

**THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
FOR THE PARISH OF
GREAT FARINGDON
2015-2031**

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

SEPTEMBER 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: CONSULTATIONS MARCH 2012 TO JUNE 2014	1
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND	1
3. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP	2
4. STEERING GROUP SUB-GROUPS	2
5. WHO WAS CONSULTED	2
6. HOW PEOPLE WERE CONSULTED	3
7. OVERVIEW OF MAJOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENTS	3
8. HOW THE MAJOR CONSULTATION EVENTS WERE PUBLICISED	3
9. CONSULTATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS, STATUTORY ORGANISATIONS, GROUPS	4
10. 2013 PRE-CONSULTATION ON FIRST DRAFT OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN	6
Consultation Comments Schedule 31st March 2013 and 11th May 2013	6
Questions 4.1 A Well Proportioned Town	7
Questions 4.2 Connections	7
Questions 4.3 Town Centre Shopping and Services	7
Questions 4.4 Local Jobs	7
Questions 4.6 Design	7
Questions 4.7 School Provision	7
11. ISSUES RAISED IN THE 2013 PRE-CONSULTATION RESPONSES	7
12. Changes made to the draft Neighbourhood Plan following the 2013 pre-consultation	11
12a) Changes to Policies Following the 2013 Pre-consultation	11
12b) Changes to Text	12
SECTION 2: PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATIONS MAY/JUNE 2014	13
13. CONSULTATION APPROACH	13
14. DETAILS OF LOCAL PUBLICITY FOR THE CONSULTATION	13
15. PLAN AVAILABILITY	14
16. LOCAL RESIDENTS, STAKEHOLDERS AND GROUPS	14
17. STATUTORY CONSULTEES	15
18. 2014 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: ISSUES RAISED AND ADDRESSED	16
19. CHANGES MADE FOLLOWING THE 2014 PRE-CONSULTATION	19
20. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL	19
21. CONCLUSION	19
SECTION 3: PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATIONS MAY/JUNE 2015	20
22. REASON FOR RESUBMISSION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN	20
23. CONSULTATION APPROACH	20
24. DETAILS OF LOCAL PUBLICITY FOR THE CONSULTATION	21

25. PLAN AVAILABILITY	22
26. LOCAL RESIDENTS, STAKEHOLDERS AND GROUPS	22
27. STATUTORY CONSULTEES	22
28. ISSUES RAISED AND ADDRESSED.....	23
Comments from Individuals Appendix CS14.....	23
Developer and land use comments Appendices CS15 and 15a	24
Chamber of Commerce Comments Appendix CS16	24
Specific Comments on Wicklesham Quarry	24
Comments from Statutory Consultees Appendix CS19.....	26
29. CHANGES MADE FOLLOWING THE 2014 EXAMINATION VERSION	27
30. CHANGES MADE FOLLOWING THE 2015 PRE-CONSULTATION	27
31. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL	27
32. THE BASIC CONDITIONS STATEMENT AND EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT.....	27
33. CONCLUSION.....	27

SECTION 1: CONSULTATIONS MARCH 2012 TO JUNE 2014

1. INTRODUCTION

This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan.

Section 15(2) of part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a consultation statement should contain:

1. Details of the persons and bodies that were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
2. Explanation of how the general public, agencies and stakeholders were consulted
3. Summary of the main issues and concerns which arose through the consultation process.
4. A description of how issues and suggestions have been considered and where objectives have been developed in relation to the neighbourhood plan.

2. BACKGROUND

On the 8th March 2012, Faringdon was granted "front runner" status to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. Approval was then given by Faringdon Town Council to accept the award for "front runner" status and to move forward with developing a Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan. Approval was given to employ a planning consultant to assist in drawing up the Plan.

On 3 April, 2012, the Planning and Highways Committee agreed that an interim group of townspeople and organisations should meet under the auspices of the P&H Working Party, Our Faringdon Our Future (OFOF). Two weeks later, the Interim Steering Group, comprising townspeople and organisations, met to draw up future terms of reference to enable OFOF to progress the Neighbourhood Plan. The first meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group took place on 2 May 2012 when a presentation was made by representatives of the District Council on the development of Neighbourhood Plans; the Terms of Reference for the Group were confirmed at that time. The Steering Group has met regularly thereafter, including meetings with AMUP to consider the emerging Local Plan. In late May 2012, a CPRE/NALC Workshop was held in the Corn Exchange, Faringdon as part of the free workshops/help sessions for local councils wishing to develop Neighbourhood Plans

Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (AMUP) were appointed as Planning Consultants on 1 June 2012 and a part-time Administrator was appointed to assist the Town Council at the same time.

The first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan was published for informal public pre-consultation purposes in March 2013. The contract period with Allies and Morrison expired at that time. Following the six week public consultation period, the responses were considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and a Sub-Group of the Planning and Highways Committee.

In July 2013 it was agreed that the Sustainability Assessment needed to be turned into a robust, sustainable Appraisal and that it would be necessary to employ new Consultants, experienced in this particular area of work, to achieve this. URS were subsequently awarded the contract to take on this work.

It was subsequently agreed that the assistance of a Consultant would greatly benefit the production of a Neighbourhood Plan for pre-submission public consultation, in a quicker and more efficient manner than might otherwise be the case. It would ensure that the Plan was of the quality that the Town Council and the Steering Group desired, to secure the outcomes it wanted. It was agreed that Bluestone Planning should be contracted to undertake this work.

The six week formal pre-submission public consultation period on the amended Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents commenced on 17 May 2014. Following consideration of the comments by the Steering Group and Planning and Highways Committee, the Neighbourhood Plan was approved by the Faringdon Town Council for submission for adoption purposes at its meeting on 9 July 2014.

3. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

For the purpose of guiding and supporting the engagement and consultation process a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group was established. This open Steering Group was made up of local residents, members of Faringdon Town Council, support staff from the Vale of White Horse District Council and the part-time Administrator. Some of the local residents also represented organisations within the town. Reports on each of its meetings have been submitted to the Town Council's Planning and Highways Committee and were placed on the website (then www.faringdonplan.webs.com) established to support the Plan process. The membership of the Steering Group has varied during the time of its existence and at one stage a Central Group was established to allow a core group of Steering Group members to focus on specific issues.

4. STEERING GROUP SUB-GROUPS

A series of sub-groups were established to explore key themes for the town. In July 2012 the Groups submitted reports which formed an important part of the baseline for the Neighbourhood Plan. Subsequently they were involved in reviewing the very first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The sub-groups established covered the following themes:

- Retail
- Employment land
- Tourism
- Housing and health
- Leisure and community
- Education
- Transport and roads
- Conservation and development boundary

The sub-group reports fed directly into the baseline outlined in Part 1 of the Evidence Base report. The reports are included in full in the appendices to Part 1 of the Evidence Base.

5. WHO WAS CONSULTED

Over the two year period from March 2012 to May 2014, many different people were consulted, depending upon the nature of the consultation to hand e.g. from the major pre-consultation on the first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan to meetings with individual stakeholders or small groups of members of the public. The following examples give a good indication of the wide breadth of this work. Also, members of stakeholder groups served as members on the Steering Group and Sub-Groups and were thus able to inform the content of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Members of the Public/Stakeholders

Philip Archard (Faze Youth Centre);
Dave Wilson, Alun Williams and John Banbrook (Faringdon Academy of Schools);
Residents of Portway and Bromsgrove;
1st Faringdon Scout Group;
Owners of Wicklesham Quarry;
Norman Snelling (Faringdon Fossil Trust);
Local Land Owners; Richard Brickell; Nigel and Alison Allaway; Rosemary and Richard Pollock;
Annabel Saunders.
Julie Watts and Jan Francis (Faringdon Town Football Club)
Sheena Gutteridge (Faringdon Library)
Steve Wright (Faringdon Community Bus)
Carolyn Taylor (Faringdon Dramatic Society)
Joanne Morgan (White Horse Medical Practice)
Richard Henderson (National Trust)

Statutory Consultees

OCC (Barbara Chillman, Education and Early Intervention; Amanda Jacobs; David Periam, Minerals

and Waste Team; Karen Lister, Head of Estates).

Vale of White Horse District Council: Andrew Maxted; Trudy Godfrey, Economic Development; Kate Arnold, Economy, Leisure and Property.

Parish Councils/Meetings: Invitees: Great Coxwell, Little Coxwell, Littleworth, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Watchfield, Shrivenham, Shellingford, Fernham, Lechlade (Cotswold DC) and Radcot (West Oxfordshire).

Faringdon House Estates (Jeremy Hulme and Juliet Souter, Land Agents; and Terry Gash, Consultant).

Thames Valley Police (PCSO Sue Haynes).

British Telecom (John Hewitt)

6. HOW PEOPLE WERE CONSULTED

- Major public consultation events
- Meetings with local groups and stakeholders, statutory organisations, local Parish Councils and Meetings.

7. OVERVIEW OF MAJOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENTS

On 12 June 2012 the first public meeting took place in the Corn Exchange. Townspeople were invited to become involved in the process. Up to 140 people attended. Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners, Planning Consultants, attended and made a presentation. Several attendees signed up to join the Steering Group. (For more detailed information, refer to Section 2, pages 75-78, of the Evidence Base Review.)

On 10 July 2012, a drop-in market stall consultation was held in the Market Place, Faringdon by Allies and Morrison, Planning Consultants.

(For more detailed information, refer to Section 2, pages 78-79, of the Evidence Base Review.)

