

Reference	Issue/Concern/Comment on policies 15/10/17 & November consultation	Response	Action to be undertaken
General	New development needs to be monitored to ensure that it supports the local community.	Concept agreed in principle, but not detailed enough to impact on the wording of policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.	No action needed.
Consultation	Need to engage with a larger cross section of Parish residents and businesses, and should be planning jointly with neighbouring areas.	Attempts have been made to engage with the whole community with variable levels of success at different stages of the process, but parishioners and local businesses can't be forced to participate. Additional methods of engagement will be brought into play as the Plan nears completion. Joint discussions have been held with Oxford City on some relevant cross boundary topics (e.g. transport and the economy) however their interest in North Hinksey Parish, and willingness to get involved in wider discussions is always likely to be limited. Cumnor Parish were initially not interested in producing their own Neighbourhood Plan and have only recently started the process, meaning that it was not possible to draw up policies together in a holistic manner.	Engagement with local residents and businesses was already due to be reviewed again as the Plan approaches completion and these comments will be taken into consideration. Where possible and beneficial joint discussions with neighbouring areas will continue.
Character Assessment	Should be more detailed for various sub-areas within Elms Rise. Need to recognise and protect views from and across the Parish.	The number of character areas identified for the Parish as a whole is quite high and there has to be some limit on how small these areas can be in practice to be useful in the planning process. Much of Elms Rise as defined in this document coincides strongly with the identified characteristics.	No action needed.
Objectives	Should be more proactive and allocate land appropriately.	There is a lack of land that could be proactively allocated, and no detailed suggestion of appropriate land for allocation or uses from the provider of this comment.	No action needed.
Housing?	Policies on existing development seem to have disappeared.	They are included as part of 4.1.3, but they reflect policies already set by the Council. NHNP has reinforced these by referring to the need as set out in the Government's NPPF paras 56 -66 especially paras 62-66.	Paragraph added to Intro Section (b).
Housing	Policies need to be clearer on densification.	Covered in VOWHDC Design Guide DG26 Density should be appropriate to the location, respond to and/or enhance the character of the existing development However this is vague, and also depends on the size of the site and the nature of the proposals. Currently there are a	See above.

Reference	Issue/Concern/Comment on policies 15/10/17 & November consultation	Response	Action to be undertaken
		number of sites that accommodate a single house that is being redeveloped or converted to provide significantly more dwellings. A critical element will be trees and onsite parking. Where there is significant opposition to an application a design review process should be initiated.	
Housing	Limit number / %age of HMOs in the area (c.f. Winchester Council policy).	HMOs are not subject to planning applications so a policy can't impact on them. Possibility of a community action being discussed with the Vale, but unlikely to be agreed by them. Winchester City Council states that If you rent out a property as a house in multiple occupation (HMO), which is three or more storeys and five or more people living as more than one household, you will require a licence from Winchester City Council.	No action needed on policies. Possibility of adding a community action being investigated.
Housing	Policies need strengthening. Identify where development could or should be focussed.	No land is allocated for Housing in the Plan because no significant areas of undeveloped land are available outside of the Green Belt and other green spaces / land used for leisure purposes. Additional housing development has already focused on Botley Centre.	No action needed.
Housing	Botley is full already. Views of the countryside are disappearing fast. 'Empty' spaces have their value too in an area where people live & work	See above.	No action needed.
Housing Objectives	Don't say 'up to four storeys' or developers will try to build up to this level everywhere. Stating 'low rise' should be sufficient.	The Housing policies specify a detailed maximum height.	No action needed.
HS1	What does 'grain' mean? Use alternative word?	Accept it is unclear.	Definition of 'grain' added.
HS1	Ambiguous		Policy has been amended to add clarity.
HS2	Could be scope for >13m if sensitive design on sloping ground?	A lot of discussion about this issue and recognising that it would reflect local character, it was felt that a defined ridge height would be more appropriate. This is broadly based on 3 storeys and pitched roof and would be a maximum from ground level.	Limit reduced to 12m.

