

BURCOT & CLIFTON HAMPDEN NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDER

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Submission Version

Prepared by Burcot and Clifton Hampden Neighbourhood Development Order Steering Group

February 2023

Contents

List of References

1. Overview
2. Early Work (2014-2018)
3. Initial (Informal) Parish Consultation (2020-2021)
4. Pre-application Advice (2021)
5. Regulation 21 (Pre-Submission) Consultation (2022)

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Initial Consultation Feedback Report

Appendix 2 – List of Statutory Consultees

Appendix 3 – Responses from Statutory Consultees to the Regulation 21 Consultation

Appendix 4 – Responses from Members of the Public

List of References:

- A: 2014 Survey Results [Burcot-and-Clifton-Hampden-Village-Plan-Survey-Topline-Results-Version-2-NR-included.pdf \(cliftonhampden.org.uk\)](https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/Burcot-and-Clifton-Hampden-Village-Plan-Survey-Topline-Results-Version-2-NR-included.pdf)
- B: 2018 Survey Results <https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Neighbourhood-Plan-Follow-Up-Survey-Results-2018.pdf>
- C: 2018 Consultation Event Report: [2018-Consultation-Sheet-Drop-In-Events-with-analysis.pdf \(cliftonhampden.org.uk\)](https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/2018-Consultation-Sheet-Drop-In-Events-with-analysis.pdf)
- D: Initial Parish Consultation (2020-2021) Feedback Report [Consultation-Feedback-Full-Report-26-May-2021.pdf \(cliftonhampden.org.uk\)](https://cliftonhampden.org.uk/Consultation-Feedback-Full-Report-26-May-2021.pdf)
- E: SODC Pre-application Advice (2021): <https://neighbourhoodplan.cliftonhampden.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Pre-app-advice-September-2021-Officer-Response.pdf>
- F: Pre-Submission (Regulation 21) draft of the Neighbourhood Development Order (2022): [Documents – Neighbourhood Plan | Burcot and Clifton Hampden](#)

1. Overview

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations 2012. Section 15(2), part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- Contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development order;
- Explains how they were consulted;
- Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development order.

2. Early work (2012-2018)

In October 2012, about 130 residents attended a Community Led Planning workshop in the village hall. The outcome was a list of the main issues that residents wanted to address, and agreement to develop a community led plan. A committee was formed.

In 2014 a detailed survey was carried out. Survey forms were hand delivered to each residential property, and follow up visits made to collect completed forms. 266 residents (out of 650) responded, and the results were reported in the Village Plan published in 2015. The survey told us that residents felt we must: safeguard the amenities, i.e. the surgery, school, shop/post office, village hall; increase housing stock; have better cycle paths and footpaths; have better parking arrangements; improve community safety; enhance our environment. As a consequence, the Parish Council decided to develop a Neighbourhood Plan, which was announced at the Annual Village Meeting in 2017. The full survey results can be found at Reference A.

In November 2018, a further consultation was carried out in order to bring some precision to the understanding of residents' needs to be brought forward through an NDO. This comprised a short survey to confirm or otherwise the main findings of the 2014 survey, and a drop in event in the Village Hall. The consultation was advertised by flyers hand delivered to every residence, by village email, and by notice boards. Survey forms were hand delivered to all residences, and an option to complete the survey on line was also provided. 213 residents responded. The survey confirmed that there was still overwhelming support for the preservation of amenities, and addressing housing needs. The survey results can be found at Reference B.

The drop-in event was attended by 50 households representing 83 residents. There was strong support for a new surgery, 90%+ for the principle of more housing. Preferences were widely expressed for smaller properties, affordable for young people and/ or for downsizing from larger properties. And that they should be for local residents and keyworkers.

Opinions on the choices for a community centre - combine village hall, scouts and sports club into one big community centre, or not – were divided and inconclusive. The NP Steering Group subsequently consulted the 3 main committees concerned (village hall; scouts, sports club). Their commonly held view was that a shared community centre would not be practical to manage for two reasons. Firstly, each group risked a loss of identity, which is what motivated many committee members to engage, and secondly large community halls often require professional management. On this basis, the idea of a single community centre was dropped.

The consultation report can be found at Reference C.

At the drop in event, residents supported the creation of a Community Land Trust. This was subsequently registered on 24 November 2018.

3. Initial (Informal) Parish Consultation (2020-2021)

In November 2019 a NDO steering group was formed, its remit being to oversee, on behalf of the Qualifying Body, the preparation of a Neighbourhood Development Order so that it can progress to Independent Examination and a community referendum and ultimately, if the referendum result is in favour, be approved by South Oxfordshire District Council. Between November 2019 and November 2020, draft design proposals were developed, and between November 2020 and March 2021, an informal parish consultation was carried out on these draft design proposals. The consultation was advertised in the parish magazine, village email, notice boards, parish council website, and flyers posted to every business and residential address in the parish. The website included a short film explaining the background to the scheme and an on-line portal for residents to respond. Residents could also respond on paper copy forms, and by email.