A large community workshop was run by the Planning Consultants on 26 July 2012 to review comments/reports from work carried out by Steering Group and to start to formulate key ideas. (For more detailed information, refer to Section 2, pages 81-87, of the Evidence Base Review.)

Another public meeting was held on 2 October 2012, when a presentation was made by Allies and Morrison. Questionnaires were circulated for members of the public to complete in response to key questions. The presentation and questionnaire, together with the results of the analysis of the questionnaires, were subsequently put on the Neighbourhood Plan website.

(For more detailed information, refer to Section 2, pages 87-91, of the Evidence Base Review.)

Records of these events are attached to the Evidence Base Review as Appendices A-D.

On 28 March 2013, a public meeting and an exhibition were held to launch the informal 6 week public consultation on first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. These took place in conjunction with the District Council's consultation on their draft Local Plan. This was seen as a good opportunity to help explain how the two documents formed part of the development plan for the Vale and that they were consistent and in conformity with each other. Faringdon Academy's public consultation on their proposals for future education provision in the town was explained at the same time. These events were not consultation events in themselves, more an important way of introducing both of the Plans and explaining the consultation processes.

8. HOW THE MAJOR CONSULTATION EVENTS WERE PUBLICISED

Major consultation events were publicised through a variety of means. These included notifications in the Neighbourhood Plan and the www.faringdon.org websites, notices and posters, a banner prominently displayed in the town centre, interviews with the Chairman on Faringdon Radio, email notifications to an 'Interested Parties' group of residents who had registered interest in being kept up-to-date with Plan progress, coverage in the Town Council's quarterly newsletters which are distributed to all residents in the town, notification in local publications where time allowed. Prior to the community workshop on 26 July 2013, a leaflet prepared by AMUP was sent to local residents. It

was also sent to stakeholders, such as the Clerks to local Parish Councils in advance of the meeting held on 9 August 2012. It is considered that these were successful, given the high numbers of people who turned out at the public meeting and workshop in the early days which assisted in setting the template for the Plan, and the number of people who commented on the informal draft of the plan.

9. CONSULTATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS, STATUTORY ORGANISATIONS, GROUPS

An important part of the consultation process has been to consult with a range of local stakeholders, statutory organisations, groups.

Date	Invitees	Purpose and Action
20 June 2012	A representative of the County Council's Education Department	The number of school places in Faringdon took place at the same time.
29 June 2012	Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners met with the following representatives: Trudy Godfrey (Economic Development, VWHDC), Kate Arnold (Economy, Leisure and Property, VWHDC), John Banbrook (Faringdon Academy of Schools), Philip Archard (FAZE Youth Centre.)	Stakeholders Meeting took place. Please refer to pages 76-78 of the Evidence Base.
June/July 2012	Youth groups.	Consultation. Please refer to pages 76-78 of the Evidence Base.
9 August 2012	Representatives of neighbouring Parish Councils/Meetings invited to a meeting: Great Coxwell, Little Coxwell, Littleworth, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Watchfield, Shrivenham, Shellingford, Fernham, Lechlade (Cotswold DC) and Radcot (West Oxfordshire).	Meeting regarding the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish representatives present were invited to comment on how they saw the town developing up until 2029 and what their residents wanted when they came to the town. Major issues discussed included education, transport and tourism.
14 August 2012	Meeting specifically for organisations and other stakeholders associated with Faringdon. This included the Police, Library etc plus clubs and land owners.	This represented an opportunity for such organisations to come together and give the Steering Group their views on Faringdon and how it should progress over the years up to 2029.
26 September 2012	Faringdon Academy of Schools	Please refer to page 90 of the Evidence Base
10 October 2012	Residents of Portway and Bromsgrove.	Residents were concerned about planning blight due to proposals contained in the initial thoughts of Planning Consultants.
11 October 2012	Representatives of the Steering Group, VWHDC, Faringdon Academy and Barbara Chillman (OCC Education and Early Intervention)	Meeting regarding forthcoming consultations concerning future education provision in Faringdon and the emerging Faringdon neighbourhood plan. There was clear agreement that combining the consultation on future education provision for Faringdon and the Draft Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan would be advantageous.

18 October 2012	Retail/Employment Land Sub-Groups and Trudy Godfrey (VWHDC Economic Development Officer)	To consider liaison with Planning and Economic Development and how assistance can be given. Also, to understand what the plans are for Economic Development within the Vale to 2029 and to share views and thoughts.
30 October 2012	Retail/Employment Land Sub-Groups and Trudy Godfrey (VWHDC Economic Development Officer)	To gather further information for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan.
7 November 2012	Dave Wilson (Head Faringdon Community College), Alun Williams and John Banbrook (Faringdon Academy of Schools)	It was agreed that it would be sensible to go out to consultation on all three documents (Neighbourhood Plan, Academy Consultation, District Council Local Plan) at the same time, if possible. Discussions regarding revision of Primary School provision, school size and leisure facilities.
10 January 2013	Representatives of Steering Group, 2 Officers of VWHDC responsible for affordable housing policy and allocation 1 senior planning officer responsible for Neighbourhood Planning.	To explore the findings of the NP consultants that demonstrate the high proportion of affordable rented homes in Faringdon
23 January 2013	Meeting with the Land Agent for the Faringdon House Estate, Juliet Souter.	To discuss proposals for the development of land off Gloucester Street and relevant provision in the Neighbourhood Plan.
25 January 2013	Representatives of the Steering Group, District and Town Councils and Alun Williams with John Banbrook (Faringdon Academy of Schools).	This meeting was essentially about co-ordinating public consultation on the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan, and the Academy's proposal for the re-organization of Primary School provision in the town.
6 February 2013	Faringdon Academy	Meeting re consultation arrangements for the FNP and restructuring of Primary School arrangements in Faringdon
6 February 2013	Meeting with residents of Portway	Re town centre retail development options contained in Sustainability Assessment.
7 February 2013	Meeting with representatives of the 1 st Faringdon Scout Group.	To consider their proposals for a new Scout HQ.
8 February 2013	Representatives of the Central Group of the Steering Group and Town Councillors.	Briefing for Ed Vaizey MP.
21 February 2013	Retail Sub-Group and Portway Residents Meeting.	Meeting for Sub-Group members and residents of Portway to exchange views on proposals contained in the Neighbourhood Plan, which residents felt affected the future of their homes. Subsequently the Plan was revised to remove these concerns.

26 June 2013	Meeting with representatives of Great Coxwell Parish Council.	It was agreed that the open land between the Town and the Parish should remain undeveloped. Subsequently revised wording had been included in the draft Neighbourhood Plan to reinforce the existing policy, which stated that the green space between the two settlements must be maintained.
21 January 2014	Meeting with representatives of Faringdon Academy.	The meeting considered the current situation regarding proposals to revise Primary School provision in the town, the future of the Infants School Site, the appropriate provision to be made in the Neighbourhood Plan
22 January 2014	Meeting was attended by representatives of the Town Council and Steering Group, David Periam (OCC), Andrew Maxted (VWHDC), the land owners, URS, and Norman Snelling (Faringdon Fossil Trust).	Meeting considered the current situation, the current provisions in the Neighbourhood Plan, and the need for an SEA/SA. It was agreed to recommend that the existing Policy should be revised for submission to Natural England and OCC for ratification.
31 January 2014	Consultation by email with Oxfordshire County Council, Thames Valley Police and British Telecom	Regarding the possible future uses of premises, currently occupied by them, as retail outlets. Responses assist in final drafting of the relevant Policy in the Neighbourhood Plan.
7 February 2014	Juliet Souter (Land Agent) and Terry Gash (Consultant) – Faringdon House Estate	re Faringdon House Estate/Gloucester Street site elements of draft FNP. Agreed FNP to express a form of words that retail and business use would be an aspiration for this site. NP policy to conform with Local Plan policy.
21 May 2014	Local land owners.	Local land owners invited to attend a meeting to explain the main provisions of the Neighbourhood Plan and to answer questions, and to explain the consultation process.
28 May 2014	Local Parish Councils and Meetings	Local Parish Councils and Meetings invited to attend a meeting
18 June 2014	Little Coxwell Parish Council	Chairman of the Steering group attends meeting of the Parish Council to allay evident fears at certain provisions in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. See Section 18.

10. 2013 PRE-CONSULTATION ON FIRST DRAFT OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The public consultation period on the informal first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan commenced on 28 March 2013 and lasted for six weeks. The responses were submitted to the Planning and Highways Committee, Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and were considered by an Officer at the District Council's Planning Department. The outcome of those considerations is set out in Appendices CS1-5.

Consultation Comments Schedule 31st March 2013 and 11th May 2013

Written comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan issued on 31st March 2013, the Evidence Base and Sustainability Appraisal, all undertaken by consultants Allies and Morrison, were received from local residents and statutory consultees, including the Vale of White Horse District Council, Oxfordshire County Council and Natural England. Responses were invited from other consultees considered to have an interest in the Neighbourhood Plan, such as Stagecoach West, utility companies as well as the members of the Steering Group. A list of respondents is attached.

The draft Neighbourhood Plan contained specific questions to stimulate responses:

Questions 4.1 A Well Proportioned Town

Do you agree any future growth of the town should be carefully limited to protect the existing character of Faringdon?

Do you agree any future residential developments should be limited to small scale development?

Do you agree that the existing development boundary should be controlled as suggested?

Questions 4.2 Connections

Are there pedestrian or cycle links not mentioned in this section that you would like to see included and delivered?

How would you like to see traffic and pedestrian issues in the town centre addressed - is a radical approach to re- prioritising space an attractive solution to you?

Do you agree that more off-street free public car parking should be provided - should this be within the town centre itself or outside the main shopping area?

