

RESPONSES TO VALE OF WHITE HORSE UFFING/BAULKING NP RESPONSE

Please see right hand column for our responses.

| Ref. | Section/Policy | VWHDC Comment/ Recommendation | Uffington/Baulking Response |
|------|--|---|--|
| 1. | <i>Page iii bullet point 3 of second list and Page iv middle sentence of first paragraph</i> | There are opposing statements in the identified sections stating that the Landscape Capacity Study covers 'most of the Plan area' and 'all of the designated plan area'. It would be useful to clarify whether it covers most, or all of the area, and for the statements to be made consistent. | Agree the reference which states 'most of' should be amended to 'all of the plan area' to be consistent. |
| 2. | <i>Page iv third paragraph and Page 10 section 2.11</i> | These paragraphs advise that VWHDC determined that an SEA and HRA was not required as the plan was non-allocating. However the SEA and HRA regulations must still be followed. It is important to note that both SEA and HRA screening decisions were published by VWHDC and it may be useful to amend these paragraphs to clarify that the SEA and HRA screening process screened out the Uffington and Baulking Neighbourhood Plan from having to do further SEA or HRA assessment. | Agree should be reworded as advised. |
| 3. | <i>Page iv fourth paragraph</i> | Suggested wording change to correct spelling error: 'to ensure that the full range of Plan objectives is are addressed' | Stet; grammatically correct (one range - is) |

| Ref. | Section/Policy | VWHDC Comment/ Recommendation | Uffington/Baulking Response |
|------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 4. | <i>Page 2 fourth paragraph</i> | Suggested wording change to correct spelling error: 'was submitted for examination by the inspector Inspector ' | Typo to be corrected in final version if possible. |
| 5. | <i>Policy H1</i> | The discussion regarding mix of housing is welcomed, although as written it may allow any development which provides a mix of dwellings. It is important to include a caveat which states that this support is subject to the application meeting the other aspects of the plan as well. | We debated whether to state that ALL policies (along with other material conditions) are used to assess planning applications – and decided not to. Agree that a generic statement to this effect should be added, possibly at the end of Section 2. |
| 6. | <i>Policy H3</i> | <p>This policy has not changed since the regulation 14 consultation. There is still uncertainty whether this policy is in conflict with the strategic policies contained in the Development Plan (in particular Core Policies 3 and 4 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1). Core Policies 3 and 4 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 identify Baulking as open countryside and advise “Development in open countryside will not be appropriate unless specifically supported by other relevant policies as set out in the Development Plan or national policy”.</p> <p>Baulking is referred to as a settlement within supporting text of the neighbourhood plan and Housing Policies H2 and H3 and there is reference to housing development being permitted at Baulking. Although the Council recognises the work the Group has undertaken to draft the policies, as currently</p> | <p>Wider issue – see replies to Examiner</p> <p>The question of uncertainty as to conflict has not been addressed since the Regulation 14 consultation. The decision is not ours to make, or that of the Vale, but the Inspector of the UBNP, as was made quite clear by the Inspector of the LPPt.2, Mr Reed (when he heard our submission at the Public Hearing) based upon the facts and justification evidence available for Policy H3.</p> <p>We used this term to refer to the collection of buildings (including the church) and community that make up Baulking parish. The status defined in the settlement hierarchy is ‘open countryside’ which does not accurately reflect the true nature of the ‘settlement’.</p> |

| Ref. | Section/Policy | VWHDC Comment/ Recommendation | Uffington/Baulking Response |
|------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>worded there is concern that the policies are not clear and could allow unchecked development at an unsustainable location. It is recommended that further information regarding what is acceptable is incorporated within the policy (for example, is it only promoting infill, or are larger schemes also promoted?) Further clarity is needed to ensure that the policies are not in conflict with the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council notes the Group have produced a 'Baulking Housing Policy Evidence' to support the policies. However, evidence could be included within the explanatory text to provide further support.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could whatever we say be in conflict, or indeed not in conflict, with the Local Plan, when as yet, there has been no agreement over the proposed H3 policy? • If the guideline is for infill and/or 'adjacent to' existing buildings or clusters of buildings then this can be added to H3 as the Inspector wishes. • We felt that adding to the text prior to finalising the H3 policy would confuse the issue, as the basic principle of the policy has not yet been agreed. Once agreed, a condensed version of the policy supporting document can be included in the main text. |
| 7. | <i>Page 35 footnote 36 and Policy H4A</i> | <p>The footnote suggests examples of non-listed buildings which form part of the sense of place and local identity and make up the 'other local features' discussed in Policy H4A. The policy states that view of these 'other local features' should be maintained as part of any housing development, however not all non-listed buildings are identified. It is suggested that for the sake of clarity the Plan should either list all of the buildings this policy/footnote intends to protect or show them on a map.</p> | <p>We could do this if deemed essential by the Inspector but we have not because it would be a time-consuming exercise and would not apply to the majority of such features in the village(s) although showing those on Footnote 36 would be straightforward. This is because it will only apply to the specific, limited number of, sites which we expect to come forward as infill.</p> <p>We would expect any application to identify such features and cover such considerations in the Design and Access Statement and/or Historic Environment Assessment.</p> |

| Ref. | Section/Policy | VWHDC Comment/ Recommendation | Uffington/Baulking Response |
|------|--|--|--|
| 8. | <i>Page 58 list of reference documents</i> | This is a useful list and it is noted that some of the documents have been submitted and are available to view. However not all of the documents have been submitted and are not on the neighbourhood plans website. To ensure that the full evidence base is available it is suggested that the missing documents (Community Led Plan, An investigation into the origins and character' and Uffington Historic Flooding Information) are uploaded onto the neighbourhood plans website so they are easily accessible. | All reference documents listed are available on the website. See https://www.ubwnp.net/public-consultation/submission-version/ |