Reference	Issue/Concern/Comment on policies 15/10/17 & November consultation	Response	Action to be undertaken
HS2	Suggest removing figure of 13m height, also in section 4.1.3b of Plan.	A maximum limit is considered necessary, but this has now been reduced to 12m after further consideration. This level is still higher than the vast majority of housing on the Parish.	Limit reduced to 12m.
HS2	So why is the new centre so high?	Policy HS2 can only be for <u>outside</u> Botley Centre area as it can't conflict with the Local Plan, plus this Plan hasn't been adopted yet. The new development meets the requirements of the Botley Centre SPD.	No action needed.
HS3	What does this mean?	This refers to housing resilience. This means that a house should be adaptable enough to cope with changing lifestyles. For instance construction of the roof should take account of the potential to convert to living or work space without major constructional difficulties.	Policy has been reworded, and this version is considered clear.
HS3	Include electric vehicle charging points.	Agreed.	Added.
HS4	Needs stronger wording. Preference for community owned development and social / affordable housing (x 2 comments).	Agree importance of affordable housing. NHNP encourages the maximum amount of affordable housing to help re-balance the community, however this is covered in VoWHDC Core policy 4a.	Policy reworded.
HS4	Affordability issues need to be addressed.	Agree importance of affordable housing. See above.	Policy reworded.
HS5	'Local people' needs defining more clearly.	'Local people' relates to residents of North Hinksey Parish and their family needs, and then residents of Oxford and Cumnor Parish. Overall the policy has been revised but local is considered an appropriate term here. It is not appropriate or practical to limit new housing to solely meet the needs of people already living within the Parish.	Policy reworded.
HS6	Not enforceable as written – what are the competitions etc?	Details to be agreed with VOWHDC.	Policy reworded.
HS6	Need to keep / protect the Green Belt with no building / housing approved on it (x 5 comments).	Need to clarify that this policy is not proposing that any specific plots of land should be reviewed for removal from the Green Belt. Also see below.	Policy reworded to make it clear that it is being put in place to ensure that <u>if</u> land is taken out of the Green Belt and developed then the design of buildings placed there must be of

Reference	Issue/Concern/Comment on policies 15/10/17 & November consultation	Response	Action to be undertaken
			high architectural merit. The policy in itself does not initiate the process of removing any land from the Green Belt.
HS6	What does this policy mean?	The Green Belt review has taken place with the Parish has broadly remaining untouched. This policy refers to land that may be taken out of the Green Belt in the in the next local plan period or sooner if the Council determines. It ensures that the highest quality of design and green, carbon neutral development takes place. The identified land is to be designated for development appropriate for an Area of Outstanding Architectural Merit. This would reflect a NHPNP principle for green land for green housing. Also see above.	See above.
HS7 & HS8	Conflict between these two policies? Suggest prioritising first time buyers over the elderly.	Agree that rewording necessary.	Policies HS7 to HS10 revised and written as a single policy.
HS7 & HS8	Please explain.	Agree that rewording necessary.	Policies HS7 to HS10 revised and written as a single policy.
HS10	Unclear.	Agree that rewording necessary.	Policies HS7 to HS10 revised and written as a single policy.
Economy	Policies need strengthening. We need to make space for appropriate development.	“Appropriate development” too vague a term to investigate.	No action needed.
Economy	Why encourage more economic growth, industrialisation and urbanisation?	Impractical question. The NPPF requires Plans to consider opportunities for sustainable economic growth, which is what we have attempted to do in this Plan.	No action needed.
Economy	Long term tenancy / stability of businesses and shops is important as well as short term tenancy.	Agreed as self-evident.	No action needed.
Economy	No land for new major business sites but Seacourt Tower Retail Park is a major opportunity to move away from large retail sheds to other types of retail unit and possibly mixed	Planning approval for the Seacourt Tower site was given several years ago and phase 2 of the works have now started, so this is not a viable option. Also we feel that this point is partially covered in Policy EE4 which calls for	No action needed.