Do you support the proposal to direct some developer contributions to the delivery of new cycle routes?

Questions 4.3 Town Centre Shopping and Services

Do you agree with the approach to extending the retail offer as set out in 4.3A?

Do you agree that contributions from developments should be steered towards public realm improvements as set out in 4.3B?

Questions 4.4 Local Jobs

Do you agree that the Neighbourhood Plan should identify further employment sites, in addition to the Local Plan, so as to provide a higher number of local jobs?

Do you agree that existing employment sites should maximise employment where appropriate to boost the number of local jobs?

Do you agree that under-used town centre sites should be considered for employment uses to boost activity in the town centre?

Do you agree sensitive refurbishment or new build on existing farms should be allowed to support economic diversification?

Questions 4.6 Design

Do you agree with the design principles proposed for new development?

Questions 4.7 School Provision

If the Academy Education Strategy proceeds and the Faringdon Infant School is no longer needed for educational use what would you like to see the site used for:

1. Develop the site for employment use?
2. Develop the site for residential use?
3. Develop the site for community use?

Would you support a change to the development boundary of Faringdon on the current Infant School site to allow for new development if it is no longer to be used as a school?

11. ISSUES RAISED IN THE 2013 PRE-CONSULTATION RESPONSES

A total of 54 comments were received on the Neighbourhood Plan, and 1 comment on the Sustainability Appraisal.

Comments were sorted and grouped according to the page or policy of the Neighbourhood Plan, etc. to which their comment referred, anonymised with a code number and arranged in tabular form as shown below:

Number	Section or Policy Number	Comments	Response	Actions
--------	--------------------------	----------	----------	---------

The comments were read and the response and action boxes filled in, firstly by Dr M L H Wise as chairman of the Planning & Highways Committee and Steering Group, then circulated to the Steering Group and subsequently reviewed by Dr A Maxted as VoWHDC adviser, then by Mr J Flawn of Bluestone Planning as consultant to the Neighbourhood Plan.

The draft Neighbourhood Plan was then annotated with every comment, appropriately colour coded to show its source, and the text amended after review by members of the Planning and Highways Committee, Steering Group and consultants. This process highlighted areas of concern that needed further consultation.

General Comments

The first group of comments were of a general nature outlining requirements to fulfil the plan in accordance with statutory requirements and advice on sharpening and revising text, aims and policies and the need for a separate Action Plan. Updating to reflect changes in the draft Local Plan and clarification whether the proposed policies referred to the town or wider parish were recommended. Policies and text were then revised to ensure compliance with national and Local Plan policies.

Neighbourhood Plan boundary

Other general comments were from two developers of land outside the defined Neighbourhood Plan boundary (coincident with the Great Faringdon Parish boundary). These criticised the fact that land in a neighbouring parish, which they wished to develop, was not included and considered the plan to be flawed as a result. This was rejected as interference in another parish's affairs and was not consistent with the defined Neighbourhood Plan boundary.

Great Coxwell Parish Council

Great Coxwell Parish Council wished to be included as a stakeholder and a meeting was arranged on 26th June 2013. Since then several meetings with Great Coxwell have been held to consider the developments mentioned above and their impact on our communities. Great Coxwell are also preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and this has resulted in greater collaboration between our parishes.

District Council

There were various comments from VoWHDC on updating and amending the text and maps that were variously acted upon although there were contrary arguments regarding the proportion of Affordable Housing that should be allowed. Faringdon has 50% more affordable housing than the Vale average, which was a concern expressed not only by Faringdon residents but from an adjacent village. The Vale's argument was about absolute rather than relative figures, claiming that Faringdon had only 10% of the Vale's Affordable Housing; however Faringdon had only 5.9% of the Vale's population so this comment was rejected.

It was suggested that policies on planning gain be accordance with the VoWHDC policy on Community Infrastructure Levy when introduced. Although health care provision could not be delivered by the Neighbourhood Plan it was requested that it should feature in the CIL and other planning gain opportunities delivered by the Local Plan.

Population Growth and Coalescence

There was concern over the growth of the town and the likely resultant population. Although the Neighbourhood Plan was careful not to set population targets and did not allocate any housing, there was despondency about the potential loss of Faringdon's small market town ambiance and that it was outgrowing its centre. Several commenters regretted the uncontrolled growth of the town but did not appreciate that the main development site had been a strategic site within the emerging Local Plan and so was outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. Since then, of course, the lack of a Local Plan

and the National Planning Policy Framework together have overtaken events with four further applications for development sites totalling a potential 700 houses. It was pointed out that this could render the Neighbourhood Plan obsolete before it could be completed. Nevertheless there was a general plea that infrastructure such as schools and health provision should keep pace with population growth.

Many residents and a neighbouring village also commented on the threat of coalescence from proposed new estates and the need to maintain a green corridor between the two settlements; although this was already clearly stated, it was further endorsed in the Neighbourhood Plan. Comments from another village appeared to have been orchestrated against an industrial development that would benefit Faringdon; these were noted.

Development Boundary

There was general agreement that the Development Boundary should be maintained as it is in order to deter sprawl, but events have somewhat overtaken this. The District Council has designated sites for development outside the Development Boundary; however, the policy remains to deter further sprawl. Natural England wanted to see the character of all landscapes conserved and enhanced and it was hoped that further development would be on a small scale and there was a general wish to maintain the existing character of the town.

Walking and Cycling

There was a desire to see walking and cycling links within the town to be improved as well as links to nearby employment sites. New development should be built with this in mind, especially links to schools. Suggestions included a new circular cycle route, safe crossings of the A420 at Fernham Road and Stanford Road and a roundabout on the A420/Coxwell Road junction. Also, a review of pavements, drop kerbs/ and pedestrian crossing places for the benefit of pushchair users and the disabled was suggested. There was a general desire for improved connectivity across the town particularly to the Tesco site so that shoppers could easily access the town centre.

Retail Development

Whilst the VoWHDC wanted to limit retail to the town centre, and to maintain the existing offer by not permitting any further changes of use to housing, there was a contrary view from the Chamber of Commerce to expand the retail offer by extending the town centre boundary out towards Station Road and Gravel Walk to encompass existing businesses. This development of the retail offer would be necessary to accommodate the growth of the town's population. There was also a move to include other sites, such as the Faringdon House Estate/Gloucester Street site near the town centre for retail development; however, others pointed out the site's ecological, conservation area and access constraints.

Attention was drawn to Faringdon's unique preponderance of organic farms and the need for an outlet for local produce. This was included in the Neighbourhood Plan although one contributor questioned the need considering Faringdon to be a dormitory town where food purchases were made elsewhere. However, there were suggestions for improved and additional markets.

Employment Land

A particular emphasis of the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan was the allocation of sufficient employment land to enable a significant proportion of Faringdon's working age population to be able to work in the town in order to stop it being a dormitory town. Concern was expressed that sites in the town that had been designated for employment in previous versions were no longer designated in the emerging the Local Plan. There was a very strong feeling among Steering Group that these sites should be allocated for employment.

In contrast, a developer offered to provide employment land on a housing development outside the town boundary; however, this was controversial as this site was not located within the defined Neighbourhood Plan boundary.

The major new site that the Neighbourhood Plan had proposed for employment was Wicklesham Quarry. This was objected to by a neighbouring parish. Arguments were put that Faringdon had

sufficient employment land because current sites were not being used; however, this ignored the fact that one major site had not then received planning permission and the recession had resulted in a downturn in the market for employment land. The recommendation that there should be further consultations with stakeholders on employment was implemented.

There was a desire to see any new and existing employment sites developed in a sympathetic and attractive way and this was incorporated in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Housing

Views were expressed on housing size, some requesting a higher proportion of larger houses to attract wealth creators into the town with the potential of job creation from new businesses, whilst others disagreeing ; however there was a general feeling that houses should be of adequate size for families with gardens and not too densely packed. A constructive comment was received from Thames Valley Police on the concept of Secure by Design and this was included as a policy.

Education

There were various conflicting comments on the potential redevelopment of the Infant School site including its use for housing, employment or a community centre. It was agreed not to change the development boundary that divides this site and leave the educational policy concerning relocation to the Faringdon Academy of Schools. If and when relocation occurs, the site will revert to Oxfordshire County Council, which has since confirmed that it will look to maximise the return from its development.

The need for the Pre-school to be accommodated elsewhere should the Infant School site be vacated was highlighted. The need for affordable pre-school provision was already mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan, but no site had been allocated. It was considered that while this matter should be for negotiation between the Pre-school and the Academy, the desirability of adequate pre-school provision was emphasised in Neighbourhood Plan without allocating a site.

Sport and Leisure

With regard to leisure facilities, the concept of the Country Park was welcomed by Natural England and the development of improved sport and leisure facilities. The location of these facilities was debated as to whether this should be at the Leisure Centre or at the Cricket/Rugby/Tennis Club/skate park site. The provision of extra allotments and the allocation of various sites, including the site referred to as 'Humpty Hill' as green spaces was welcomed.

There were various opinions on the need for a new community centre and where it should be located. Suggestions for locating it in the Country Park were countered that an out-of-centre location would require car transport and parking whereas a central location would be more accessible with better use made of existing premises. Suggestions for the using the old theatre for youth activities had been already implemented, but there was a plea for long term planning for this facility.

Health and Care Provision

Improvements to health care and care for the elderly were welcomed and that these should be linked to new developments.

Tourism

There were comments for and against the establishment of a museum as a tourist attraction, whether it would be viable and was one needed as there was already the Downland Museum in Wantage; it was recommended that more should be done to promote tourism although development of the area around the Thames was questioned.

