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Consultation Statement

1. Introduction

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

• details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
• how they were consulted;
• the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
• how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

2. Community Planning Refresh

In 2012 the Parish Council conducted an internal review of the 2005 Parish Plan which had been highlighted in the Dorchester News and distributed to all 500 households in the village at the time. Various issues were still being progressed by the parish council, but wider development issues were also being raised, and the council looked into the possibility of producing an updated village plan. The Parish Council commissioned Oxfordshire Rural Community Council (now called Community First Oxfordshire) to undertake an Affordable Housing Needs Survey in September, ready to report at a public meeting the following month (Appendix 1).

Initial Public Consultation

A public meeting on 20th October 2012 was facilitated by Anton Nath from ORCC and was advertised via ORCC leaflets inserted in the parish magazine (Dorchester News) and A4 posters throughout the village.

80 attendees were introduced to the concept of Neighbourhood Planning and invited to participate in an interactive questionnaire by sticking post-it notes on “Issue” boards which arose from the old Parish Plan and the subsequent work by the parish council. These were then carefully collated and summarised (Appendix 2). The results indicated housing (affordability, size and location) and the environment (rural and built) to be the main issues, plus many other items that were being addressed, first by the Parish Plan, and subsequently by the Parish Council.

Attendees (and afterwards the wider village) were asked to volunteer and a new project Steering Committee was formed, with their first meeting on 12th December 2012.

The Committee comprised 14 members, 7 of whom were from the parish council. As village planning had changed since the old Parish Plan, there was a choice between a Community Led Plan (CLP) and Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). In view of the different areas of focus, it was decided to initiate both a CLP and a NDP, with the steering committee split into two, with the NDP committee being chaired by Councillor Mark Stevenson.

A community engagement strategy set out the main communication activities that would be undertaken during the preparation of the Plan, and the stakeholders that should be addressed, including:

• residents;
• businesses;
• developers;
• local government; and
• community groups.
3. NDP Launch

In the light of the NDP having legal status which the CLP did not, it was eventually recognised that it would be impracticable to move both projects along at the same time, that priority should be given to the NDP and that effectively work on CLP be formally deferred with a number of the projects being progressed individually. It was decided to formally apply to South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) to register a NDP. This update was discussed at a public meeting on 15th May 2013, prior to the Parish Council Annual Parish Meeting.

On 7th June 2013 SODC gave approval to the neighbourhood area being defined as the whole parish of Dorchester-on-Thames per the designated map below.

4. Public Consultation

First Draft
Useful feedback came from a public meeting held on 31st January 2015 which opened with a poster display and a PowerPoint presentation of the plan including draft policies for each subject area. The feedback was drawn together in detail and summary form to provide the basis for careful review and further modifications to the Plan. Appendix 3 contains the responses at the meeting and Appendix 4 contains comments from those unable to attend but who reviewed the policies at a later date.
Demesne Field
Dorchester on Thames is washed over by the green belt, but a public meeting was called on 14th January 2016 to discuss the potential implications of a green belt review by SODC which included a recommendation to remove the 35 acre Demesne field from the green belt.

99% of attendees were against the suggestion that it should be removed from the Green belt so the committee moved on towards obtaining formal approval of the Plan as quickly as possible.

Dorchester News
In order to involve as much of the community as possible throughout all stages of the Plan development, a programme of continuous communication of progress was put in place.

Dorchester News is a free publication delivered to all households in the village ten times a year. It has carried regular updates, both by short summaries of progress and by way of a reserved special green high profile page reporting decisions and key policy issues in between the village meetings.

Committee Meetings
Committee meetings occurred regularly, with progress (or otherwise!) reported back to parish council meetings each time.

NDP members have attended some invaluable formal presentations:

- CPRE (Didcot) - ‘Neighbourhood plans – Getting started workshop;
- 11.12.13, Eland House, London, Department for Communities and Local Government (well attended by NDP groups from all over The country);
- 23.04.2013 Brookes University workshop on Neighbourhood Planning

These have all offered sensible guidance (e.g. be brief, be positive, keep the local community fully informed, interact with District Council staff) and provided good opportunities for networking.

SODC has maintained a close interest as the draft Plan has evolved, attending many of the committee meetings and providing suggestions for improved content and presentation, with particular regard to conformation with existing National and Local plans. NDP members’ personal networks have provided information from other villages (e.g. Great Coxwell, Woodcote) and specialist bodies (e.g. Dorchester’s Hurst Water Meadow Trust, Earth Trust, Environment Agency, Historic England etc.).

Village Website
The website has carried updates and draft versions of the plan, together with consultation notices at: www.dorchester-on-thames.co.uk/information/neighbourhood-planning/

5. Statutory Consultation
Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation 2016
The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group finalised the Draft NDP in March 2016 and the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation ran for a six-week period from 30th March 2016 to 11th May 2016.

The consultation was promoted through the village website, notices in the Dorchester News and posters on the village notice boards.

Copies of the plan were made available on the village website at:
https://www.dorchester-on-thames.co.uk/information/neighbourhood-planning/ and at the parish clerk’s office in the High Street.

