

## **Tiddington with Albury Parish Council ( PC )**

### **Draft PC response to Neighbourhood Plan ( NP ) Examiner's Clarification Note**

The Examiner's paragraphs are referred to in order

#### ***Initial Comments***

The PC thanks the Examiner for this positive feedback. Credit is in large part due to the volunteer NP team who lead the NP process under the PC's leadership.

#### ***Points for Clarification***

TwA1 - the PC accepts the recommendation

TwA2 - the PC accepts the point and suggests the first sentence is removed and the second sentence modified accordingly

TwA3 - thank you

TwA7 - The PC would like to keep the Local Gap green . natural and free of development in order to protect the views and archeology of that area in accordance with parishioner's feedback during the NP questionnaire process. The PC would welcome the examiner's recommendation to make modifications in achieving this aim. The PC recommends the following modification:

***A. The Neighbourhood Plan identifies a Local Gap, as shown on the Policies Map, on the pastures between Tiddington and Albury for the purpose of preventing coalescence of the two settlements, and to protect their character and rural setting.***

***B. Development proposals within a Local Gap will only be supported if they do not harm, individually or cumulatively, its open character.***

5.38 The policy defines an area of land between two of its settlements which plays an important role in preventing development that will undermine the visual integrity of the gap to the point that there is coalescence of these two distinct settlements, Appendix 3.8. The Local Green Space analysis shows that this area of land plays an important role in forming the separate setting within which each part can be appreciated and enjoyed.

5.39 Although the land lies outside the Village Boundary of Policy TwA2 that policy acknowledges that there are some types of development that are suited to the countryside which may be appropriate. However, this policy requires that its effects, by way of their location, height, and/or mass, – should not harm the function and purpose of the Local Gap. The land included in the gap is considered to make a significant contribution to maintaining the individual and rural character of the two adjoining settlements.

TwA11 - the PC accepts this proposition and can confirm 'lept' should be 'kept'.

#### ***Representations***

In general the representations are considered by the PC to have been helpful . The PC believes the NP represents parishioners' opinions and views and representations which are supportive are thus welcomed .

The Fisher German ( representation 9 ) is not aligned with parishioner's views as expressed through the NP questionnaire process . The PC has some specific comments as follows :

- A. The PC wishes to stay with the settlement boundary approach as outlined in the NP. The methodology adopted for drawing the settlement boundary uses conventions adopted by other local planning authorities that use this development management tool. Essentially, the boundary follows the observed settlement edge formed by the built form which have a clear functional relationship to the settlement. The curtilages of buildings were included as a guiding principle unless the curtilages related more to the character of the countryside than the built form. Domestic gardens on the edge of the settlement which are extensive and not functionally related to the physical built form of the settlement were excluded. It is therefore considered that a consistent approach has been adopted in drawing the settlement boundary with no changes necessary.
- B. The parcel of land referred to fronts onto the Ickford Rd which is already considered to have excessive traffic , especially at the junction with the A418. Development which increases such traffic is thus not consistent with the NP
- C. Being outside the edge of the settlement boundary the PC considers that any development on that parcel of land cannot be considered infill
- D. There would be concern about flooding issues in that area of the parish
- E. The PC notes that the village has already met its 2035 target for housing development. In respect of additional housing allocations, the NP has been prepared at a time when a new Joint Local Plan 2041 is in the very early stages of preparation. The focus of the NP has therefore been to ensure the quality of new development within the Parish is of a high quality and to prepare for potential growth in and around the area through expressing the identity of the existing village community. Once the strategy for these plans become clearer, the PC will consider any resulting opportunities. It is therefore considered that no changes are necessary.
- F. In the light of E above the PC does not agree that an increased target of 10 - 15% provision should be made in this NP
- G. Notwithstanding A to F above, the PC is aware that there remains an opportunity for Rural Exception Sites and First Homes Exception Sites (outside of the Green Belt) to come forward within the parish to meet local housing need and the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 and Policy TwA4 of the TNP contains provisions in respect of these types of development.

The PC thanks the District Council's for their suggested revisions and would welcome them being incorporated