Alternative Energy Sources

A request to include a micro-hydroelectric generation scheme was received from a local environmental group and a new policy on renewable energy was included as this was thought to have been an omission, given the local participation in the Watchfield Wind and Solar Farm Co-operatives.

Other Statutory Consultee Comments

Natural England was supportive and wanted to see that changes did not have any environmental or ecological impact; this was endorsed in the Neighbourhood Plan.

A contribution from *Stagecoach West* regretted that the request for bus services to other towns would not be financially viable but noted that since the frequency of the 66 Oxford-Swindon service had been increased from hourly to half-hourly, passenger usage had increased by 80% despite the low density of population along the route.

English Heritage commented that it was well aware of the historic significance of Faringdon, with its large number of listed buildings and Conservation Area and would welcome mention of the listed buildings within the parish as well giving a more complete picture of the historic environment of the parish. A list of the 134 listed buildings has been attached to the Neighbourhood Plan.

English Heritage also welcomed the policy regarding a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and the desire for improvements to the Conservation Area and a review of its boundary. It recommended that the first stage of the latter should be a characterisation study of the whole town, which could then be used as a basis for the review. This would be part of the subsequent Action Plan.

Comments were received from *Network Rail*, *Thames Water* and *Scottish and Southern Energy* but were more statutory in nature and concerned matters that were more the responsibility of the Planning Authority, although *Network Rail* acknowledged the comments about the aspiration for a new station at Grove/Wantage.

12. Changes made to the draft Neighbourhood Plan following the 2013 pre-consultation

Comments were received from the Steering Group and the sub-groups, Statutory Consultees, other public bodies who were not statutory consultees, neighbouring parishes, the Vale of White Horse District Council, Oxfordshire County Council and individuals.

All of these comments were appended to the text of the March 2013 pre-consultation draft, Appendix CS1.

The comments were extensively reviewed by the Steering Group, Faringdon Town Council, the Vale of White Horse District Council and Bluestone Planning, through several iterations.

For example: changes recommended by the Steering Group are shown in Appendix CS2 and were incorporated as shown. Specific comments were also incorporated following meetings with sub groups.

Changes recommended by the combined comments from the other parties were processed in three stages: 1) a preliminary review by the Chairman of the Steering group (Appendix CS3a and CS3b [OCC comments arrived late]); 2) by officers of the Vale of White Horse District Council (Appendix CS4); and 3) by Bluestone Planning (Appendix CS5). The latter reviews, having been recommended by planning experts, were taken as being authoritative.

All sections were updated to take into account changes that had occurred since the initial pre-consultation draft and comments from consultees.

The document sections were renumbered: the introductory section was renumbered 4.1 and an extra section, Section 4.8, was added regarding infrastructure (this changed policy numbering between the 2013 and 2014 pre-consultation drafts).

12a) Changes to Policies Following the 2013 Pre-consultation

As a result of this sequence of reviews, all policies were revised to take into account the comments made by individuals, consultees and consultants to ensure that these were in conformity with the emerging Local Plan, while reflecting the will of the residents.

Residential development Policies 4.1A-C were extensively revised and replaced with new Policies 4.2A-C, to ensure conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging Local Plan.

Connections Policies 4.2A-E (Policy 4.2E was mislabelled) were reworded as Policies 4.3A-E for clarity. Policy 4.2B for conformity with Local Plan policy; Policy 4.3C on Shared Surfaces added (because of local safety concerns) and Policy 4.3E rewritten to include lockable bicycle parking facilities following local input.

Retail provision Policies 4.3A-B were extensively revised to be in conformity with current legislation as in Policy 4.4A. Policy 4.3B was reformed into Policies 4.4B-C to separate the town centre and wider retail offer to include new potential retail sites. Policies 4.4D, on improving links between retail sites and the town centre, and 4.4E, on retaining public houses, were added.

Employment land Policies 4.4A-E were revised extensively following consultations with stakeholders and statutory consultees. Policy 4.4A was rewritten as Policy 4.5A to include good quality design; Policy 4.4B was divided into Policies 4.5B-E each dealing specifically with the respective employment sites; Policies 4.5B-C were amplified to include the suggestions made following consultations with stakeholders and input by statutory consultees (e.g. Natural England); Policies 4.4C-E were reworded as Policies 4.5F-H, but were substantially unchanged.

Housing Policy 4.5A was abandoned as it involved housing site allocation. Policy 4.4B was rewritten as Policy 4.5A but the specific make-up of development types was removed to be in conformity with Local Plan policy. Policy 4.5C on self-build was retained, unchanged as Policy 4.6B.

Housing Design Policies 4.6A-D were amplified as Policies 4.7A-D to take into account the District Council Design Guide and the inclusion of District Heating in 4.7B. Policy 4.7C was reworded for clarity as 4.4C; 4.7D was reworded to be in conformity with the NPPF and the housing density figures were removed to be in conformity with the Local Plan. At the recommendation of Thames Valley Police, a new Policy 4.7E on Secured by Design was added and Policy 4.6E on visual impact was relabelled as 4.7F.

The Education Section 4.9 was updated by the Faringdon Academy of Schools to reflect recent changes and Policy 4.9A was added at the request of local residents concerning the possible re-use of the Infant School building should it become available.

Sport and Leisure Policy 4.8A was revised as Policy 4.10A changing the emphasis towards the development of the existing Country Park rather than the creation of a new park with the amplification and itemisation of issues. Policy 4.8B was revised as 4.10B to accord with the Vale of White Horse Leisure Facilities Strategy and 4.8C on allotments reworded as 4.10C to give more emphasis.

Caring community Policies 4.9A-B were reworded as Policies 4.11A-B emphasising the need for the growing portion of the very elderly (over 85) for the former and rewording for accuracy of terminology in the latter.

Landscape Section 4.10 did not contain any policies.

Finally, Tourism Section 4.11 Policies 4.11A-B were left unchanged as Policies 4.13A-B, but a new Policy 4.13C on alternative energy schemes was introduced at the request of a local environmental group who were actively pursuing a microgeneration scheme.

12b) Changes to Text

The accompanying text was extensively revised to take into account the comments made by the consultees. The number of changes are too great to list however, key examples are:

A new infrastructure section 4.8 was formed out of previous section 4.5 to improve clarity.

Text was added to reflect the importance of organic farming and local food production Section 4.4, Local Produce.

Text was added to include the success of the Folly Tower Project at the Action for Market Towns Awards 2012 Section 4.7, Design.

References were added to support comments made from consultees, regarding clarifications of terminology, supporting data and observations.

SECTION 2: PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATIONS MAY/JUNE 2014

13. CONSULTATION APPROACH

Faringdon Town Council developed a consultation strategy that aimed to engage with as wide a cross-section of Faringdon's population as possible. The aim was to ensure that all local residents and interested parties were aware of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and how to comment on it.

In addition all relevant statutory consultees were contacted by e-mail. Key statutory consultees (including adjoining local authorities and parish councils) were also contacted.

The pre-submission consultation commenced on Saturday 17 May and closed on Saturday 28 June, giving people six weeks and one day to respond. This met the statutory requirement. The overall timetable was constrained by a cut-off date of the end of February 2015 for any Referendum, due to the impending General Election later in the year.

The consultation had two main aspects:

- a. local residents, stakeholders and groups.
- b. consulting the bodies referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (the Statutory Consultees) as advised by the Vale of White Horse District Council.

A complete set of responses is set out in Appendices CS 6-9.

14. DETAILS OF LOCAL PUBLICITY FOR THE CONSULTATION

The pre-submission consultation was publicised locally by the following means:

Date	Media	Publicity
Early May 2014	Faringdon Folly newspaper	Advance information about the impending consultation.
8 May 2014	E-mail	Advance information about the impending consultation to 101 people on the interested parties list.
Early May 2014	Website	Advance information about the impending consultation.
13 May 2014	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Planning and Highways Committee	Recommend the Town Council to adopt the draft Neighbourhood Plan for formal pre-submission public consultation purposes.
14 May 2014	Town Council	Adopted the draft Neighbourhood Plan for formal pre-submission public consultation purposes.
15 May 2014	Posters and banner	Posters re public consultation process distributed to shops, pubs, cafes, public library. Large banner positioned in town centre and remains in situ for 6 week period.
15 May 2014	Letter	Letters sent to all members of the Chamber of Commerce and the businesses at Wicklesham Lodge.
15 May 2014	Email	Details sent to a representative of, or agent for, 8 companies with an interest in proposed planning applications for housing in or around Faringdon
15 May 2014	Email	Details confirmed to 13 residents of Portway.
15 May 2014	Email	Details confirmed to 101 people on the Interested Parties list.
17 May 2014	Public Exhibition	To launch the consultation process, a public exhibition was held in the Corn Exchange from 10am to 1pm, staffed by members of the Steering group. Attended by over 40 members of the public.

17 May 2014	Radio Oxford	Coverage of start of consultation in news item
20 May 2014	Website	Item about public meeting included in faringdon.org website.
20 May 2014	Public Meeting	Public meeting in the Corn Exchange, commencing at 7pm. To explain the proposals contained in the Plan, to explain the consultation process and answer questions. Over 20 members of the public attended.
21 May 2014	Stakeholder Meeting	A meeting was held for local landowners to hear about the plan and how to make comments. Three people attended.
28 May 2014	Stakeholder meeting	A meeting for local parish Councils and Meetings to hear about the plan and how to make comments. One person attended.
1 June 2014	What's On in Faringdon	Coverage of the consultation process forms a major part of the Town Council's newsletter, circulated to all properties in Faringdon as an insert in What's On.
Early June 2014	Faringdon Folly newspaper	Reminder of details of the consultation arrangements.
21 June 2014	Email	Reminder to Interested Parties, Parish Councils and Meetings etc. of the consultation deadline.