Reference	Issue/Concern/Comment on policies 15/10/17 & November consultation	Response	Action to be undertaken
	used, linked better with the new Botley Centre redevelopment.	certain sites to be designated for local businesses and others for (inter)national businesses.	
EE1 & EE2	How to support?	These policies are the only support that WG2 can offer.	No action needed.
EE1	Short term tenancies would limit successful businesses?	Unlikely.	No action needed.
EE2	'Improve' not 'combat' air quality.	Agreed.	"Improve" substituted for "combat".
Transport	Air pollution and its mitigation does not appear to have been considered	Not within powers of Parish Council – we cannot determine what vehicles circulate within the parish. But see TR5.	No action needed.
Transport	The Plan doesn't identify possible improvements to cycle routes. Where are the identified cycle links to the north and south of the area? Have views of local cycle groups been sought? Use Parish land to deliver some improvements, e.g. alongside cemetery.	Botley Cemetery is owned and managed by Oxford City Council and the Parish Council doesn't own any land in that area. The only and owned by the Parish Council is used for recreational purposes (e.g. allotments, playing fields and nature reserve), and is not in locations that would benefit from additional cycle lanes.	No action needed.
TR1	Encourage cyclists to actually use provided cycle lanes.	Improving signage and road marking (TR1) should help. NHPC cannot determine cyclists' behaviour.	No action needed.
TR1	How can this be done as there is no room for widening roads?	Mark dedicated cycle lanes to indicate shared space (TR1).	No action needed.
TR2	Disagree with CPZs if off-road parking not available.	An opinion – TR2 indicates if supported by a majority of affected residents.	No action needed.
TR2	Need CPZs now to overcome parking problems.	Read TR2 (as above).	No action needed.
TR2	Need car parking management measures / reconfiguring streets, avoid losing front gardens to off-road parking spaces.	Reconfiguring streets VERY expensive. What people do with their front gardens is unfortunately their own business.	No action needed.
TR3	Not necessary. Current crossings meet the need.	Disagree, especially to Seacourt Retail Park.	No action needed.
TR3	Need to facilitate pedestrians, cyclists and buses. Safe routes / shared space to Field House and over West Way?	Not clear what is meant beyond the present provision.	No action needed.
TR4	Move Seacourt Park and Ride outside the Ring Road to ease Botley traffic.	Seacourt P&R is not in the Parish (owned by the City), and we have no suitable sites for an alternative in the parish.	No action needed.
TR5	Wary about A34 'improvements'. Need to enforce the 50mph speed limit.	A matter for the police/Highways Agency, not for the Parish. Police say they do enforce the 50mph speed limit, but don't have the resources to do so continually.	No action needed.
TR5	Support new road link from Abingdon to Pear Tree.	Detailed response only relevant to any subsequent consultation, not to Neighbourhood Plan content.	No action needed.