The draft proposals for development via the NDO presented for consultation included: 25 houses on two sites, a new surgery, additional parking, an extension to the village hall, a new burial ground, repositioned allotments, footpaths. Other community benefits that would flow from the NDO were presented in parallel:

- Substantial grants towards the school buildings, the scout hut, cricket pavilion and sports bar on the recreation ground
- Purchase of Post Office and Shop building into community ownership
- Provision of a public footpath and cycle path from Clifton Hampden to Long Wittenham
- Retention of rights for residents and visitors to use the Barley Mow carpark whether or not they are not patrons, i.e. to be used as an extension of village car park.
- Moving the traffic lights on the south side of the bridge beyond the Barley Mow public house, improving safety for pedestrians using the bridge to access the Barley Mow

Feedback from the consultation was published on the village website in May 2021. The full report can be found at Reference D and at Appendix 1: The main points are summarised here:

A total of 123 responses were received representing 230 residents. 59% supported the proposals, 33% were against, were 8% neutral. The main themes were:

GP Surgery. Support for retaining a GP surgery within the parish on a new site was overwhelming. Those agreeing that a new surgery is needed outnumbered those who don't agree by a ratio of more than 7:1.

New housing. Those agreeing that new housing is required outnumbered those who disagree by a ratio of more than 4:1. Most respondents' comments were about housing, the main themes being:

- **Housing Numbers and Types.** More 1, 2 & 3 bedroom houses, and for accommodation on a single floor such as apartments or bungalows.
- **The Allotments Site.** Concerns about proximity to existing properties, risk of being overlooked, loss of views, loss of rural feel, risk of flooding, traffic and access.
- **The Paddock Site.** Many supportive of the layout, look and feel of the scheme. Some concerns such as proximity; risk of being overlooked; loss of views; flooding; access off the A415.
- **Style.** There were mixed views on the style of the surgery and housing. Some felt the designs shown were too modern, others not modern enough.

Other key themes were:

- Strong support for the proposals for the Allotments, Cemetery, improving the Village Hall, and policies to improve or extend the School.
- Environmental issues, e.g. significant harm to the Green Belt with no very special circumstances to justify; designs must be eco-friendly; not enough to promote bio-diversity.
- Parking and access.

The Steering Group responded to the consultation by preparing a revised scheme:

- Reducing the number of new houses to 20,
- A significant downward shift in the size of houses towards 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms, with most available as market housing, and to include single floor accommodation arranged in bungalows and apartments.
- A major redesign of the Allotments reflecting the smaller footprint now required and reducing the impact on neighbouring properties.
- A reconfiguration of the Paddock site to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties.

The revised scheme was published on the parish council website on 21 October 2021. A request for pre-application advice was made at this time. All documentation relating to the pre-app advice was published on the website.

The feedback report from the Initial Parish Consultation can be found at Reference D

4. Pre-Application Advice (2021)

In their response to the request for pre-application advice, SODC's advice (Reference E) was that the impact on the Green Belt should be further mitigated by reducing the amount of space under development, and the impact on

Conservation Area reduced by aligning the set back of the houses on the Paddock site with the existing housing to the east and west. The full text of the SODC pre-application advice is included in the supporting documents.

In response to this advice, the scheme was further adjusted, and the revised scheme published on the website on 21 March 2022. This scheme, with minor adjustments, forms the basis for the proposal that was consulted under Regulation 21.

5. Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 21) (2022)

5.1 The consultation method. Between 17 August 2022 and 29 September 2022, the first statutory consultation (Regulation 21) was carried out on pre-submission draft of the NDO. The consultation was managed by the Parish Council, announced and advertised by village email, notice boards, parish council website, and flyers posted to every business and residential address in the parish. Statutory consultees, listed at Appendix 2, received a copy directly by email. The website included a written narrative and short film <https://neighbourhoodplan.cliftonhampden.org.uk/> to explain the background to the scheme, and an on-line portal for residents to respond. Residents could also respond on paper copy forms, and by email. A dedicated consultation phone number was provided.

5.2 Description of the pre-submission draft NDO presented for consultation. The draft NDO (Reference E, which can be found at [Documents – Neighbourhood Plan | Burcot and Clifton Hampden](#)) presented for consultation included: 17 houses on two sites, a new surgery, additional parking, an extension to the village hall, a new burial ground, repositioned allotments, footpaths. Other community benefits that would flow from the NDO were also set out:

- Substantial grants towards the school buildings, the scout hut, cricket pavilion and sports bar on the recreation ground
- Purchase of the Post Office and Shop building into community ownership
- Provision of a public footpath and cycle path from Clifton Hampden to Long Wittenham
- Retention of rights for residents and visitors to use the Barley Mow carpark whether or not they are not patrons, i.e. to be used as an extension of village car park.
- Moving the traffic lights on the south side of the bridge beyond the Barley Mow public house, improving safety for pedestrians using the bridge to access the Barley Mow

5.3 Response Overview. Comments were received from 5 statutory consultees, one business, and 36 members of the public. In their responses, 4 members of the public supported the proposal without qualification, 2 gave qualified support, one was neutral, and 29 were objections or requests for the NDO to be withdrawn. The 29 objections came from 18 households.