15. PLAN AVAILABILITY

Throughout the consultation period:

- Hard copies of the draft Plan and supporting documents were available for inspection, together with response forms, at the offices of Faringdon Town Council and at the Public Library, both located in Gloucester Street.
- Following advice from the District Council, hard copies of the Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents were available for purchase at the offices of Faringdon Town Council, along with response forms.
- Electronic copies were available on www.faringdonplan.webs.com along with supporting documentation and response forms.

16. LOCAL RESIDENTS, STAKEHOLDERS AND GROUPS

As well as utilising local websites, newspapers, posters, email etc to advise local people of the pre-submission consultation process and timetable, and offering meetings to local Parish Councils and landowners, the bodies who were specifically notified of the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan and asked to comment included the following.

Faringdon Association of Residents
Faringdon Police Station
Sovereign Housing Association
Faringdon and District Rotary Club
Faringdon Collections Trust
Faringdon Cricket Club
Faringdon Folly newspaper
Faringdon Judo Club
Faringdon Pre-School
Faringdon Tennis Club
Faringdon Town Football Club
Faringdon's family and Children's Centre
Faringdon Fire Service
Faringdon Health Centre

All Saints Church
Churches Together in Faringdon
Faringdon Allotments Society
Faringdon Area Project
Faringdon Community Bus
Faringdon Day Centre for the Elderly
Faringdon Historical Society
Faringdon Library
Faringdon Radio
Faringdon Rugby Club
Faringdon U3A
FAZE Youth Centre
Faringdon Dental Practice
Oxford Geology Trust

Faringdon Fossil Trust
 Pink Pigeons Trust
 Farcycles
 Royal British Legion
 Sudbury House
 Rogers Concrete
 Land Agent, Faringdon House Estates
 Gladman Developments Ltd
 SGR (Faringdon) Ltd
 Tetronics (International) Limited
 All members of Faringdon Chamber of Commerce
 All businesses at Wicklesham Lodge

Faringdon Dramatic Society
 Probus
 National Trust

 Tesco
 Wicklesham Lodge
 Bloor Homes
 Drivewalk Ltd
 Welbeck Strategic Land LLP
 Builders Ede

17. STATUTORY CONSULTEES

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 identify the bodies that must be consulted. The following bodies, as advised by VWHDC plus additions, were notified of the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan and asked to comment.

Vale of White Horse District Council	Cherwell District Council
Oxford City Council	West Oxfordshire District Council
South Oxfordshire District Council	Cotswold District Council
Oxfordshire County Council	Gloucestershire County Council
Wiltshire County Council	Swindon Borough Council
West Berkshire Council, Planning and Transport Policy	
Longcot Parish Council	Kelmscott Parish Meeting
Grafton and Radcot Parish Meeting	Shellingford Parish Meeting
Little Coxwell Parish Council	Great Coxwell Parish Council
Eaton Hastings Parish Meeting	Littleworth Parish Meeting
Buscot Parish Council	Coleshill Parish Council
Lechlade Town Council	Littleworth Parish Council
Shrivenham Parish Council	Stanford in the Vale Parish Council
Watchfield Parish Council	Oxfordshire County Council Library Services
Environment Agency	Highways Agency
Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution	Thames Water Property Services
Network Rail	Natural England
NHS England Primary Healthcare Oxfordshire Bucks and Berks	
Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (Acute and Community Services)	
Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust	
Swindon Clinical Commissioning Group (Acute and Community Services)	
MONO Consultants Ltd for Mobile Operators Association	
The Coal Authority (Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department)	
Homes and Communities Agency	NHS Property Services
National Grid Plant Protection	Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership
Marine Management Organisation	British Telecom
British Gas	Southern Electric
London Oxford Airport	Wales and West Utilities
English Heritage Historic Environment Planning Adviser	
Oxfordshire Local Nature Partnership	Thames Valley Police (Design)
Sport England	Thames Valley Police
BBOWT	Ms Nicola Blackwood MP
Mr Ed Vaizey MP	HSE Nuclear Installation Inspectorate
Health and Safety Executive	HSE Nuclear Installation Inspectorate
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	HSE Chemical Services Division

18. 2014 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: ISSUES RAISED AND ADDRESSED

A total of 116 comments were received on the Neighbourhood Plan, and 1 comment on the Sustainability Appraisal. This time, the comments tended to concern minor changes of wording to policies or text rather than major changes. A large number of responses was received as a result of an organised campaign in a neighbouring village regarding the development of Wicklesham Quarry for industrial use.

As before comments were anonymised with a code number and arranged in tabular form as shown below:

Number	Section or Policy Number	Comments	Response	Actions
--------	--------------------------	----------	----------	---------

Comments resulting from the pre-consultation were sorted in those from statutory consultees and those from local people and stakeholders. As before, the comments were read and the response and action boxes filled in, firstly by Dr M L H Wise as chairman of the Planning & Highways Committee and Steering Group, then circulated to the Steering Group and subsequently reviewed by Dr A Maxted as VoWHDC adviser, then by Mr J Flawn of Bluestone Planning as consultant to the Neighbourhood Plan.

The draft Neighbourhood Plan was then annotated to show every comment, including typographical and grammatical errors, and a list of proposed changes prepared. These were then either approved or rejected by the Steering Group at a meeting on 3rd July 2014 after which the text was revised in preparation for submission to the Vale of White Horse District Council.

General Comments

Several minor, typographical changes were suggested to improve the wording of policies and supporting text.

The County Councillor made observations on the Farmers' Market and impact of new housing on the A420 and the need for corresponding infrastructure improvements to meet the demands of the growing population as a result of the proposed housing. These were incorporated in the text as shown in Appendix CS10.

Other comments were received about housing developments and road improvements that were outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan and the responsibility of senior councils.

Developer and land use comments

A developer, Bloor Homes, made some useful suggestions regarding the wording of policies and terminology, which were accepted as shown in Appendix CS10. Another developer objected to a development site in a neighbouring village not being included in the Neighbourhood Plan area, which was defined as the parish boundary of Great Faringdon.

Two landowners objected to the inclusion of a site that had been designated as green space; the site was currently under appeal and had been proposed as a Village Green by local residents. It was considered that the outcome of the hearing would resolve the issue either way.

The Chamber of Commerce fully supported the Neighbourhood Plan as did Great Coxwell Parish Council, apart from the allocation of Wicklesham Quarry; 29 comments were received from residents of Little Coxwell objecting to its allocation as employment land. The advice from our consultant was that the acceptability of any future use of the land will be determined through the planning application process: the policy sets out the Neighbourhood Plan's proposal but it does not, of itself, grant planning permission.

At a meeting on 18th June in Little Coxwell, the Chairman explained to Little Coxwell Parish Council the reasoning behind Wicklesham Quarry being included as employment land and the background to the Neighbourhood Plan. It was stated that a principal aim of the Neighbourhood Plan is to secure sufficient employment land to meet the employment needs of Faringdon's growing population. Although it was claimed that there was underused employment land in Faringdon, it was explained that the 4&20 site had only recently received planning permission and there was an aim for over a

third of the working age population to work in Faringdon to limit commuting and adding to the overloaded A420.

The current planning permission requires Wicklesham Quarry to be restored as agricultural land. Little Coxwell's concern is that if this happens it will create a precedent for a new extension of the quarry, most of which is in Little Coxwell, to be so designated in 25 years time. It was explained that the proposal is subject to planning permission and that the subsequent process would determine the suitability of the site for employment, not the Neighbourhood Plan. There were some misconceptions that it could be filled in, but this would be contrary to its SSSI designation.

The Neighbourhood Plan team had consulted with stakeholders on the planning and geological aspects of the site. A meeting was held on 22nd January 2014 regarding the proposed use of Wicklesham Quarry for employment land at which David Periam (OCC Minerals and Waste Team) and Prof. Norman Snelling (Faringdon Fossil Trust) were present. It was reported that: *The meeting paid particular attention to the special attributes of the site, being the geology which was of international importance and the habitats of two colonies of Great Crested Newts. All of these would have to be very carefully protected. An email from Natural England on this subject had been circulated to everyone before the meeting and the special protection requirements were discussed. It was stressed that the employment use of the site wouldn't harm these features and that better vehicular access and a car park would assist geologists wishing to visit the site.*

Norman Snelling advised the meeting of the huge importance of the Faringdon fossil reef and his expert knowledge was gratefully received. It was suggested that this unique feature could form the basis of a museum, either of a general nature or more specifically geological. It was accepted that even if restored as agricultural land it would not be particularly good for farming.

There were also comments regarding the developments in Great Coxwell, contiguous with Faringdon. It was explained at the Little Coxwell meeting that the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate housing sites, and that these sites have been proposed as either strategic sites in the emerging Local Plan 2031, or, as in the case of Fernham Fields, given outline planning permission by the Planning Authority. There was concern that because of the proposed site allocations in Great Coxwell, Faringdon was encroaching on neighbouring parishes, but it was pointed out that this was entirely against the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan and that this extra housing was unwanted and Faringdon Town Council had objected to development on these sites.

Performance space

A local resident mentioned the lack of performance space in Faringdon compared to neighbouring settlements. Comment on this was included in the text, as shown in Appendix CS10, with a suggestion that this could be appraised in the Action Plan.