Copies were emailed to the following statutory bodies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxfordshire County Council</th>
<th><a href="mailto:planning@oxfordshire.gov.uk">planning@oxfordshire.gov.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Oxfordshire District Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk">planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berinsfield Parish Council (adjacent parish)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:berinsfieldpc@aol.com">berinsfieldpc@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warborough Parish Council (adjacent parish)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clerk.warborough@btconnect.com">clerk.warborough@btconnect.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council (adjacent parish)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bcsparishcouncil@gmail.com">bcsparishcouncil@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Wittenham Parish Council (adjacent parish)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:littlewttchair@gmail.com">littlewttchair@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Wittenham Parish Council (adjacent parish)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.longwittenham.com">www.longwittenham.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Hampden Parish Council (adjacent parish)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne@greystone.demon.co.uk">anne@greystone.demon.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Homes and Communities Agency</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk">mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk">consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Environment Agency</td>
<td><a href="mailto:enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk">enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:southeast@historicengland.org.uk">southeast@historicengland.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@highwaysengland.co.uk">info@highwaysengland.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soha Housing</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SLynch@SOHA.CO.UK">SLynch@SOHA.CO.UK</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td><a href="mailto:developer.services@thameswater.co.uk">developer.services@thameswater.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Very little feedback was received, other than from SODC (Appendix 5). SODC’s comments led to a lengthy period of discussion over the issue of nominating potential development sites in a village that was entirely in the Green Belt.

Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation 2017
It was eventually decided to remove nominated sites from the plan. The committee felt that this was such a significant change that it was appropriate to re-run the Pre-Submission Consultation, which ran for a six-week period from 27th March 2017 to 8th May 2017 using the same communication methods as in 2016 and to the same statutory consultees.

Feedback was received from some members of the public, from statutory bodies and from a local pressure group formed in response to footpath and access issues on Bishops Court Farm that first arose in November 2016.

This feedback was carefully reviewed and the draft plan modified as appropriate. Individual comments, and the changes to the plan - if any - that were made as a result of comments from residents, employers and consultation bodies, are contained in Appendices 6 & 7.

Extensive detailed feedback was received from SODC covering:
• structure of the Plan documentation;
• drafting;
• legality, practicality and reasonableness of the proposed Policies;
• consistency with the Adopted Local Plan; and
• points of detail.

The issues were addressed by redrafting of the Plan documentation, redrafting (and in one case, deletion) of Policies, and provision of additional detail in the Plan and its supporting documents. SODC feedback is Appendix 8.

6. Issues Raised

The dominant issues identified in the 2012 public meeting were parking, broadband, affordable housing and concern around preserving the local environment.

The Parish Council expected that the provision of affordable housing would be raised, as it had been an issue for some time. As already mentioned, the Council had commissioned a housing needs survey to try and quantify need and assess the level of support (Appendix 1) and presented findings at the meeting.

The survey had 263 responses and highlighted the high proportion of owner-occupied 3 and 4+ bedroom houses. 76% of respondents supported small-scale development of affordable properties, but the issue of local allocation was raised as a requirement.

Only 12 respondents indicated a housing need, and only 2 were on the SODC housing list. While some felt that this effectively killed off the subject, others felt that the stock of smaller properties would only get smaller as extensions to older smaller properties became more commonplace. The lack of affordable housing would only get worse and needed addressing.

Discussion started around the definition of “affordable”. The National Planning Policy Framework definition is “Affordable housing is social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market.” However, some respondents felt that the provision of “relatively affordable” 1 and 2 bedroom properties on small developments would help meet village needs, so it became important to differentiate between the legal and the colloquial use of the term.

The Housing Survey suggested some sites as suitable for future development, and these were later assessed by SODC and fed into the draft NDP presented for consultation in 2016.

Built and Natural Environment
Dorchester has an extensive history, is quite picturesque, and has been used as locations in various TV episodes and films. The centre of the village is a conservation area. There was a general feeling for the need to conserve and preserve the character of the village.

How Issues Were Taken Into Account – First Draft

Many issues raised in 2012 did not materialise in the 2015 draft policies. There were various reasons for this: events overtaking the issue, for example the creation of the Better Broadband for Oxfordshire initiative, which planned to deliver fibre broadband to the village by late 2015; issues falling outside the remit of a NDP; for example the withdrawal of the post office; issues being addressed separately by the parish council, for example threat to bus routes in the village. The public briefing in May 2013 marked the official start of the NDP process.

Issues raised at the 2012 public meeting that were appropriate for a NDP were directly fed into draft policies that would not just preserve the character of the village but would also lay guidelines for future growth and change.

Draft policies were then tested at the public meeting in January 2015 and amendments made where there was strong consensus.
Built Environment
The 2012 meeting showed that preserving the historic nature of the village and the conservation area was important to residents and the draft policies reflected this, and scored very high levels of approval.

Natural Environment
The 2012 meeting also generated many comments about the green spaces and the walks down to the river Thames, and policies were developed to reflect this and the general need to retain the nature reserves and even expand wooded areas. At the 2015 meeting, these policies all scored over 90% approval.

Housing
The definition of affordable housing again arose, and there was also some feeling against social housing development, with some respondents feeling that there was ample social housing in neighbouring Berinsfield that was close enough to resolve the issue. However, 61% of respondents at the meeting supported a high level of affordable housing allocation on new developments.

Housing policies that supported the character of the village scored much higher, although there was some resistance to the provision of 1 or 2 bed properties. The steering committee was reminded that there was a need for 3 and 4 bed affordable properties as well as the 1 and 2 bed.

Economy
Policies supporting the local businesses and tourism scored very highly. While there was focus on the high street, it was felt necessary to remind villagers that there are three working farms in the parish, as well as light industrial units across the by-pass at Queenford Farm.

