU

Tel: 01844 353267

Appendix 2: Groups and organisations consulted at Reg. 14 stage of the NDP

Local Councils

Sydenham PC

Aston Rowant PC

Towersey PC

Bledlow cum Saunderton PC

Crowell Meeting

Thame Town Council

Wycombe District Council

Bucks County Council

OCC

SODC

Other Locals & Groups

St Andrews School:

Mill Lane School:

Chinnor Village Centre

Chinnor Good Neighbours & Neighbourhood Watch

St Andrews Church Warden,

Methodist Church

St Andrews Church Rev.

'The Village Centre

St Andrews Church Warden

PCSO VP

Community Church

Chinnor Scout Group

Badminton Club

Activity Group

'Greening Chinnor' ;

Friends of Earth / J&J Pre School

Patient Participation Group

Chinnor Scouts

Chinnor Guiding –

'chinnor.library@oxfordshire.gov.uk';

Chinnor Silver Band

U3a Fight Bladder Cancer

Cha Char Chimps

Chinnor Pavilion

Bytomic Tae Kwon Do

Marimba

Roma Louisa Dance Academy

Whiteway Fitness

Chinnor Allotments

Tennis Club

Country Dancing

First Responders

C&PRR

CYFC

Appendix 3:

Summary of representations received to the Regulation 14 draft

Consultee	Date	Summary of comments	Response
Thames Water	05.07.2019	WATER/WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE Proposed new text A new paragraph should be inserted: "It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is teh major contributor to sewer flooding". the housing allocations will be valuable in assessing TW needs. ADDITIONAL INFO REGARDING EACH SITE SUPPLIED.	Though the points are well made, the NDP does not discuss flooding which is left to the provision of the SODC Local Plan. The additional paragraph and data has been added to Appendix 6 as additional information.
Historic England	05.07.2019	No comment	noted
individual	05.07.2019	The NDP does not restrict further development - should clarify that outside the development boundary, no more development will be allowed.	The reference to "countryside" is in effect no more development, other than related to agricultural and countryside land uses, and limited residential development such as affordable housing exceptions.
Natural England	05.07.2019	Proposed changed wording to NDP policies	amendments made as suggested. No new policy on landscape which is left to the policies in the SODC Local Plan.
individual	05.07.2019	4.17 - ref to Care Home on Old Kilns Lake - site has been marked for further housing - need to reflect that care home is no longer going forward. 4.27 CH CH7 new development boundary (not clear what is being asked - but no changes suggested); 6.3 remove reference to skate board ramp because no longer in action; 6.15 - proposes changes to layout of Crown Roundabout - take out idea of lightat at roundabout in Action Point 3.5 (page 83); 7.6 change text to "is already puttin strains on"; 9.2 need to update to actual pupil numbers now; 9.5 need to update need for pre-school places; add text: "The increase in children at primary school level in Chinnor will have a significant effect on places at secondary schools in the area, and is an issue of concern for parents in the area"	Changes made as suggested where appropriate. Some suggested changes not material to planning, updated with evidence from OCC.

Gladman	05.07.2019	CH H2 - NDP should not contain an affordable housing figure duplicating the adopted policy - might become out of date if emerging policy changes; CH H4 - not la land use policy and should be removed; CH H6 - should monitor the build-out of allocated sites; CH H7 - object to use of settlement limits which restricts future sustainable development, and the housing numbers in emerging plan have not been adopted yet - should have a more flexible approach such as a criteria based approach to further development;	Chinnor wishes to see more affordable housing and will support the adopted 40% target in the hope that more local people can remain in the village and not be forced to move due to high house prices. The LPA will monitor the housing delivery. The settlement boundary has been used because Chinnor has met its housing requirement with a very wide margin. Most of these developments have not provided any new community infrastructure and further development could not be sustained. The development boundary approach will be retained in agreement with the planning authority. Some of the comments related to unchanged made policies and no new changes were added in response.
individual	04.07.2019		
Pegasus Group	04.07.2019	Wish to promote land off High Street. There is a need for additional housing aimed at the elderly.	The proposed site is outside the development boundary and is therefore in the "countryside". Planning decisions for housing should reflect local needs. If there is an identified need for housing for the elderly, then a planning application should be submitted to the planning authority.
Crowell Meeting	05.07.2019	Speed limits on B4009 should be reduced to 30 mph; safe cycle and pedestrian routes needed between Chinnor and Crowell.	Parish Council to liaise
SODC	04.07.2019	Specific changes proposed	See separate schedule.
WYG Env Planning	04.07.2019	Re Garden Centre site (Chinnor turf and paving). NDP identifies land as suitable and achievable and it will shortly become available.	The site might become available, but Chinnor has proven it has met its housing need with a very large margin. It would therefore be preferable to meet South Oxfordshire's housing needs at another site to benefit other villages that need to grow. In addition, most of the recently permitted or allowed schemes have made no contribution to local infrastructure and Chinnor is not necessarily a sustainable location for additional major development. If a proposal were to come forward on this site for commercial development, the proposal would need to be taken on its merits, having regard to the proposed development boundary.