Statutory Consultees

Most of the comments received from statutory consultees were either outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan and more relevant for the District Council or County Council or had no comment to make, e.g. those from SSE Power, the Marine Management Organisation, the Highways Agency, Natural England, Thames Water, Network Rail, the Coal Authority and the HSE.

The **Environment Agency** made a useful observation regarding Policy 4.13B that campsites were not appropriate for land designated as a category 3b Flood Zone Functional Flood Plain and could only be considered within Flood Zone 3a or 2 if they passed the Sequential Test. As this area is in a Flood Zone 3, it was removed from the policy. It could be considered at a planning application should the need arise.

English Heritage found much to support in the Neighbourhood Plan and made some useful comments, nearly all of which were incorporated in the text or policies as shown in Appendix CS10. Terminology, *Conserving* for *Preserving* was accepted; the Neighbourhood Plan's emphasis on protecting the historic character of Faringdon was welcomed and extra text was added to further strengthen the concept that *development should reflect and express the historic character of*

Faringdon. Policy 4.2C was modified to reflect Policy 4.2B by adding *All development at Faringdon should be carefully planned to respect the special character of the town*.

Text was added to potential retail sites 1, 4 and 5 within the conservation area that *any development or redevelopment on sites 1, 4 and 5 should conserve or enhance the special architectural and historic character of the Conservation Area* and to Policy 4.5C regarding land NW of Gloucester St. car park in the Conservation Area *avoiding harm to the special character and quality of the Faringdon Conservation Area and the significance of other nearby heritage assets and to the amenity of adjoining use* and to the supporting text *bearing in mind the impact of any development on the green aspects of the site and its sensitive heritage location*. Additional wording regarding the limitation of change to the woodland was not added on the advice of the District Council as it was considered that the existing wording gave adequate protection and that these matters would be a condition of any planning conditions.

Further discussions with English Heritage about this site will take place.

Additional text *or historical or architectural significance* was added to Policy 4.5G after *landscape character*.

English Heritage asked for more on the Historic Environment of Faringdon and so two extra paragraphs were added to Section 4.7 regarding the listed buildings and scheduled monuments. The schedule of listed buildings was also updated as part of the Evidence Base Review, Appendix F and the Sustainability Appraisal.

There was support for the emphasis on new developments respecting the scale, proportions and character of the existing historic fabric and for the recognition of the town's historic features and Policy 4.7F.

Text, as shown in Appendix CS10, abjuring riparian development near the Grafton Lock CWS was added under Policy 4.13B.

The Berks, Bucks, Oxon Wildlife Trust welcomed policies 4.5B, 4.5C and 4.10A and extra text supporting NPPF paragraph 109 was added to Section 2 at their request. The two County Wildlife sites referred to, were already mentioned in the Evidence Base Review and Sustainability Appraisal.

The Vale of White Horse District Council acknowledged the effort that had gone into the Neighbourhood Plan and that it had made a positive contribution to planning for the future of Faringdon and set out a number of worthwhile policies. Some useful comments were received to improve the text and policy wording and these were incorporated, as shown in Appendix CS10. A suggestion to add A3 use to A1 use in Policy 4.4A was not recommended by our planning consultant; *there are other implications including that it opens up other change of use benefits that may lead to unforeseen consequences. It may be better to keep it as it is*.

Oxfordshire County Council commented that the policies on transport were supported, but a comment about a traffic survey seems to have ignored the activities of the Western Vale Villages to which Faringdon Town Council had contributed funding towards a traffic survey and to which OCC was also a partner. The comments on improved bus services appeared to run counter to OCC's own Oxfordshire Faringdon Area Transport Strategy, which it had not implemented, and the Neighbourhood Plan objectives. Comments on the 66 Oxford to Swindon service were also counter to local wishes for an improved peak time and evening service; rather than a 20 minute service throughout the rest of the day.

A comment that *Any parking additions will avoid the major bus routes* was added as the town centre is congested and bus drivers find it difficult to manoeuvre around the narrow streets.

The comments on the Faringdon Academy of Schools proposed school sizes were welcomed.

Revised wording regarding Wicklesham Quarry was suggested and accepted, but comments on SUDS drainage and Extra Care Housing were considered to be the responsibility of the District Council; the latter had already been included in the outline plan for the site South of Park Road.

Comments regarding archaeology are covered in the Local Plan 2031 policy 38.

Regarding waste management, a sentence was added to Policy 4.7B that *New developments should provide sufficient space for recycling and composting containers in order to encourage recycling and composting through the District Council schemes or home composting for garden use.*

19. CHANGES MADE FOLLOWING THE 2014 PRE-CONSULTATION

The tables of comments received with responses and actions at different levels of consultation can be seen in Appendices CS6-9.

The changes made to the pre-consultation version of the Neighbourhood Plan are shown in Appendices CS10-11. These are divided into typographic, grammatical and transcription errors, CS10 and changes resulting from the comments received from the consultees, CS11. These changes were approved at the meeting of the Steering Group on 3rd July 2014.

It was decided to remove Figure 3b, showing the proposed housing estates as it was found to be confusing. It had been intended to show the possible new development boundary of Faringdon to complement the existing development boundary shown in Figure 3a. The advice from the District Council was that it did not show the current state of Faringdon and some respondents had mistakenly thought that these sites were being proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. It was decided to use this figure in the Evidence Base Review to show where the proposed developments discussed in the text were located; accordingly, it was attached to the Evidence Base Review as Appendix G.

The changes are listed in Appendices CS10 and 11. A fully marked version of the pre-consultation version of the Neighbourhood Plan can be seen as Appendix CS12.

20. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

English Heritage also raised issues concerning the Sustainability Appraisal. It was recommended to add text to 6.5.1 to support a key message from the NPPF to *conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.* This was accepted.

Text acknowledging that a small part of the adjacent grade II* Registered Historic Park and Garden (Buscot Park) lies within Great Faringdon parish in Eaton Woods was added to 7.5.1. This site had previously been removed because Buscot Park is in Buscot and it not was considered prudent to include assets in neighbouring parishes.

A schedule of Listed Buildings was attached to the Evidence Base Review as Appendix F.

Text was added to state that a Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan will be undertaken as part of the Action Plan to follow the Neighbourhood Plan.

The sustainability objective to *Protect, maintain and enhance Faringdon's cultural heritage resource including its historic environment and archaeological assets* was welcomed.

Paragraphs 14.5.3 and 15.1.3 were welcomed and there was agreement with the comment in paragraph 15.1.4. that *"The FNP should seek to ensure that all development in and adjacent to the Faringdon Conservation Area is carried out in conjunction with, once prepared, the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan"*.

A comment that *The Grade II listed barn and granary should be retained and their setting conserved or enhanced* was added to page 42 and in the Table after paragraph 4.5, the term *Preserve* was changed to *Conserve* as this was English Heritage's preferred terminology.

The schedule of changes is shown in Appendix CS13.

21. CONCLUSION

The Consultation Statement demonstrates that the issues raised by consultees have been considered and the Neighbourhood Plan documents amended accordingly.

P Anderson and M L H Wise
for Faringdon Town Council, July 2014

SECTION 3: PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATIONS MAY/JUNE 2015

22. REASON FOR RESUBMISSION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Following the receipt of the report from the Independent Examiner on 22 October 2014, discussions were held with Vale of White Horse District Council on options for the Neighbourhood Plan regarding the changes recommended by the Independent Examiner. The main concern of a group of local people was the deletion by the Examiner of the section on Green Spaces because of a perceived lack of evidence. Although supportive evidence had been assembled as objection to a planning application for the site adjacent to, but commonly known as, 'Humpty Hill' this evidence had been submitted to the District Council and not to the Steering Group and therefore not included in the Plan. Also, the evidence supporting the other sites was lacking in detail as it had been included in the Plan at a very late stage.

District Council advised that three options that were available for consideration on how to progress the Neighbourhood Plan as follows:

- Option 1: Proceed to referendum with current Examiner's Report;
- Option 2: Reassess the Local Green Space issue and resubmit for examination;
- Option 3: Proceed to referendum with current Examiner's Report and commit to an early partial review of the NDP to re-consider the Local Green Space issue

Although there was a desire to go to referendum, there was considerable local feeling that, as there was evidence regarding the designation of the Humpty Hill site as a green space and its importance as a recreational facility for the town, the Neighbourhood Plan should be resubmitted for re-examination with all the supporting evidence included. The site had been rejected by the District Council for housing development and was subject to a planning appeal by the developer, but the decision had been called in by the Secretary of State, because of the Neighbourhood Plan. It was publicly believed that while the green space issue was extant it would carry weight with the Secretary of State's decision, but if it were omitted and the plan were to proceed to referendum, it would not. Following public response at meetings of the Planning and Highways Committee on 28 October and 18 November 2014 it was decided at the meeting of the Steering Group on 9 December 2014 to accept Option 2 and recommend this to the subsequent meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee. All three options, together with the recommendation from the FNP Steering Group, were considered by the Committee at length and members of the public were also given the opportunity to put their views. It was strongly felt that it was important that all the green spaces in Faringdon, including Humpty Hill, be protected and that there was still an opportunity to do this through re-examination of the Local Green Space issue with the relevant supporting evidence. The Planning and Highways Committee of 9 December accepted this and recommended to the Town Council to resubmit the Neighbourhood Plan including evidence to the support Green Space designations. This was approved at the Faringdon Town Council meeting on 10 December 2014.