Tourism & Leisure
Again, policies supporting tourism and leisure were well supported, recognising the positive impact of the Abbey. Mitigation of parking was again raised.

How Issues Were Taken Into Account – Subsequent Drafts
The period from the public meeting in January 2015 to the regulation 14 consultation in spring 2016 was taken up in redrafting policies to reflect public comments but also in response to guidance from SODC.

Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation 2016
The key impact of this consultation exercise was the incorporation of more detailed suggestions from SODC.

The issue of trying to be pro-active in guiding development in a parish washed over by the Green Belt resulted in a decision to remove from the NDP details of four sites that might be suitable for small-scale development and the notes on three further sites examined and rejected by the committee.

Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation 2017
The removal of suggested sites was felt to be a significant change, warranting a new period of formal consultation. Responses were received from statutory bodies and the public.

Detailed suggestions were made by SODC. Almost all were adopted as suggested, and some further amendments were made based on other feedback.

7. Conclusion
This Consultation Statement and the supporting documents in the Appendix to this Statement are considered to comply with Section 15(2) of part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.
Appendix 1:
2012 Public Meeting Responses
BUSINESS & ECONOMY

Communications a major issue—New section ‘IT & Communications’

Support local businesses eg (P.O. - Co-Op - Krusco) more
Keep Post Office
Co-Op
Keep our Post Office please
The Co-Op

WISH LIST

[Continued support for local Post Office
Could do with a Post Box near Herringcote
Shop and Post Office—preserve]

We want much BETTER BROADBAND
Increase Broadband speeds
Fast Broadband
Fast Broadband
Faster Broadband
Better mobile signal but without towers
Compulsorily purchase space/land/building for businesses
[More discussion at Parish Council. Less formality & adherence to the minutes
Parish Councils Meetings—Suggest wine & cheese to help attendance]
COMMUNITY BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

- Just the right facilities for small village
- Drama group
- Abbey
- The Abbey—not just as place of worship, but heritage and venue
- Multi-use Abbey
- Mobile library service
- Historic central area/Abbey
- Playground
- See also: Recreation & Leisure
- Sports facilities
- Tennis courts
- Allotments
- The allotments
- Lily's
- Lily's
- Lil's
- Pubs and restaurants
- Pubs
- Village shop
- Keeping a Post Office
- Post Office
- Shop and Post Office
- Keep Post Office
- Shops, Co-op and PO
- Co-op
- The Co-op
- Co-op
- Only one shop—Co-op
- Opening times of local shops
- Village Hall
- Village Hall
- Village Hall
- Village Hall
- Village Hall
- Abbey Guest House
- Community spirit

CRIME AND SAFETY

- Low crime area
- Low crime area
- Safe feeling
- Minor crime
- Neighbourhood Watch
- Neighbourhood Watch

WISH LIST

- Bus service through the High Street
- See also: Roads, Traffic & Transport
- Lack of litter bins
- Bin collections Green (recycling) should be every week
- See also: Environment
- Litter campaign
- See also: Environment

(involve new volunteer teams—become parish council sub committee)
EDUCATION

School
Local school and pre-school
Like local school and pre-school
Pre-school
Primary school

See also: [Groups and Societies]

ENVIRONMENT

Attractive village core
Beautiful place to live
Walks / River
Plenty of good walks nearby
Hurst Meadow
Hurst Meadow
Hurst
Countryside and access
Countryside
Maintain green areas around village
The Bypass

[Relative lack of crime or anti-social behaviour]
See also: Crime & Safety
Clean and maintained
No expansion of parish boundary
Size
Green spaces all around village
Historic buildings and countryside
Community spirit
No litter, thanks

Weeds & untended grass verges & paths
Litter on all country lanes, pathways (campaign)
Loss of river energy at Overy
Overy Mill preservation
More bins for doggie poos
Dog mess
Access to lakes

[Car parking in High Street]
Parking
Street Parking

Hurst Meadow
Countryside and access
Countryside
Maintain green areas around village
The Bypass

See also: IT & Communications

WISH LIST

[Groups and Societies] See also: Community

WISH LIST

River: flood control and navigation
[Issues: New build houses must adhere to present feeling of the village]
See also: Housing
Buildings: Light control of ???????????]
Schedule regular (6/year?) meetings with ORCC
At least 22 houses in Abingdon Road DO NOT have mains drainage
Yet less gravel on the footpath along Dorchester cemetery—especially the upper (end half) towards the Rec

[Double parking need restriction]
See also: Roads, Traffic & Transport

CAR PARKING—double yellow lines needed AND POLICED! – even by Traffic Wardens
Double yellow lines between the COOP and the Thame Bridge on one side of the road
Please can we push for double yellow lines in the High Street on one side. The excuse for police not
monitor it is rubbish

We have lived here for 46 yrs & love the village but the parking has ruined this village. I am now an
old lady and find that moving around is a problem!!! Buses have a great problem getting down the
High Street & soon they will cease to come through. This is a major PROBLEM. More help for the el-
derly please.
HEALTH AND WELFARE

Pill run
‘Pill Run’ Service to local health centre
Health facilities locally very good
Care for aged hoping to stay in their homes

No Doctor
Health care for elderly

WISH LIST

Help the Aged
Help the elderly

[Development of residential facilities for the elderly with care so they may stay in village]
See also: Housing