individual	05.07.2019	Disappointed to see sites identified for development outside the current village boundary. These sites will not be developed in the next 5 years. Impacts on schools, healthcare, businesses, sewerage not properly addressed. Should reduce traffic speeds to 20 mph to control impacts of drivers from new developments - insufficient attention paid to this. Should monitor air quality. Crime text is misleading (but does not state why). Overall, the NDP lacks a long-term strategy how to tackle issues raised.	This misunderstands the purpose of the development boundary which seeks to contain future development within it, preventing further sprawl. The purpose was not to allocate further housing land. All allocations were applied retrospectively and planning permission was already in place. Those planning permissions and allowed appeals would have addressed the needs for all types of infrastructure which will also be supplied by SODC through their CIL infrastructure plans. Traffic speeds and air quality monitoring are not material to planning. The long term plan would appear to be related mainly to non-land-use matters, and though the point is well-made, the NDP is not the correct vehicle for delivery.
individual	07.07.2019	remove traffic lights from the plan - temporary lights in the area have shown that they exacerbate existing traffic problems.	no change made - not material
individual	5.6.2019	Appendix 2: infill numbers - should not have considered 140 houses as infill; CH H7 - concerned that there will be development in the countryside. Proposed rewording of CHH1 on definition of infill development.	The 140 houses were described by the planning inspector as "infill" and are therefore thus described in the NDP. Misunderstands the level of protection in the countryside where only limited development will be allowed - the NDP cannot place stronger protections than this outside the boundary.
individual	02.07.2019	various errors	errors corrected
individual	01.07.2018	Appendix 4: discusses cycle but mentions foot - need to clarify wording. Need to double journey length to post office. Ref. manual for streets which considers journey to be 10 mins/800 metres on foot. Should refine to account for elderly people's slower walking pace. Provided estimate of elderly people at each development (age 65+)	The word "Cycle" has been deleted from table title, this is just an objective measure to show how accessible a site is relative to other sites since no other criteria are available.
individual	2.7.2019	all appeal sites were objected to by parish residents and council - should not put them into NDP	Mr Dodd does not understand implications of out of date housing policies. No change made.
individual	04.06.2019	error in table 3 - both Point 40 of Appendix 6 states September 2018 which is incorrect. 896 should (page 32) be shown to have been allowed in December 2018.	corrections made
individual	07.06.2019	disregard comment on 40 Oakley road which is correct.	noted

Archstone Projects Ltd	04.07.2019	Ref. SHLAA site 901: site was subject to dismissed appeal, the site compares favourably against other sites that were allocated; question the methodology used for cycling and walking with regard to 901.	The site assessment has identified dwelling land in excess of requirements. Further housing allocations should be sought in other locations so that their needs are met.
OCC	04.07.2019	strategic comments: CH C3: should address below-ground archaeology (suggested policy wording). Para 2.46 updated pupil numbers for January 2019: St Andrews (320 pupils); Mill Lane (190 pupils). Also update in para. 9.2. Para 9.1/9.2 St Andrews is now a 2 form entry due to increased housing numbers using temporary accommodation in the first instance, admission number to 60, thus creating additional 105 places. Building work to permanently expand school planned and awaiting DfE approval. para 9.3 - S106 funds have been sought toward replacing temporary classrooms. Para 10.3 refers to the potential need for new primary school - education authority does not consider this will be required. Para 2.47 update Lord Williams school to 2, 129 pupils in Jan 2019, Icknield Community Collage had 693 pupils in Jan 2019. Both schools being considered for expansion. Paras 2.45, 2.46, 9.5 inaccurate - there are only 2 pre-schools	all figures updated as requested, the NDP does not have policies on flooding and SUDS so no changes made
JCPC	02.07.2019	Ch H7 in relation to land to the rear of 59-63 Lower Icknield Way - changes to development boundary to correct error	boundary amended
individual	02.07.2019	Action Point 3.2: suggest a more generic statement "Speed reduction, by introducing appropriate speed calming measures at entrances to Chinnor Village"	Added "traffic calming" but otherwise not material to planning
individual	02.07.2019	table of suggested changes - typos and minor corrections	Most changes made where possible or info available. Many comments about poor formatting but PDF looked OK to me.
individual	01.07.2019	suggests that the basic figure in the plan should be updated (number of school children and crime rate)	info updated according to response from OCC
Sydenham PC	19.06.2019	Growth of traffic, Action Point 3 (83): wish to work with Chinnor PC regarding traffic speeds on B4445 - could CIL funding be put towards this?	Parish Council to liaise
individual	06.06.2019	2.5 - bus no longer runs - update; when can we expect traffic improvements in the village?	amended as suggested but NDP cannot improve traffic conditions