All comments are available for viewing on the Parish Council Website at [Neighbourhood Development Order Comments – Neighbourhood Plan | Burcot and Clifton Hampden](#)

5.4 Comments from Statutory Consultees. Responses from statutory consultees are summarised in the table below:

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Parish Council Response
<p>South Oxfordshire District Council</p>	<p>SODC are in general supporting of the NDO, and welcome changes made reflecting pre-application advice.</p> <p>Comments from SODC fall into the following categories:</p> <p>General comments and recommendations for improving the description and evidence supporting the NDO.</p> <p>Recommendations for improving the Basic Conditions Statement, particularly concerning Very Special Circumstances.</p> <p>Affordable Housing. SODC do not agree that the provision of a fully compliant Affordable Housing solution is not viable financially.</p> <p>The Landscape Officer has made recommendations for improving the evidence provide in the LVIA</p> <p>An environmental noise assessment is required.</p> <p>An Energy Statement is required before the Council can comment on compliance with DES 10</p> <p>An Air Quality Assessment is requested</p> <p>Surgery documents should be updated to include information on funding, safeguards, and ownership.</p> <p>The HNA would helpfully identify the quantum of new housing needed.</p> <p>The paragraph on Site Selection should give more prominence to the independent Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>A formal Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion is recommended.</p>	<p>All general comments and recommendations have been taken forward into the submission version of the NDO.</p> <p>The Basic Conditions statement has been updated.</p> <p>A Stage 2 Viability Assessment was commissioned, challenging the conclusions of the SODC response.</p> <p>A difference of opinion of the Benchmark Land Value remains.</p> <p>The PC/SG view remains that full provision of AH is not commercially viable. SODC LP H9 makes policy provision for variations in level and type of AH, and therefore the NDO meets Basic Conditions.</p> <p>The NDO will be submitted with 4 AH, i.e. unchanged.</p> <p>An environmental noise assessment has been conducted, and the report added to the supporting documentation.</p> <p>An Energy Statement has been provided</p> <p>An air quality assessment has been conducted, and the report added to the supporting documentation</p> <p>Surgery Documents have been updated</p> <p>A supplementary HNA report has been conducted and</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Parish Council Response
		<p>added to the supporting documentation</p> <p>The NDO Section on Site Selection has been updated in line with the recommendation.</p> <p>SODC have confirmed in their screening opinion that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.</p>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>Transport: Allotments Site</p> <p>Parking Spaces: Acceptable.</p> <p>Secure undercover cycle parking for maisonettes required.</p> <p>How will adequate car parking for the surgery during both morning and afternoon drop off/pick up periods be maintained?</p> <p>Access to the site: visibility is required to be provided at 59m to the west and 71m to the east.</p> <p>Review of the proposed access will be required to be undertaken to establish the requirement for a right turn lane.</p> <p>The swept paths provided within the TS at the site access appear acceptable. However, swept paths will also be required showing a 11.6m long refuse vehicle passing a large car within the site.</p> <p>Concerns in relation to the location of the access that will serve the proposed surgery car park and that of the site. The access to the car park will be required to be relocated</p> <p>Details in relation to the specific use and operation of the proposed burial garden will be required</p> <p>Transport: Paddock Site</p>	<p>Design drawings have been updated to provide the information requested.</p> <p>The Transport Strategy has been updated to address all other issues raised.</p> <p>A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been conducted and is included with the submission documents.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Parish Council Response
	<p>Access: the cross-section does not provide sufficient detail to confirm that appropriate visibility can be provided.</p> <p>Transport: Layout. Submitted plans are required to show all dimensions associated with parking bays, carriageway and footway widths and junction radii etc. In addition, the boundary of the adjacent highway will be required to be clearly shown on the submitted plans</p> <p>Transport Assessment Methodology. Reviews required of: road traffic accidents along the adjacent highway network: trip rates using representative sample sites; a comparative assessment of the existing and proposed doctors' surgery will be required to be undertaken in terms of the associated traffic generation.</p> <p>Transport Mitigation. The applicant will also be required to provide a 3.5m wide cycle/footway across the frontage of both sites; a TUCAN crossing will be required to be provided along the A415.</p> <p>Transport General. A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit will be required to be undertaken in relation to the layout of both sites and the means of access.</p> <p>Flooding. No objections subject to conditions and planning</p> <p>Minerals and Waste. No objections</p> <p>Education: No S106 contributions required.</p>	
Historic England	No issues raised	
Network Rail	No issues raised	
Thames Water	No Infrastructure Concerns	

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Parish Council Response
Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board	ICB need not be involved in addition to OCCG, and the OCCG letter of 24 November 2021 is still relevant.	OCCG letter of 24 Nov 21 is included in the surgery evidence paper

Copies of the comments made by Statutory Consultees are at Appendix 3.