Reference	Issue/Concern/Comment on policies 15/10/17 & November consultation	Response	Action to be undertaken
TR6	How? There is no room.	This is a planning matter to be discussed with the developer about on-site space. If access road already exists, difficult to do anything. Vale's experts always say any extra traffic won't make a significant difference: they don't understand integral calculus.	No action needed.
TR6	Electric vehicle charging points should be the norm, not an exception. Encourage them at Park and Ride sites.	Two issues: electrical power is provided to all dwellings, but there may be issues over the level of power supply required for e.g. rapid charging. This could require new cables, transformers etc. At the moment the number of electric vehicles is small, so not a problem. North Hinksey does not have any P&R sites in the parish.	Electric vehicle charging points being covered by several policies in various sections.
TR6	Electric vehicle charging points should be required in all new housing and employment sites.	See above over level of power supply needed – could be expensive if there were large take-up of electric vehicles with rapid charging.	Electric vehicle charging points being covered by policies in several sections.
TR6	What does 'satisfactory' mean?	Maybe "safe" a better word	Change text to "safe".
TR6	Needs to be 300m, not a range.	Agreed.	Change text to 300m, not a range.
Social Infrastructure	High priority but no clear proposals or allocations to address shortfalls. New development should not be allowed without assessing and meeting infrastructure needs. N.B. Specific lack of a day nursery for under 2 age group – land should be allocated to safeguard provision.	Shortfalls in leisure facilities are being addressed by NHPC using land already in use for / allocated for that purpose (e.g. the Louie Memorial Playing Fields and the new community hall) so further allocation of land is not necessary. Health and education needs should already be considered when major developments are approved by the Vale and should not need further specific policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst a day nursery might well be desirable it is not possible for the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate land specifically for that business purpose.	No action needed.
S11	Location of facilities very important. Don't want facilities relocated to an inaccessible site.	The full policy already requires any relocation to be to a site of equal accessibility and usability.	No action needed.
Utilities	The 'historic Willow Walk' is mentioned but not the much older Hinksey Causeway.	Not relevant to utilities but could be mentioned within the historical background section of the Character Assessment	Added to the historical background section in the Jan 2018 update of the Character Assessment.
Utilities	Emphasis on groundwater / drainage considerations is welcomed.		No action needed.

Reference	Issue/Concern/Comment on policies 15/10/17 & November consultation	Response	Action to be undertaken
UT1	Should approve if the development mitigates the risk through design or landscape.	Agreed.	Plan amended accordingly.
UT1	Propose requirement that a detailed drainage assessment (including all of the elements already has to be submitted with the planning application, not later as a condition of approval.	Agreed.	Plan amended accordingly.
UT2	Enforceable? Need quantitative maximum limits.	VOWHDC would need to enforce the policy (NHPC has no authority to do so) and would also need to identify guidelines on enforcement.	No action needed.
UT2	Need Electric vehicle charging point in all new housing and business sites.	Agree that electric charging points would be beneficial.	This is now included this in policies under other topics.
UT2	Low carbon good but carbon neutral better. Passivhaus? Policy not strong enough, quality of design not mentioned.	Agree in principle, but realistically this would not be feasible for all new developments.	No action needed.
Green spaces	Some green spaces are poorly maintained. Either look after it or use it for development (housing or leisure).	We note that the existence of less rigidly maintained areas managed for wildlife increases biodiversity both in the Parish and beyond. Such semi-wild patches have been untouched for decades and add to the semi-rural character of our Parish.	Encourage the community to keep such areas free from litter to reduce unkempt appearance, otherwise no further action.
Green spaces	Need to consider youth and provide leisure facilities for them. Biodiversity and healthy living should go hand in hand.	The Social Infrastructure policies cover the provision of leisure facilities fully. There need be no conflict in the wisely planned provision of leisure facilities that benefit some and cause no detriment to anything.	No action needed.
GS2	Discourage loss of garden areas / encourage green elements in front gardens.	Neighbourhood Plans have little power over this issue pertinent in our Parish, other than to reiterate the law that "hard surfacing of more than five square metres of domestic front gardens [comes under] permitted development only where the surface in question is rendered permeable. Use of traditional materials, such as impermeable concrete, where there was no facility in place to ensure permeability, requires an application for planning permission. (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/permeable-surfacing-of-front-gardens-guidance)	This is now reflected in the Green Spaces supporting information section of the draft Plan.

Reference	Issue/Concern/Comment on policies 15/10/17 & November consultation	Response	Action to be undertaken
GS2	Planting in central reservations?	WG6 presumes this suggestion relates to the two roads with dual carriageways in the Parish: West Way and the A34. Planting and maintenance would be the concern of Oxfordshire County Council and Highways England respectively.	No action needed.
BU1	Support Brookes' plan to loop U1 bus via Lime Road development.	Not possible as land was not safeguarded for this purpose when approval was given for the Lime Road development.	No action needed.
BU1	What do 'significant' and 'predominantly' mean?	'Significant' is defined in the full Policy BU1, but 'predominantly' is not.	Definition of 'predominantly' added to the text of the Policy.