Revised documentation was prepared in the period December 2014 to February 2015, but because of the impending national and local elections on May 7, the District Council imposed a "purdah period" from the end of February which delayed the launch of the six week formal pre-submission consultation on the revised Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan until 15 May 2015. The revised documentation included an amended and updated Neighbourhood Plan that incorporated the Independent Examiner's recommendations, a revised section on Green Spaces and an updated timetable together with a revised Basic Conditions Statement and Evidence Base Review to take into account the changes to the Neighbourhood Plan. The Evidence Base Review was also updated regarding changes in local circumstances that had occurred since the examination.

23. CONSULTATION APPROACH

Although the purpose of the resubmission was for the issue of green spaces to be re-examined, the Town Council was advised that the whole of the documentation had to be subject to re-examination. As before, a consultation strategy was developed that aimed to engage with as wide a cross-section of Faringdon's population as possible and to ensure that all local residents and interested parties were

aware of the revised Neighbourhood Plan and how to comment on it. Additionally, all relevant statutory consultees (including adjoining local authorities and parish councils) were contacted.

To meet the statutory requirement the pre-submission consultation commenced on Friday 15 May and closed on Saturday 30 June, giving people six weeks and one day to respond.

The consultation had two main aspects:

a. local residents, stakeholders and groups.

b. consulting the bodies referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (the Statutory Consultees) as advised by the Vale of White Horse District Council.

The comments received, together with responses and actions, are set out in Appendices CS14-22.

24. DETAILS OF LOCAL PUBLICITY FOR THE CONSULTATION

The pre-submission consultation was publicised locally by the following means:

Date	Media	Publicity
March 2015	Faringdon Folly newspaper March edition	Advance information about an impending public consultation
March 2015	Faringdon Town Council Newsletter Spring edition	Advance information about an impending public consultation
End April 2015	Faringdon Town Council Website, local community website & Tourist Information Office	Advance information about the impending public consultation.
27 April 2015	Facebook/Twitter	Advance information about the impending public consultation
May 2015	Faringdon Folly newspaper May edition	Advance information about the impending public consultation.
14 May 2015	Posters and banner	Posters re public consultation process distributed to shops, pubs, cafes, public library. Large banner positioned in town centre and remained in situ for the 6 week consultation period.
15 May 2015	Letter	Letters sent to 18 local landowners
15 May 2015	Email	Details of public consultation sent to a representative of, or agent for, 7 companies with an interest in proposed planning applications for housing in or around Faringdon
15 May 2015	Email	Details of public consultation sent to 13 neighbouring local parish councils
16 May 2015	Public Exhibition	To launch the consultation process, a public exhibition was held in the Jubilee Room of the Pump House from 10am to 1pm, staffed by members of the Steering group.
21 May 2015	Email	Details of public consultation confirmed to 101 people on the Interested Parties list.
1 June 2015	“What’s On” in Faringdon	Advertisement publicising the public consultation.
25 June 2015	Public Meeting	Public meeting in the Old Town Hall 6-8 pm organised by the Chamber of Commerce. To explain the proposals contained in the Plan, and answer questions.

25. PLAN AVAILABILITY

Throughout the consultation period:

- Hard copies of the draft Plan and supporting documents were available for inspection, together with response forms, at the offices of Faringdon Town Council and at the Public Library, both located in Gloucester Street and, following advice from the District Council, copies of the Plan and supporting documents were made available for purchase at the offices of Faringdon Town Council, along with response forms.
- Electronic copies were available on <http://faringdowntowncouncil.gov.uk/council/neighbourhood/> (replacing the previous website) along with supporting documentation and response forms.

26. LOCAL RESIDENTS, STAKEHOLDERS AND GROUPS

As well as utilising local websites, newspapers, posters, email etc to advise local people of the pre-submission consultation process and timetable, and offering meetings to local Parish Councils and landowners, the bodies who were specifically notified of the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan and asked to comment included the following.

All Saints Church	Churches Together in Faringdon
Faringdon Police Station	Faringdon Allotments Society
Sovereign Housing Association	Faringdon Area Project
Faringdon and District Rotary Club	Faringdon Community Bus
Faringdon Collections Trust	Faringdon Day Centre for the Elderly
Faringdon Cricket Club	Faringdon Historical Society
Faringdon Folly newspaper	Faringdon Library
Faringdon Judo Club	Faringdon Tennis Club
Faringdon Pre-School	Faringdon Dramatic Society
Faringdon Rugby Club	Faringdon U3A
Faringdon Town Football Club	FAZE Youth Centre
Faringdon's family and Children's Centre	Faringdon Dental Practice
Faringdon Fire Service	Oxford Geology Trust
Faringdon Health Centre	Pink Pigeons Trust
Faringdon Fossil Trust	Farcycles
Probus	Royal British Legion
National Trust	Tesco
Sudbury House	Wicklesham Lodge
Rogers Concrete	Bloor Homes
Land Agent, Faringdon House Estates	Drivewalk Ltd
Gladman Developments Ltd	Welbeck Strategic Land LLP
SGR (Faringdon) Ltd	Builders Ede
Tetronics (International) Limited	All businesses at Wicklesham Lodge
All members of Faringdon Chamber of Commerce	

27. STATUTORY CONSULTEES

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 identify the bodies that must be consulted. The following bodies, as advised by VWHDC plus additions, were notified of the revised Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan and asked to comment.

Vale of White Horse District Council	Cherwell District Council
Oxford City Council	West Oxfordshire District Council
South Oxfordshire District Council	Cotswold District Council
Oxfordshire County Council	Gloucestershire County Council
Wiltshire County Council	Swindon Borough Council
West Berkshire Council, Planning and Transport Policy	
Longcot Parish Council	Kelmscott Parish Meeting
Grafton and Radcot Parish Meeting	Shellingford Parish Meeting

Little Coxwell Parish Council	Great Coxwell Parish Council
Eaton Hastings Parish Meeting	Littleworth Parish Meeting
Buscot Parish Council	Coleshill Parish Council
Lechlade Town Council	Littleworth Parish Council
Shrivenham Parish Council	Stanford in the Vale Parish Council
Watchfield Parish Council	Oxfordshire County Council Library Services
Environment Agency	Highways Agency
Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution	Thames Water Property Services
Network Rail	Natural England
NHS England Primary Healthcare Oxfordshire Bucks and Berks	
Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (Acute and Community Services)	
Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust	
Swindon Clinical Commissioning Group (Acute and Community Services)	
MONO Consultants Ltd for Mobile Operators Association	
The Coal Authority (Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department)	
Homes and Communities Agency	NHS Property Services
National Grid Plant Protection	Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership
Marine Management Organisation	British Telecom
British Gas	Southern Electric
London Oxford Airport	Wales and West Utilities
English Heritage	Highways Agency
Oxfordshire Local Nature Partnership	Thames Valley Police (Design)
Sport England	Thames Valley Police
BBOWT	Ms Nicola Blackwood MP
Mr Ed Vaizey MP	Health and Safety Executive
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	HSE Chemical Services Division

28. ISSUES RAISED AND ADDRESSED

A total of 39 comments were received during the consultation period: 26 from individuals, one from a parish council, eight from statutory consultees, two from developers, one from a landowner and one from the Faringdon Chamber of Commerce. Of the comments from individuals most of the responses received (20) were as a result of an organised campaign in a neighbouring village against the development of Wicklesham Quarry for employment use, with one comment from the resident of another in village in support. The remaining five were on specific wording changes or on general topics.

These have been listed in tabular form as shown below and as before, the comments were read and the response and action boxes completed, firstly by Dr M L H Wise as chairman of the Steering Group, then circulated to the Steering Group and reviewed by Mr David Potter as VoWHDC Neighbourhood Plan adviser:

HS ref	Name	Section or Policy Number	Support, object or comment	Comments	FTC Response	Actions
--------	------	--------------------------	----------------------------	----------	--------------	---------

Where relevant the Neighbourhood Plan and Evidence Base Review have been annotated to show proposed changes as a result of points made in the consultation, and a list of proposed changes prepared. These were then approved by the Steering Group at a meeting on 10 September 2015 after which the text was revised in preparation for submission to the Vale of White Horse District Council.

Comments from Individuals Appendix CS14

General Comments

Several minor, typographical changes were suggested to improve the wording of policies and supporting text.

A District Councillor made observations on strategic housing sites, employment land and bus schedules. These were incorporated in the text as shown in Appendix CS14.

Other general comments were received from Faringdon residents about parking (referred to the Parking Survey undertaken by GKS Ltd), the Junior School site (not affected), the effect of population growth on the Medical Centre, a complaint about the number of charity shops, a suggestion to amalgamate the emergency services on one site, a request to relocate the car showroom and other workshops to the industrial estate and one to prohibit a public house on a development outside the Neighbourhood Plan boundary (all the above outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan); a detail on car parking availability at supermarkets (addressed in the text); opening access from the A420 into Fernham Road to allow access for school buses (an issue not previously raised, but a matter for OCC as this land is outside the Neighbourhood Plan boundary); a request for a new roundabout on the A420 Coxwell Rd junction and other road issues outside the Neighbourhood Plan boundary (currently being addressed by OCC as part of a new development); also a plea impose a 20 mph speed limit in the town (communicate it to OCC as the responsible body). Interestingly, there were no comments from the general public on the Green Space designation apart from the District Councillor who commented on the legitimacy of allocating sites owned by the District Council - this was considered by our Vale Officer to be within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan and had been discussed with other Vale Officers.

Developer and land use comments Appendices CS15 and 15a

Two developers made comments. The first from Drivewalk were fully in support of the Neighbourhood Plan and particularly Sections 4.6 on Family Housing (policy 4.6A Housing Balance), 4.7 Design, 4.12 Landscape and policy 4.10D Green Spaces.