5.5 Comments from Businesses. There was one response from a business within the Parish, namely the GP Practice. In their response, the practice confirmed that Clifton Hampden Surgery support the NDO proposal and have every intention of occupying the new building to be able to continue supplying GP services to the community.

5.6 Comments from Members of the Public. Comments on the scheme from members of the public fell into 26 themes, set out in the table below. The numbers in () alongside each theme show the number of responses in which a comment on this theme was made.

Traffic and Parking (30)	Green Belt (23)	GP Surgery (20)	Conservation Area (17)
Housing Need (12)	Community Led Development (10)	Governance/ Membership of the Parish Council (6)	Impact on Wildlife(6)
Loss of Rural Charm (6)	Alternative Proposals (6)	Cumulative Development (5)	Flood Risk (4)
Precedent for Future Development (4)	'Unique Proposal' ((3)	Benefits (3)	Site Selection (3)
Pre-App Advice (4)	Impact on Neighbouring Properties (3)s	Consultation Process (3)	Selection of Development Partner (2)
Missing Documentation (2)	Use of Public Funds (2)	Dependency on Bypass (2)	Burcot Needs (2)
Eco Credentials (2)	Landscape (2)	Climate Crisis (1)	Viability (1)
Handling of Complaints (1)	Mitigations (1)		

Representative examples of comments made by members of the public in each of these themes, and the Parish Council Response, are set out in Appendix 4.

All original comments made by members of the public are available for viewing on the Parish Council Website at [Neighbourhood Development Order Comments – Neighbourhood Plan | Burcot and Clifton Hampden](#).

5.7 The Main Themes: Comments and Responses.

Six themes attracted comments from a significant (i.e. from 10 or more) respondents.

5.7.1 Traffic and Parking. 30 residents commented on the impact of the NDO on traffic and parking. Their comments covered a range of issues: traffic safety; there is insufficient new parking; residents' parking is needed; doesn't do enough to improve the life of residents; there will be additional traffic in the village centre; the proposals will not alleviate congestion at school drop off and pick up.

The Steering Group's response on parking is that: the NDO will, compared with current provision, provide an additional 9 public parking spaces for use by the new surgery, 5 by the village hall, and 18 completely new public parking spaces by the burial ground, bringing the total number of public parking spaces to 55 (currently, there are 23); the NDO will ensure that the current village carpark by the Barley Mow used primarily by visitors, will remain free to use, and that if the NDO does not proceed, this right may be lost exacerbating current problems; the opportunity to provide yet more parking is constrained by the requirement to minimise the impact on openness of the Green Belt, specifically spatial considerations; any additional parking over and above that proposed risks turning the centre of the village into a massive car park.

The Steering Group's response on traffic is that: the re-siting of surgery parking away from Watery Lane will alleviate pressure at the traffic lights as traffic to and from the west no longer needs to cross the junction; the overall increase is marginal and acceptable; whilst the NDO is not conditional on them, there is an expectation that a new river crossing and bypass will be delivered by 2024 leading to a very significant reduction in traffic levels within the village centre.

The issues raised by OCC's Transport Officer regarding parking, footpath width, traffic and safety have been addressed; no further changes to the NDO are required; subject to compliance with planning policy, "the Basic Conditions", which includes traffic and transport policies, the provision of additional parking and acceptance of any associated risks should be decided by referendum

5.7.2 Impact on Green Belt. 23 residents commented on the impact on the Green Belt. Their comments can be summarised as 'we should not be overriding the protection afforded by the Green Belt'. The Green Belt is not an absolute barrier to development. The National Policy Planning Framework makes provision for development in the Green Belt under certain circumstances, of which an NDO, ultimately decided via referendum, is one. There are no objections from statutory consultees on these grounds.

The Steering Group's response therefore is that: on balance, the wishes of the significant majority of residents who support the development, as evidenced through by the early consultations and the Initial Parish Consultation, cannot be set aside on the basis of comments raised; no further changes to the NDO are required; subject to compliance with planning policy, "the Basic Conditions", which includes meeting the test of 'Very Special Circumstances', the NDO should be decided by referendum.

5.7.3 New surgery. 20 residents commented on the proposal for a new surgery. Their comments covered a range of issues: lack of commitment from the partners; viability of the surgery given that one partner has recently retired; increased traffic; insufficient parking; current building is adequate; current building should be

extended; proposed surgery not big enough to meet future need; a new surgery is needed.