[Housing for many]
Affordable housing
Affordable housing in Abingdon Road
Affordable housing this decade
Affordable housing for young families
Affordable housing
Affordable housing
Affordable housing
Survey of available site for housing
NIMBY
More young families

Affordable housing
Yes with good design
Affordable housing
Affordable housing
General architecture of High Street
Limit on size of house conversions
Very limited housing development
Lovely old buildings

WISH LIST

Affordable housing for village children
Housing for many
New houses
Affordable housing in Abingdon Road
Affordable housing this decade
Affordable housing for young families
Affordable housing
Affordable housing
Affordable housing
Survey of available site for housing
NIMBY
More young families

[Personal request:
More lowered kerbs for prams, pushchairs and powered chairs. Getting over anything over 11/2 inches (with no '?????' in front) has cost me several hundred pounds in repairs to my electric chair]

Threat of extra housing without necessary facilities and backup
Don’t implement current central government planning proposals on extensions etc
No housing on greenfield sites
Participate in some form of affordable housing scheme for younger residents
Affordable housing need more
Shortage of affordable housing
Diversity of population
Plans for extra retirement homes
Condition of homes in some parts
Energy efficient housing
Affordable housing for the young

See also : Roads, Traffic & Transport
RECREATION & LEISURE

Abbey community and concerts
Availing of allotments
Allotments community
[Village hall
Service behind the village hall bar]
See also : Community Buildings & Facilities
Recreation ground
Rec
Rec
Co-op
Tennis club
Cricket club
Ability to participate in many activities
[Well marked & well maintained footpaths
Countryside
Nice walks around village
Open access to fields & Dyke Hills
Hurst
The Hurst
See also : Environment
Noisy water sports

Warm outdoor swimming pool—by Tim and Sam Waller age 8

WISH LIST

ROADS, TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT

Use Marshalls to direct traffic to car parks during events at the Abbey
Encourage/expand use of Bridge Meadow car park
Parking for visitors of Dorchester need more space
Visitor parking
Street parking
Parking
Parking during EVENTS Not normally a prob
Car parking areas
Visitor parking
Visitor parking
Visitor parking
Consider traffic calming measures for High Street
FOR VILLAGE PLAN Install 20 IS PLenty speed signs
Congestion on High Street
Traffic speed & volume
Speed limit through High Street
Speed in High Street
Abingdon Road speeding >60mph
Poor street lighting outskirts of village
Parking in Queen St. at beginning & end of school day.
An accident waiting to happen
Remove access to A4074 from road to Berinsfield
Consider traffic calming measures for High Street

[Village hall
Service behind the village hall bar]
See also : Community Buildings & Facilities

Use Marshalls to direct traffic to car parks during
events at the Abbey
Encourage/expand use of Bridge Meadow car park
Parking for visitors of Dorchester need more space
Visitor parking
See also : Community Buildings

Warm outdoor swimming pool—by Tim and Sam Waller age 8

WISH LIST

Roads, Traffic & Transport

Speed limit in Queen Street
Buses on Bypass
Safety issues

Death waiting
Put pavement on south side of Abingdon Road adjacent
to Bells garage
Watling Lane road surface
Watling Lane road surface
Surface of Watling Lane
General untidiness of verges footpaths & bridge approach
Narrow footpaths Abingdon Road (mother & child
nearby knocked over on 18 Oct 12)

Speed in High Street
Abingdon Road speeding >60mph
Poor street lighting outskirts of village
Parking in Queen St. at beginning & end of school day.
An accident waiting to happen
Remove access to A4074 from road to Berinsfield
Separate signed pathway which ends on A4074.

See also : Environment
[Conservation area
Foot paths and their signage]
See also : Environment

WISH LIST

Bus service through village ? X39/40 through village
as X40 through Woodcote
Transport through village
Some X39 buses to pass through village
INClude In PLAN Score map of condition of
Dorchester roads
Access to & from X39 stop on the bypass
Parking
Parking in High Street needs resolving
### MAJOR ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Hall</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. DORCHESTER PARISH PROFILE

Population and Place
- The Parish of Dorchester is in South Oxfordshire District, just under 10 miles south east of Oxford, four miles north west of Wallingford and approximately 6½ miles east of Abingdon.
- According to the 2001 census, Dorchester has a total population of 992 comprising 450 households.

Churches
- St Birinus Catholic Church
- Abbey Church of St Peter and St Paul (Dorchester Abbey)

Social Life
- There are three pubs/hotels/restaurants; The George Hotel, White Hart Hotel and The Fleur de Lys Inn.
- www.dorchester-on-thames.co.uk provides information about village activities and events.

Schools
- There is a pre-school in purpose built premises in the grounds of the primary school.
- This is a much smaller than the average-sized primary school. Most pupils are of White British heritage, with a few coming from other backgrounds. The proportion of pupils known to be eligible for free school meals is low. The school also has a low proportion of pupils with disabilities and special educational needs.
- School children in Dorchester are in the catchment area for Fitzharrys, John Mason and Larmkend secondary schools in Abingdon.

Services
- There are a number of shops including a post office in Dorchester.
- There is a Doctors and Dentist surgery in nearby Berinsfield.
- A Mobile Library van stops at the war memorial every other Thursday from 10.40 to 11.15am.