individual	30.06.2019	2.5 bus service has ceased; 2.36 update (plumber, bathroom and double glazing businesses now gone); 4.15 clarify wording that no young people can afford to live in Chinnor; CH H4 does not give priority to local people; 5.3 Chinnor village lies between Upper Icknield Way and Lower Icknield Way; CH C1 need to be stronger to take account of AONB; 6.4 Old Orchard incorrectly described; CH GP3 development "must" protect existing PROW.... or allow access to more users.....; 8.5; should not compare Chinnor to Watlington; 822 tourism and parking conflicts; 9.1 needs to be updated to reflect data in para. 4.5; Action point 5: failed to meet needs of equestrians; appendix 2: white's field not a golf practice and 8 Heyley Croft is dangerous for play; add Land at A2 Dominion Site to Local Green Spaces table; Appendix 4 - roof design needs to address pitch to reduce harm to AONB; typos in Appendix 6,	Changes made as suggested where appropriate. Some suggested changes not material to planning, some related to made policy/text. Brought to attention of Steering Group if they wish to write new text and policy.
individual	19.06.2019	Planning permission should only be granted that meet the requirements of the policies. Affordable housing should have solar panels, gey water collection; there should be clear identified infrastructure requirements; why is care home not proceeding at New Kiln Lakes and what is being done about it? What can be done to support local businesses?	Planning permission will be granted in accordance with adopted policies in the Development Plan. Affordable housing is by definition not expensive and items such as solar panels add to the purchase price - they can be added by the new owners when they can be afforded, and should not be required at the outset; Alternative care home proposals may come forward within the development boundary. An NDP cannot in itself sustain retail businesses.
Highways England	28.05.2019	No comment	noted
individual	28.05.2019	Why have additional houses been allowed? Will it be strong enough for challenge? Development boundary does not show houses at Mill Lane/Thame Road already occupied. Why is there not a policy for traffic? Incomplete sentence point 83 aspirations. remove lights opposite St Andrews school from diagram p 107. contents page in appendix 6. SAD p. 29 says that care come has been completed but it has not., p 107 missing text; Don't allow infill; cycling criteria are pie in the sky because it's not safe to walk/cycle in the village; jargon ; 85;	Because there was not a secure 5 year housing land supply at the time of the applications. Traffic is not something that an NDP can affectively address - this should be done in discussion with the Highways Authority.
National Grid	01.07.2019	info on grid connections	noted

individual			
individual		Need to mitigate effects of development on climate change	The site allocations are already permitted so not possible to change approach now.
individual		Pleased to see sites are already under construction, not new. Climate change.	The site allocations are already permitted so not possible to change approach now.
individual		ring road, hedgerows	Comment not understood
individual		urgently prioritise a safe cycleway between Chinnor and Thame - Phoenix Trail. Enforce boundary of development	
CEF	30.5.2019	need for affordable housing	
Flood Authority	12.6.2019	General discussion about SODC and national policy on flooding and SUDS	The issue of flooding is better dealt with in the Local Plan.
individual		factual corrections - bus service has stopped, CH H5 - can NDP do more than support?; 6.17 renewable energy?; traffic generated air pollution, object to traffic lights; 20 mph area should cover Mill Lane estate and Estover Way.	The rationale for site selection is set out in Appendix 6; housing for the elderly is supported where a good case can be made, no information is available on energy saving in permitted development, traffic cannot be addressed in an NDP. Letter is called to attention of Steering Group.
individual	6.6.2019	bus route cancelled, traffic problems	amended as suggested but NDP cannot improve traffic conditions

Appendix 4: response from SODC with table setting out how comments were taken into account

SODC letter reference number	Response
1	parish council will be asked to supply references
2	accepted
3	accepted
4	accepted
5	accepted
6	reverted to original version in made plan, other changes made
7	not clear what was being asked so no changes made
8	accepted
9	reverted to original version in made plan, other changes made
10	4.15 is a statement of fact - no change; CH H4 is a made policy - no change
11	accepted
12	accepted
13	wording changed
14	wording changed
15	policy wording changed, dev boundary not changed
16	this cuts across other policies and change not made. Also, development inside the boundary will not be restricted to c class uses. Other changes accepted
17	correction made
18	not clear what is being asked to no changes made
19	accepted
20	accepted, reverted to original made policy
21	changes made according to Natural England comments
22	accepted
23	accepted
24	accepted
25	accepted
26	accepted
27	most changes made but new images not available - this section is part of made plan
28	part of made plan, no resources available to update as suggested
29	noted
30	accepted
31	could not find error.....