The Steering Group's response is that: on balance, the wishes of the very significant majority of residents who support the need for a new surgery, as evidenced through by the early consultations and the Initial Parish Consultation, cannot be set aside on the basis of comments raised; the current building is not fit for purpose and the case for a new surgery as set out in the supporting documentation is valid; the partners have re-confirmed their support for the new surgery and intention to occupy it; sufficient new parking has been provided; the additional amount of traffic, which is marginal, is acceptable; the issues raised by OCC's Transport Officer have been addressed; no further changes to the NDO are required; subject to compliance with planning policy, "the Basic Conditions", which includes meeting the test of 'Very Special Circumstances', the provision of a new surgery building via the NDO should be decided by referendum.

5.7.4 Impact on Conservation Area. 17 residents commented on the impact on the Conservation Area. Their comments can be summarised as 'we should not be overriding the protection afforded by the Conservation Area'. The Conservation Area is not an absolute barrier to development. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use." The level of harm that might be caused to the conservation area falls very much at the lower end of 'less than substantial harm' as that term is defined and used in the NPPF and the accompanying PPG. Public Benefits are set out in Section 3 of the NDO. There are no objections from statutory consultees on these grounds.

The Steering Group's response is that: the benefits arising from the NDO outweigh the degree of 'heritage harm' caused; no further changes to the NDO are required; subject to the NDO being compliant with planning policies ("The Basic Conditions"), the decision whether or not to proceed with development in the Conservation Area should be taken by the community as a whole, at Referendum.

5.7.5 Housing Need. 12 residents commented on housing need. Their comments ranged across: not supported by survey results; larger houses not needed; not needed in light of large developments at Culham and Berinsfield; how is local need to be met; needs driven by landowner's interests.

The Steering Group's response is:

- a) A significant majority of residents have expressed their support for new housing at every stage of consultation up to and including the Initial Parish Consultation (November 2020 – March 2021). Initially, residents expressed a need for new homes balanced across the 1-4 bed range, but this shifted to a preference for smaller homes.
- b) The need for new housing is set out in an independent Housing Needs Analysis prepared by AECOM. The HNA states the need (primarily but not exclusively) for smaller and more affordable market homes to accommodate both younger

households and those wishing to downsize who currently lack suitable options. In a supplementary report, AECOM quantify the need for new homes at 25.

c) The provision in the NDO of a few larger houses (2 x 4 bed, 1 x 5 bed) results both from the evidence of need set out in previous consultations and the HNA, and the need to generate financial benefit for the community, an objective of the NDO. The financial evidence is set out in the Viability Assessment.

d) Whilst residents expressed a preference for a larger number of smaller developments, rather than a few larger ones, because only two sites have the potential for development of the type and scale required, the PC/SG have been unable to offer options for a scheme that meets this preference.

The PC/SG view is that, subject to the NDO being compliant with planning policies ("The Basic Conditions"), the decision whether or not to proceed with development of new houses should be taken by the community as a whole, at Referendum.

5.7.6 **Community Led Development.** 10 residents commented that the NDO is not community led. Their comments range across: lack of appointment of the steering committee; refusing opportunities for community members to join; overly influenced by collaboration with developers and landowners; NDO is developer/landowner, not community led; community benefits are solely for the residents of [Clifton Hampden](#).

The Steering Group response is:

a) Unlike a planning application made by a landowner or developer and decided by a planning committee or independent inspector, the NDO requires the active engagement of the community through its development, and is decided by the community at referendum, i.e. it is community led

b) Every resident within the Parish has had multiple opportunities to engage with the process, as evidenced in the Statement of Community Involvement. Every resident has also had the opportunity to sit on the various committees and steering groups leading, ultimately, to the strategy agreed for the NDO at the NP SG meeting on 13 March 2019. No application to join the NP SG was ever refused

c) The NDO is, in effect, the execution of the strategy agreed by the NP SG. The membership of the NDO Steering Group is appropriate for a project of this type. The community is represented on the NDO SG by 5 members, i.e. the majority. Both the chair and deputy chair are community members. One resident's application to join the NDO SG was refused on grounds of conflict of interest, as their application made it clear that their purpose in applying was to represent their own interest as a contiguous owner.

No changes to the NDO or supporting documentation have been made in respect of the matters raised.

Appendix 1 - Initial Parish Consultation – Feedback Report

Published by the Neighbourhood Development Order Steering Group

26 May 2021

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide you with feedback on what you told us in the Initial Parish Consultation, to explain how we are responding to what you have told us with new proposals, and to confirm the next steps of the process.

ABOUT THE CONSULTATION

The consultation was carried out in two stages between 19 November 2020 and 28 March 2021. Residents were invited to comment on the draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and a set of development proposals.

Neighbourhood Plan Policies	Development Proposals
BCH1 – New Surgery	The New Housing
BCH3 – School Improvements	The New Surgery
BCH4 – Community Facilities	The Allotments and Cemetery
BCH5 – Design Principles in Burcot	The Village Hall
BCH6 – Design Principles in Clifton Hampden	
BCH7 – Assets of Community Value	
BCH8 – Green Infrastructure	
BCH9 – Local Landscape Character	
Implementation	
Other Policies and Issues	

WHAT YOU TOLD US

Summary Statistics

A total of 123 responses were received representing 230 residents, up from 93 responses representing 176 residents at the end of the first phase of the consultation in December 2020.