Transport
- The Thames Travel bus (no 114) runs through Dorchester from Wallingford to Abingdon 4-7 times daily from Mon-Sat.
- There is a Dorchester Surgery Car Scheme operating at 9.30am on Wednesdays taking patients from their homes to Berinsfield Health Centre.

Access to Services
NOTE: this information is taken from ‘Dorchester Parish Profile’, in Evidencing Rural Need, Action for Communities in Rural England (ACRE), 2012. This project was commissioned by ACRE on behalf of the Rural Community Action Network to strengthen the evidence base on rural need across England. The full Dorchester report can be requested from the RHE.

Road Distance to Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Oxfordshire</th>
<th>Dorchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Office (km)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public House (km)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP (km)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School (km)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Centre (km)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 21. Road distance to services (2010)

Car Ownership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cars</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Oxfordshire</th>
<th>Dorchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No cars</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One car</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two cars</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three cars</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four+ cars</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 18. Car ownership (2001)
2. OXFORDSHIRE RURAL COMMUNITY COUNCIL

The ORCC aims to improve the quality of life for those who live or work in rural Oxfordshire. It supports programmes that are influenced by the needs of rural communities. The Rural Housing Enabler (RHE) promotes and assists Parish Councils and community groups to facilitate Housing Need Surveys in order to assess local needs for affordable housing.

- The RHE is employed by ORCC, part of the national network of Rural Community Councils.
- The RHE is a member of the Oxfordshire Rural Housing Partnership, which works closely with rural communities to meet their affordable housing needs.

3. AIM

The aim of the September 2012 Housing Needs Survey was to assess the affordable housing need for local people (or those who need to live in the parish or the locality) in Dorchester, and to gauge local opinion about a small development of affordable housing.

- Affordable housing is, in essence, for those who would be unable to rent or buy on the open market, or have significant financial difficulties in doing so.
- Housing need can be defined as the need for an individual or household to obtain housing which is suitable to their circumstances.
- Housing need implies that there are problems or limitations with the household's current housing arrangements and/ or that the household is unable to afford or to access suitable accommodation in the private sector.
- Housing problems may be concerned with costs, size, location, layout, state of repair or security of tenure.
- Housing need may be immediate or anticipated in the near future.

4. DISTRIBUTION AND RESPONSE

In order to carry out the Housing Needs Survey, questionnaires were delivered to all dwellings in Dorchester Parish in September 2012.

- The RHE, liaising with the Parish Council, prepared the structure of the survey.
- Respondents were asked to return their surveys to ORCC by 22nd September, using a Freepost envelope or the ballot box situated in the village post office.
- The RHE analysed the returned surveys and prepared this report.
- The survey does not claim to be representative of the entire population of the parish.

The survey responses were analysed in two parts. All respondents were asked to complete Part One of the questionnaire and respondents in need of affordable housing (and who wished to remain living in or move back to Dorchester) were asked to complete Part Two.

- The 2001 census identifies Dorchester as having, in total, 450 households.
- 100 surveys were returned, a fairly good response of 22%.
- 76% (76 respondents) said yes they would support a small development of affordable housing in Dorchester parish if there was a proven local need from individuals or families with a genuine local connection to the parish? In total 11% of respondents said ‘no’ and 13% said maybe.
- No information is known about the non-respondents, and no assumptions will be made about their needs or requirements.
5. Housing Profile and Affordability

**Current Mortgage Affordability in Oxfordshire**

An average semi-detached property in Oxfordshire cost £274,975 in July 2012 (Source: www.home.co.uk House Prices Report for Oxfordshire – July 2011 to July 2012). In the current financial climate, it is proving difficult for many to secure a mortgage. Mortgage lenders typically require a deposit of c. 20%. On the figures above, this would equate to almost £55,000. Even in the, now unlikely, scenario of a household being offered a mortgage of three-times their salary, their total annual income would have to be over £70 000. This is beyond the means of many first-time buyers and those with a low/average or single income.

**Current Sale and Rental Market Context in Dorchester**

In order to contextualise survey responses with market housing conditions in Dorchester, a web search for properties for sale or rent was conducted in the w/c 22/10/2012. The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Price¹</th>
<th>Totals for Sale and Rent²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Sale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed</td>
<td>£650,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>£260,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>£249,950</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>£137,450 (Berinsfield)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Rent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed</td>
<td>£1,400 pcm (BcS)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>£900 pcm (Berinsfield)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed *</td>
<td>£725 pcm (BcS)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed *</td>
<td>£650 pcm (Wallingford)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where properties of this size were not available for sale or rent in Dorchester the search radius was widened to 3 miles.

¹The lowest price for each size property has been recorded.

²Sale and rent totals are based on properties available within Dorchester

Source: www.rightmove.co.uk

**General Comments**

- At the average prices of homes in Dorchester, it would not be possible for a household to purchase a property without a large deposit, some equity in an existing property or a substantial income.
- First-time buyers would generally struggle to meet any of the criteria necessary for obtaining their own home.
- In some cases shared ownership housing would be a suitable option, whilst in other instances affordable rented would be advisable.

6. Survey Results

**Part One – You and Your Household**

Total responses: 263

Note: graphs are based on total responses. Where the total is less than 100 a respondent(s) declined to answer the question

**Q1**

How many people of each age live in your home?

![Age Range Graph](image)

**Q2**

What type of home do you live in?

![Type of Home Pie Chart](image)
Q3
How many bedrooms does your home have?

Q4
Who owns your home?