The second from Gladman Developments was a long and detailed argument specifically against the designation of the site known as Humpty Hill as a green space. The inclusion of this site as a designated green space was the specific wish of many local residents and the major reason for resubmitting the Neighbourhood Plan. Gladman Developments had made a planning application on that site which has been refused by the Secretary of State following appeal, principally on landscape grounds (see Appendix 7, File 7 to the Neighbourhood Plan), and the site is not included in the Local Plan Part 1 as a strategic allocation. The following counter comments were recommended:

- The Independent Examiner's report concerning this site in the FNP is acknowledged.
- The revised plan passes the tests as set out in the NPPF. Evidence to support this policy is included in the appendices to the revised Neighbourhood Plan .
- Clearly there is a disagreement between Gladman and the FNP Steering Group/FTC on how this applies to one site.
- The evidence submitted in the FNP is considered to be sufficiently robust to meet the standards set by the NPPF.
- The evidence also in part submitted to another enquiry (designation of this site as a Village Green) does not negate its validity in the FNP.
- The evidence is appropriate to this plan and it is for the Independent Examiner to determine against the NPPF, not against legislation.

Chamber of Commerce Comments Appendix CS16

The Chamber of Commerce fully supported the Neighbourhood Plan particularly policies 4.4A-E and 4.5B-H.

Specific Comments on Wicklesham Quarry

As before, the allocation of Wicklesham Quarry as employment land attracted most interest and, as before, most of these were from residents of Little Coxwell responding in a co-ordinated campaign.

Comments from Parish Councils Appendix CS17

Little Coxwell Parish Council (the only neighbouring council to comment) objected to the allocation of Wicklesham Quarry as employment land citing the current planning permission to restore it to agricultural land and claiming that there was sufficient employment land to meet Faringdon's needs. However this claim referred to the VoWHDC 2009 Preferred Options document, which has been succeeded by the Local Plan 2031 Part 1. In fact the inadequacies of the 2009 Preferred Options

document regarding the lack of employment land to meet Faringdon's needs, had been the stimulus for Faringdon Town Council to undertake the 'Our Faringdon Our Future' report in 2010 to inform the 2011 Local Plan. Employment land needs for the future population has consistently been underestimated leaving Faringdon facing a future as a permanent dormitory town as shown in the Evidence Base Review. The employment land allocation in the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 was also cited but, as pointed out in the Evidence Base Review, the URS employment land survey that informed the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 contains errors and was written before the Oxfordshire SHMA increased the allocation of houses in the Vale of White Horse and, consequently, Faringdon. The objection also stated that land to the south of the A420 is open countryside: this is not so; Wicklesham Farm is a thriving employment site. The aim of the Neighbourhood Plan has been to provide sufficient employment land to meet the future population of Faringdon.

In passing it is worth noting that the 4.2 ha 4&20 site now has outline planning permission for A1/A5 retail that will employ ~120 people with the only prospective B2 use on the rest of the site so far employing a further 11.

Comments from Individuals CS14 and 14a

Comments objecting to the quarry's allocation as employment land were received from nineteen residents of Little Coxwell and one from Great Coxwell, many of whom had responded similarly to the pre-consultation in 2014.

The main arguments put forward were that the potential change to the current planning permission (which requires restoration to agricultural land) was unnecessary as sufficient employment land had already been allocated to meet Faringdon's needs. It was repeatedly quoted that the previous employment land surveys (often referred to as 'independent') and the Local Plan Part 1 had ruled out Wicklesham Quarry as employment land. In fact Wicklesham Quarry was only mentioned in the URS 2013 survey, which did not rule it out, but acknowledged the cost of remediation. Again the outdated Preferred Options 2009 was referred to as evidence.

There were also co-ordinated claims about the failure of previous consultations to publish documents of which we have no evidence and of inadequacy of the Basic Conditions Statement, which passed examination.

New criticisms to support the objections were based of the estimate of potential jobs required by Faringdon residents in the Evidence Base Review. These figures were re-examined using the 2011 census data and showed that 49.9% of the total population of Faringdon were in full or part time employment (consistent with rest of the Vale). The original aspiration of the Chamber of Commerce and the Employment Sub-Group had been to secure employment land to meet the needs of at least 27% of the working age population (to maintain the claimed status quo as a dormitory town) with an aspiration to achieve 38% or even 44% of this figure in local employment. The working age (cf. the working) population (16-74) from the 2011 census was 71.6% of the population, of whom only 75.6% were economically active and 92.2% of these in employment (hence, the figure of 49.9% of the population in employment).

Taking the working age population rather than the number in employment could have inflated the jobs need, and the Evidence Base has been amended to explain this. Nevertheless, the Evidence Base also shows that the number of residents employed locally is probably much smaller than the 27% assumed, but even taking the minimum estimate on residents locally employed indicates a significant requirement for more employment land than is allocated in the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and justifies including the additional sites allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Unfortunately, there are no definitive figures on local employment and these can only be estimates; however, the potentially low density of jobs on the 4&20 site and the reduced area available for development of the Rogers Concrete site would suggest that these are not going to meet the needs of a further increase in population to ~11,000 and that the Neighbourhood Plan's allocation of more employment land than the Local Plan is prudent to meet the town's future needs.

Other objectors tried to make the case that increasing employment land would encourage people to commute in and overload the road network or argue that there were available sites near the centre of

the town, which this is not the case. The lack of a transport plan was also often mentioned, but this an issue to be considered as part of a planning application

None of these objectors appears to recognise that the acceptability of any future use of the land will be determined through the planning application process: the policy sets out the Neighbourhood Plan's proposal but it does not, of itself, grant planning permission. Principally, it aims to give protection to the site should it be developed and enable access to the SSSI by interested parties.

One resident of Eaton Hastings was fully in support of the allocation of Wicklesham Quarry as employment land to reduce out commuting and acknowledging the protection that was to be afforded to the SSSI.

Comments from a Landowner CS18

Comments were also received from the owner of Wicklesham Quarry who pointed out that following restoration to agricultural land it would take a long time before it became productive and that, despite comments made by objectors regarding rare plants, there were none in the quarry. The colony of Great Crested Newts, he believed, had probably fallen in to a settling pond excavated by the quarry operators; these would be protected as would the SSSI in any future use.

Comments from Statutory Consultees Appendix CS19

Eight comments were received from statutory consultees.

The Marine Management Organisation, Highways England had no comments to make.

Historic England was very positive in its comments. It supported Sections 2, 3 and 4 in emphasising the historic character of the town and in identifying the conservation of historic buildings; in particular Policy 4.2A, section 4.3 on '*streets for all*' and section 4.4 on conserving the Conservation Area. The rewording of policies 4.5C, D and G, as recommended in the previous consultation, was welcomed as was the more detailed description of the parish's historic environment in section 4.7; here, policies 4.7A and E were welcomed and supported. Sections 4.12 and 4.13 with respective references to '*any new development must take into account Faringdon's historic relationship with its landform and landscape*' and '*the historic character of the town must be conserved and enhanced to give the very best impression to attract visitors*' were also welcomed and supported.

Thames Water supported section 4.8 and policy 4.8A regarding the utilities infrastructure and the reference to the sewage treatment works in the Evidence Base Review.

Scottish and Southern Energy made comments that were more relevant to planning issues on electricity supply and not specifically to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Natural England had reviewed the allocation of green space and had had no concerns; it had no further comments to add to those made previously.

Sport England's comments were not specific to the Neighbourhood Plan, but more directed to ensuring conformance with the NPPF, preventing the loss of sports facilities to redevelopment and enhancing existing facilities.

Oxfordshire County Council noted the new section 4.10 on green spaces but did not want to add any other comments to those made in the previous consultation (these were incorporated into the amended text). It did, however, note that it had published '*Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015 - 2031*' (LTP4) for consultation and intended to finalise it later in 2015 including a new strategy for the A420 corridor, recommending that text under 4.3 could be updated to refer to this. The A420 is discussed in the Evidence Base Review and it was considered that this comment would be more appropriately placed on page 58 of the Evidence Base.

A comment was made on Wicklesham Quarry, but this was only to revise the dates regarding permissions for ceasing work and restoration. The two, two-form entry primary school and one, eight-form entry secondary school were still considered by OCC to be adequate for Faringdon's future educational needs, as reported in section 4.9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

29. CHANGES MADE FOLLOWING THE 2014 EXAMINATION VERSION

The changes to the Neighbourhood Plan recommended by the Independent Examiner are shown in Appendix CS20. Also, some items were transferred to a non-statutory appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan, as recommended. Subsequent changes to the 2015 pre-consultation version are shown as the non-highlighted sections of Appendix CS21. Apart from the major change to Section 4.10, regarding the designation of green spaces, these are mainly updates to take into account changes in timetabling and local circumstances.

30. CHANGES MADE FOLLOWING THE 2015 PRE-CONSULTATION

The changes to the Neighbourhood Plan following the 2015 pre-consultation are shown highlighted in yellow in Appendix CS21. Similarly, the changes to the Evidence Base Review, shown highlighted in Appendix CS22, are mainly updating plus clarification on employment statistics.

31. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

No comments were received on the Sustainability Appraisal.

32. THE BASIC CONDITIONS STATEMENT AND EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Both of these were updated to reflect the changes in policy numbering as a result of the deletion of certain policies recommended in the Independent Examiner's report.

33. CONCLUSION

The Consultation Statement demonstrates that the issues raised by consultees have been considered and the Neighbourhood Plan documents amended accordingly.

M L H Wise
for Faringdon Town Council, September 2015