75% (172) of those represented were from Clifton Hampden, 25% (58) from Burcot.

Across the parish:

- 59% (136) of those represented support or strongly support the proposals,
- 33% (77) are against or strongly against
- 8% (17) are neutral.

And Clifton Hampden and Burcot separately:

Clifton Hampden			Burcot		
Support or Strongly Support	Neutral	Against or Strongly Against	Support or Strongly Support	Neutral	Against or Strongly Against
53% (92)	8% (13)	39% (67)	76% (44)	7% (4)	17% (10)

Reason for Scoring

From your responses, it was possible to deduce the *main* reason for the scoring that you gave.

Top 3 reason given by those supporting	% of those represented	Top 3 reasons given by those against	% of those represented
Well designed scheme	29% (67)	Impact on Green Belt	13% (31)
Sustains the amenities	14% (33)	More Information Needed	5% (11)
The parish must grow	10% (22)	Process and governance	5% (12)

The Surgery

Support for retaining a GP surgery within the parish on a new site is overwhelming. 74% (172) agree that a new surgery is needed, 10% (24) disagree, 15% (34) did not express a view or needed more information. The number of residents who agree that a new surgery is needed outnumbers those who don't agree by a ratio of more than 7:1.

Of note was that many of those who are against the proposals overall and most of those who were neutral none the less agreed that a new surgery is needed.

Housing

Support for new housing within the parish is strong. 70% (161) agree that new housing is needed, 16% (37) oppose new housing, and 14% (32) did not express a view, were unsure, or needed more information. The number of residents agreeing that new housing is required outnumbered those who disagree by a ratio of more than 4:1.

Of note firstly was that some of those who are against the proposals overall and most of those who were neutral none the less agreed that some housing is needed. And secondly that the percentage of those who oppose new housing (14%) has remained substantially unchanged from levels reported in the 2014 survey, when 16% expressed the view that no new homes were needed.

Most comments made by respondents were about housing.

- **Housing Numbers and Types.** Some residents felt that the number of houses proposed was too high. Many commented on the proposed mix of housing types:
 - There should be proportionately more 1,2,& 3 bedroom houses.
 - The need for accommodation on a single floor such as single floor apartments or bungalows for elderly residents is not being met.
 - The number of Affordable Homes (e.g. shared ownership or social housing for rent) is too high

- **The Allotments Site.** Many residents whether supportive, neutral or opposed expressed concerns about the proposals for the Allotments site, e.g.:
 - Too close to Watery Lane properties
 - Should not have been extended into the field north of the current allotments
 - Risk of being overlooked
 - Loss of views onto open countryside
 - Loss of quiet enjoyment
 - Loss of rural feel of Watery Lane
 - Risk of flooding
 - Traffic concerns at the road access point shared with the village hall, surgery, new parking.
 - Whether the proposed 'Kiss and Drop' arrangements were workable in practice.

A number of residents offered ideas to improve the layout on the Allotments site. A common theme was increasing the separation between new and existing houses.

- **The Paddock Site.** Many residents were supportive of the layout, look and feel of the scheme on the Paddock site. A few expressed concerns such as proximity; risk of being overlooked; loss of views; flooding; access off the A415.
- **Housing Style.** There were mixed views on housing style. Some felt the designs shown were too modern, others not modern enough. Some expressed the view that the houses on the Allotments site should be styled individually, reflecting the character of the existing houses in Watery Lane.

The Allotments and the Cemetery. 46% (106) support the proposals to retain the allotments and provide new cemetery space. 11% (25) oppose. 43% (99) did not express a view or required more information. The number of residents supporting the proposals to retain the allotments and provide new cemetery space outnumbered those against by a ratio of more than 4:1.

The Village Hall. 51% (117) support the proposals to upgrade the village hall. 11% (25) oppose. 38% (88) did not express a view or required more information. The number of residents supporting the proposals to upgrade the village hall outnumbered those against by a ratio of more than 4:1.

The School. 38% (88) agreed with the draft Neighbourhood Plan policies to improve or extend the school. 7% (16) disagreed. 55% (126) did not express a view, were unsure, or required more information. The number of residents agreeing the policies for the school outnumbered those who did not by a ratio of more than 5:1.

Environmental Issues. A number of residents expressed views on environmental issues. Their comments were generally made across the draft policies for Green Infrastructure (BCH 8) and Local Landscape Character (BCH 9), and the proposals for new housing. Of those who commented on with BCH 8 and BCH 9, about 65% (78) agreed, 26% (31) disagreed and 8% (10) required more information. Those who disagreed appeared from the text of their responses to be concerned not with the policies themselves, but that the development proposals were not compliant with them. Our reading of this is that the policies themselves are widely supported.