Q5
How long have you lived in your home/ parish of Dorchester?
Note: graphs are based on total responses. Where the total is less than 100 a respondent(s) declined to answer the question

Q6
Would you support a small development of affordable housing in Dorchester if there was a proven need from individuals or families with a genuine local connection to the parish?
Q7
If you answered yes or maybe to question 6, can you suggest a suitable site?

- Waste land along Abingdon Road: 6
- Gravel grading site: 3
- Opposite Meadside: 2
- Allotments: 2
- Watling Lane: 2
- Land at Orchid Lakes: 2
- Vacant development site: 2
- Opposite Sailing Lake: 1
- Extend behind Tenpenny: 1
- Between Meadside and bridge: 1
- Off Drayton Road (before bridge): 1
- Wasteland opposite cemetery: 1
- Small field beside Belcher Court: 1
- Before Overy, opposite existing houses: 1
- Former Council land, Abingdon Road: 1

Q8
Have any members of your household left the parish in the last few years?

(39 in total)

Why did they leave?

- Employment: 13
- Education: 15
- Lack of Housing: 13
- Other: 1

Q9
Does anyone living in your home need affordable housing?

- Yes: 12 (41%)
- No: 11 (38%)
- Maybe: 6 (21%)

Would they return if there was affordable housing in the village?

- Yes: 12 (41%)
- No: 11 (38%)
- Maybe: 6 (21%)

Q8 Diagram:

- Yes: 69%
- No: 31%

Q9 Diagram:

- No: 79%
- Yes: 8%
- Some: 3%
- Everyone: 3%
- One: 5%
Part 2 - Affordable Housing Need

Total respondents:
Note: graphs are based on total responses. Where the total is less than 12 a respondent(s) declined to answer the question.

Q10
How many people in each age group would live in the new home?

Q11
Why do you need a new home in this parish?

Q12
Who owns the home you live in now?

Q13
What type of home would you like?

*some respondents gave more than one answer.
Q14
How many bedrooms will your new home need?

No respondents indicated that they had a supported housing need.

Q16
Which of the following would be best for you?
Q19
Can you give us some idea of your household’s monthly income?

Q20
Do you live in the Parish at the moment?
Seven respondents said they do not currently live in the parish.

How many years have you lived in the parish of Dorchester for?

Q22
Are you on The Vale of the White Horse District Council Register?

Do you agree to share this information with South Oxfordshire District Council Housing Department?
All respondents agreed to their information being shared.

7. Findings

76% of those who responded ‘yes’ to the question ‘would you support a small development of affordable housing in Dorchester parish if there was a proven local need from individuals or families with a genuine local connection to the parish?’. 13% replied ‘Maybe’ and 11% ‘No’.

From an analysis of Part Two of the Housing Needs Survey responses it is assumed there is an affordable housing need from 12 respondents. All of these respondents have stated that they have a local connection to Dorchester. All would be unable to afford to rent or buy on the open market or would have significant financial difficulties in doing so.
Housing Needs Breakdown

Rental

5 of the 12 respondents expressed an interest in an affordable rented property. These households would require:

- 2 x 1 bedroom unit
- 2 x 2 bedroom unit
- 1 x 3 bedroom unit

Shared Ownership

7 of the 12 respondents expressed an interest in a shared ownership property. These households would require:

- 6 x 2 bedroom unit
- 1 x 3 bedroom unit

Total units = 37

2 x 1 bedroom unit
8 x 2 bedroom unit
2 x 3 bedroom unit

Summary

10 of the 12 potential applicants are not on the South Oxfordshire District Council Housing Register. The RHE will send all applicants who are not on the South Oxfordshire District Council Housing Register, and who have provided contact details, details of how to apply to the Housing Register.

The findings of this report are exclusively based on the September 2012 Housing Needs Survey. Support for an affordable housing development in the parish and an affordable housing need has been identified.

The report is intended as a guide for future discussion on the potential development of an affordable housing scheme in Dorchester. These discussions shall also be informed by, for example, additional housing need as evidenced from The South Oxfordshire DC Housing Register.
Appendix 3: Response to Draft Policies, Public Meeting January 2015
### Draft Policies

#### Built Environment Policies
1. Developments which maintain or enhance those characteristics which have been identified in the Dorchester Conservation Area Character Appraisal as contributing to the established character of the Conservation Area will be supported.
2. Due regard should be given to the contribution made by properties included in the local list of buildings of note to the character and appearance of Dorchester, especially where development proposals directly affect these buildings.
3. Developments which could result in an increase in vehicular traffic and car parking must include an effective plan to mitigate any negative impact, especially in relation to car parking, traffic congestion and pedestrian safety.
4. All the other policies in this plan will be measured against the objective in this section.

#### Natural Environment Policies
1. Recognising Dorchester's key position in the Oxfordshire Conservation Target Area no. 27, developments protecting the biodiversity of sites on the banks of the River Thame upstream to the A4034 will be encouraged.
2. Proposals on sites adjoining designated Nature Reserves will be favoured where they make a positive contribution to the ecology of those sites.
3. Developments which retain, protect and enhance the green lanes, spaces and verges in the village will be encouraged.
4. Notable wildlife sites such as the Hurst Water Meadows and the Dyke Hills must be given extra protection by designating them as County Wildlife Sites.
5. The development of X site for woodland would be supported.

#### Housing Policies
1. All new housing developments with net gains of three or more units should include 40% affordable housing in accordance with SODC’s Core Strategy.
2. Developments which provide in excess of 40% affordable housing will be welcomed.
3. Where the provision of 40% affordable housing is proved to be unviable, developers will be expected to provide the maximum amount of affordable housing units that are demonstrated to be viable and deliver these in line with policy CSH3 of the Core Strategy.
4. Development proposals that relate well to the character of the surrounding area and deliver a high proportion of one and two bedroom properties using housing forms and layouts to help retain the dwellings as smaller properties will be preferred.
5. Applications for new housing development in the village should demonstrate that they are helping to establish the balanced housing mix required by the village.
6. Any applications to extend properties built after the adoption of this Plan which are beyond “Permitted Development” should only be accepted where they can demonstrate a particular housing need.
7. Applications for new buildings will be encouraged to exceed the minimum required Sustainable Buildings Code level.
8. Proposals for all new homes to be built in Dorchester should provide for one off-street parking space for each bedroom, unless otherwise justified having regard to site-specific circumstances and Oxfordshire County Council parking standards.

#### Economy Policies
1. Development which retains and supports existing retail, commercial, farming and home working businesses and employment will be encouraged.
2. Developments which support tourism and leisure enterprises which are based on the conservation and enjoyment of the qualities of the area will be encouraged.

#### Tourism and Leisure Policies
1. Recognising Dorchester’s prime position as an Oxfordshire tourist destination, development proposals will be encouraged where they promote tourism and support leisure facilities for the benefit of local businesses and the community as a whole.
2. Development related to the tourist industry which could result in increased demand for or loss of car parking should include measures to mitigate this.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Policies</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Not Supported</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>% Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Environment Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Natural Environment Policies** | | | | |
| 1. | 49 | 1 | 6 | 91 |
| 2. | 50 | 6 | 93 |
| 3. | 53 | 3 | 98 |
| 4. | 53 | 3 | 98 |
| 5. | 51 | 5 | 94 |

| **Housing Policies** | | | | |
| 1. | 40 | 7 | 9 | 74 |
| 2. | 33 | 12 | 11 | 61 |
| 3. | 41 | 4 | 11 | 76 |
| 4. | 43 | 6 | 7 | 80 |
| 5. | 47 | 9 | 87 |
| 6. | 45 | 3 | 8 | 83 |

| **Economy Policies** | | | | |
| 1. | 51 | 5 | 94 |
| 2. | 50 | 6 | 93 |

| **Tourism and Leisure Policies** | | | | |
| 1. | 48 | 2 | 6 | 89 |
| 2. | 48 | 1 | 7 | 89 |
### Draft Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Built Environment Policies</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developments which maintain or enhance those characteristics which have been identified in the Dorchester Conservation Area Character Appraisal as contributing to the established character of the Conservation Area will be supported.</td>
<td>Any developments should be spread &amp; not concentrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Due regard should be given to the contribution made by properties included in the local list of buildings of note to the character and appearance of Dorchester, especially where development proposals directly affect these buildings.</td>
<td>Consider preservation order for, say, double doors next to post office as part of retaining historical character of High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developments which could result in an increase in vehicular traffic and car parking must include an effective plan to mitigate any negative impact, especially in relation to car parking, traffic congestion and pedestrian safety.</td>
<td>The car parking issue is extremely sensitive &amp; warrants a policy statement of its own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. All the other policies in this plan will be measured against the objective in this section.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Natural Environment Policies

| 1. Recognising Dorchester’s key position in the Oxfordshire Conservation Target Area no. 27, developments protecting the biodiversity of sites on the banks of the River Thame upstream to the A4074 will be encouraged. | - |
| 2. Proposals on sites adjoining designated Nature Reserves will be favoured where they make a positive contribution to the ecology of those sites. | Regular dredging of Thame to avoid flooding & encourage wildlife (2) |
| 3. Developments which retain, protect and enhance the green lanes, spaces and verges in the village will be encouraged. | Keep river bank open accessible to public & river itself navigable |
| 4. Notable wildlife sites such as the Hurst Water Meadows and the Dyke Hills must be given extra protection by designating them as County Wildlife Sites. | Must not impede river flow |
| 5. The development of X site for woodland would be supported. | Principle of using woodland to protect boundaries strongly accepted, but can't comment on “X” without knowing what this refers to. |
| 6. Subject to their being proportionate & in keeping with their immediate environment | Is “X” Demesne Field? B5 (??) may be targeting |
| 7. All new housing developments with net gains of three or more units should include 40% affordable housing in accordance with SODC’s Core Strategy | Support site off Monks Close as woodland (Demesne) |