Reasons given by residents for commenting that the proposals were not compliant included:

- Significant harm to the Green Belt with no very special circumstances to justify
- Designs must be more eco-friendly
- Concern on the impact of the proposals on bio-diversity

Parking. Many residents expressed concerns about whether the scheme delivered enough new parking.

The New Loo. Views on the proposed loo were sharply divided. Some see it as essential, whilst others were strongly opposed.

Clifton Hampden as a Visitor Attraction. A number of residents expressed the view that, based on the experience of Summer 2020, Clifton Hampden is already a visitor attraction causing significant additional pressures on parking, and that no further steps should be taken through the scheme to pursue such an objective.

Footpath and Cyclepath links between Burcot and Clifton Hampden. A few residents expressed the view that the scheme should aim to improve the link between Burcot and Clifton Hampden for pedestrians and cyclists, away from the A415.

Future Development.

- A number of residents expressed concerns that these proposals could set a precedent for further development on the two sites and more widely, and that it should be an explicit objective of the scheme and its legal framework to include safeguards against this.
- A number of residents expressed the view that the proposals do not do enough to safeguard against infill development in Burcot.
- A few residents expressed the view that the proposals don't offer enough for residents of Burcot, and that some development in Burcot should be considered.

Implementation

35% (82) agreed with the proposed implementation plans. 7% (15) disagreed. 64% (148) did not express a view or required more information. The number of residents agreeing the proposals for implementation outnumbered those who disagreed by a ratio of more than 5:1.

The consultation itself. The quality and volume of the feedback received is evidence that residents, whether for, neutral or against, have taken a great deal of care in preparing their responses using the information available and contributing to a data set that is rich in detail. A number of residents expressed concerns with the consultation process, and the lack of information to form a view on some aspects.

Governance. A number of residents expressed concerns about the governance of the project. These have been addressed separately by the Parish Council.

WHAT WE ARE DOING ABOUT IT

The Revised Scheme

The Steering Group are now developing a revised scheme:

- A significant downward shift in the size of houses towards 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms, with most available as market housing.
- To include single floor accommodation arranged in bungalows and apartments.
- A major redesign of the Allotments reflecting the smaller footprint required and reducing the impact on neighbouring properties.
- A reconfiguration of the Paddock site to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties, particularly the risk of being overlooked.

The following features of the current proposals will be retained:

- Use of both sites, with the Surgery, smaller housing, additional parking, Allotments and Cemetery on the Allotments Site, and larger houses on the Paddock Site.

- Some Affordable Housing (but a lower number than the 10 currently proposed).
- Village Hall Improvements

The following feature remains under consideration:

- The new loo

We are also considering, as part of options for the scheme and related settlement with the landowner, and in order to address concerns about future development, arrangements for the ownership of undeveloped land that might be acquired from the Gibbs Estate through this scheme, on the principle that the best way for the community to influence or prevent future development on land is to own it. Examples of this are Watery Lane and the garages by the Old School Yard, and the Village Hall car park.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

We will now hold a series of meetings:

- ‘Q&A’ sessions open to all residents. Each meeting will be for an hour and, in order to allow everyone present a reasonable opportunity for their questions to be aired, each meeting will be limited to 10 people. Enough meetings will be held for everyone who wishes to do so to attend one meeting.
- Once we have drafted an option or options for a revised scheme, and in accordance with the undertakings given at the workshops on 5 April 2021, we plan to hold two design workshops (one for the Paddock site, one for the Allotments site) with those residents most directly impacted, to hear their views on the option(s) for a revised layout on each site and explore what further improvements might be made. We will then invite the community as a whole to do the same through the second Parish Consultation.
- Two meetings, open to all, to discuss and to explore concerns and discuss ideas about:
 - Environmental issues such as eco-performance, biodiversity, and visual impact
 - Parking and access

These meetings will be held face to face after 21st June, Covid-19 permitting. They will be held in the Church until the Village Hall is no longer required for vaccinations, which we understand to be late July.

Please visit the ‘Workshops and Meetings’ page on the website for dates, times and how to register.

These meetings are in addition to the Annual Village Meeting to be arranged by the Parish Council.

Second Parish Consultation

We plan to hold the second, non statutory, parish consultation on the revised proposals, over 6 weeks in September/October 2021 starting with an open event in the Village Hall. That will be followed by the statutory ‘Pre-Submission’ consultation managed by SODC in early 2022, then public examination by an inspector leading up to a Referendum in mid 2022.

Additional Information Updates

Over the next few weeks, the website will be updated to include details of meetings and workshops, and updated versions of the papers already published, reflecting the outcome of the consultation and new information:

- Overview of Project and Community Engagement Timelines
- Housing Numbers and Types

- The Surgery
 - A new paper on the future ownership of Estate land
- Thank you again

Giles Baxter OBE
Chair
Neighbourhood Development Order Steering Group
gileshlbaxter@btinternet.com

Notes on the Analysis Process

Sensitivity Check

Respondents were invited to say how many residents lived at their property, and how many of these were represented in their response. The statistics in this report use the number of residents represented for quantitative analysis. However we also wanted to check whether using the number of responses for quantitative analysis would have returned a different result.

Based on the number of responses (total 123):

- 59% (72) of those represented support or strongly support the proposals,
- 33% (41) are against or strongly against
- 8% (10) are neutral.

These results are identical to the method based on the numbers of residents represented.

We also wanted to check whether the results were affected because we accepted responses from those who are resident here and those who own residential property in the parish but are not resident, and from residents of all ages. To do so we tested what the outcome of the referendum, in which those under the age of 18 and/or not resident in the parish are not eligible to vote, might be if residents voted along the same lines as their responses. Based on our collective knowledge of the parish and its residents, we estimated the number of residents represented in each response who are likely to be eligible to vote in a referendum in 2022.

We estimated:

- 159 of those represented would be eligible to vote
- 65% (103) would vote yes
- 35% (56) would vote no

For the purposes of this calculation, we assumed that the eligible residents who expressed a neutral view would not cast a vote.

We therefore concluded that the statistics for the overall level of support were not materially sensitive to the method (number represented, number responded, number eligible to vote in a referendum) used to generate them.

Code of Practice

This report has been prepared in accordance with guidance on how to release information safely as issued by the Information Commissioners' Office. Of particular note is the guidance that particular

care must be taken that the identity and views of an individual, to whom an undertaking of confidentiality has been given, cannot be inferred by a 3rd party outside the Steering Group.

Analysis Team

The analysis was conducted by the members of the Steering Group 'The Data Processor', namely the 5 community members, the landowner, and the GP surgery partners representative. The Development Partner has sight of the responses as a member of the Steering group, and in the nominated role of 'Data Controller'. The Development Partner has not been involved in the analysis of responses.

Analysis Methodology

Respondents were invited to tell us in overall terms what they thought of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and development proposals, using this scale:

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Against	Strongly Against
------------------	---------	---------	---------	------------------

Respondents were invited to tell us why they scored as they did, to make general comments, and to comment on each section of the development proposals and draft Neighbourhood Plan

Development Proposals	Neighbourhood Plan Policies
The New Housing	BCH1 – New Surgery
The New Surgery	BCH3 – School Improvements
The Allotments and Cemetery	BCH4 – Community Facilities
The Village Hall	BCH5 – Design Principles in Burcot
	BCH6 – Design Principles in Clifton Hampden
	BCH7 – Assets of Community Value
	BCH8 – Green Infrastructure
	BCH9 – Local Landscape Character
	Implementation
	Other Policies and Issues

Some respondents sent their comments in letters and emails using their own format. The steering group generally found it straightforward to deduce how these responses should be scored, and to assign their comments against the most relevant section from the list above.

Residents from Watery Lane and the High Street who are most directly impacted by the development proposals were invited to attend workshops on 25th March. A number of those attending submitted comments on the proposals which have been also been taken into account in the analysis of their responses and preparation of this report.

Each section of each response was then summarised and put into an analysis spreadsheet, one row per response, along with the name, location (Burcot, Clifton Hampden), the number represented in

the response, score, and an estimate of the number of those represented likely to be on the electoral roll.

Members of the Steering Group independently checked that the spreadsheet entries were a reflection of the text entries on response forms. Each member of the Steering Group also read every response form so as to come to their own view of the main themes emerging.

The combination of quantitative scoring and qualitative comments transferred into a single integrated document has provided the Steering Group with a rich data set from which to conduct both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the type reported in this document, for the scheme as a whole and for each individual element of it.

The Steering Group will not be publishing this document. This is because, in order to protect the identity of respondents and to respect the undertaking of confidentiality given, the content would have to be in large part redacted.

The Steering Group will prepare and include a thematic Consultation Statement with the Pre-Submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and Neighbourhood Development Order put forward for statutory consultation under Regulations 14 and 21.

Appendix 2 – List of Statutory Consultees

Oxfordshire County Council – Planning Policy
Oxfordshire County Council – Cllr Robin Bennett
South and Vale Planning – Ricardo Rios]
South Oxfordshire District Council – Planning Policy
South Oxfordshire District Council – Cllr Sam Casey-Rehaye
Long Wittenham Parish Council
Berinsfield Parish Council
Nuneham Courtney Parish Council
Culham Parish Council
Dorchester on Thames Parish Council
Coal Authority
Homes England
Natural England
Environment Agency
Historic England
Network Rail
Highways England
Marine Management Organisation
BT
EE
Three
EMF
Gigaclear
NHS – Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group
NHS – Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board
National Grid
Cadent Gas
SSE
UK Power Networks
Thames Water
UKAEA
Age UK Oxfordshire
CPRE
BBOWT