### Housing Policies

| 1. All new housing developments with net gains of three or more units should include 40% affordable housing in accordance with SODC’s Core Strategy | This policy needs careful rewording. Danger of mis-interpreting - key issue in view of Berinsfield expansion |
| 2. Developments which provide in excess of 40% affordable housing will be welcomed | Max height should be 2 storeys |
| 3. Where the provision of 40% affordable housing is proved to be unviable, developers will be expected to provide the maximum amount of affordable housing units that are demonstrated to be viable and deliver these in line with policy CSH3 of the Core Strategy | Implication of wording of 1-4 is as much Affordable Housing as possible at maximum density. There should be a balance |
| 4. Development proposals that relate well to the character of the surrounding area and deliver a high proportion of one and two bedroom properties using housing forms and layouts to help retain the dwellings as smaller properties will be preferred. | 1 bed houses can be let & become a ghetto for crime & vandalism |
| 5. Applications for new housing development in the village should demonstrate that they are helping to establish the balanced housing mix required by the village. | This policy will attract less families & more retirees |
| 6. Applications for new housing development in the village should demonstrate that they are helping to establish the balanced housing mix required by the village. | Layouts should accommodate the disabled |
| 7. Applications for new housing development in the village should demonstrate that they are helping to establish the balanced housing mix required by the village. | Working is opaque |
| 8. Any applications to extend properties built after the adoption of this Plan which are beyond “Permitted Development” should only be accepted where they can demonstrate a substantial need. | What is “balanced”? Who decides? (2) |
| 9. Applications for new buildings will be encouraged to exceed the minimum required Sustainable Buildings Code level. | Is “need” the community’s or applicant’s? |
| 10. Proposals for all new homes to be built in Dorchester should provide for one off-street parking space for each bedroom, unless otherwise justified having regard to site-specific circumstances and Oxfordshire County Council parking standards. | - |

### Economy Policies

| 1. Development which retains and supports existing retail, commercial, farming and home working businesses and employment will be encouraged. | Rather conservative. Should be more encouraging. Any businesses we should discourage? |
| 2. Developments which support tourism and leisure enterprises which are based on the conservation and enjoyment of the qualities of the area will be encouraged. | Avoid fast-food outlets |

### Tourism and Leisure Policies

| 1. Recognising Dorchester’s prime position as an Oxfordshire tourist destination, development proposals will be encouraged where they promote tourism and support leisure facilities for the benefit of local businesses and the community as a whole. | Need a specific policy regarding sport & leisure facilities (2) |
| 2. Developments which support tourism and leisure enterprises which are based on the conservation and enjoyment of the qualities of the area will be encouraged. | - |

---

### Specific Responses

- **Field(?)**
  - This policy needs careful rewording. Danger of mis-interpreting - key issue in view of Berinsfield expansion

- **Housing Policies**
  - Max height should be 2 storeys

- **Economy Policies**
  - Rather conservative. Should be more encouraging. Any businesses we should discourage?

- **Tourism and Leisure Policies**
  - Need a specific policy regarding sport & leisure facilities (2)
Appendix 4: Further Public Comments on 2015 Draft Policies

Care - too many tourists destroy the object of their tourism

Need to retain peace & tranquility. Look what's happened to some Cotswold & W Country villages

Section seems muddled in terms of historical App.

Developments related to the tourist industry which could result in increased demand for or loss of car parking should include measures to mitigate this.

Village needs a new car park
Appendix 4 Further public comments on 2015 draft policies

General Comments

Whilst the Plan should be as succinct as possible, some explanation of the thinking behind it would be helpful.

Several terms are used which may or not have a precise definition. This should be explained in a preamble or notes – for example “affordable housing”.

Some policies may conflict with one another. Where this happens it should be recognised with an indication of how they are to be balanced.

The village boundary has been set & should not be breeched

If village pavilion is redeveloped then village hall could be converted to social housing

The principle of development in any location is not accepted & all existing spaces, footpaths etc must be retained

Built Environment Policies

This section accurately reflects what is supposed to be the established policy for conservation areas.

Unfortunately SODC take no notice of it, as a notorious recent example demonstrated. Could there be some reference to giving weight to the views of the residents who are affected by planning decisions?

These are the over-riding policies and are therefore the most important. On the whole I agree with them although it would be clearer to add at the end of Policy 1 “Otherwise they will be opposed”.

Is the Appraisal referred to in Policy 1 readily accessible?

I think Policy 3 would seem to allow a development which was deemed very negative providing it had an “effective” mitigation plan. In the context of the sensitive road system around the village, I suggest the policy be expanded to say: “Developments which could result in an increase in vehicular traffic and car parking will not be supported unless they are proportionate to their means of access and include……pedestrian safety.”

Should it be “objectives” in Policy 4?

Natural Environment Policies

Para 1 should have regard to the interests of river users such as fishermen, canoeists, swimmers and boaters.

Does para 4 mean Local Wildlife Sites? What are the implications of this? The DEFRA guidance devotes a lot of space to definition, criteria and funding, but doesn’t really explain what practical action would follow.

What is X site in para 5. Is this the field which might provide a buffer against the noise of the By Pass?

These look sensible but I was not sure what P3 is getting at. What kind of developments are envisaged?

It seemed to me there should be added to P3 the words “subject to them being proportionate and in keeping with their immediate environment.

Housing Policies

This section is expressed entirely in terms of the arithmetic of housing units. What are these formulae trying to achieve?

One objective might be to prevent the average age in the village rising still further – the emphasis on single and two bedroom units might suggest the opposite.

Paras 1-3 appear to do little more than restate CSH3: some explanation of what this means in practice might be helpful.

Para 4 is opaque. Does it mean that joining small cottages together to make larger units should be resisted?

As for para 5, what is the “balanced housing mix required by the village”? Who has decided this and whom did they consult?

Para 8 is potentially very important. Can we impose an off street parking standard that is more restrictive than that of OCC.

This is manifestly inadequate as two car dwellings are the norm and more than that quite common. Perhaps this is an issue to be revisited in conjunction with some form of licensing.

All the policies in this section seem to be reactive and there is nothing which says what the village wants or thinks it may need. I know this is difficult but would you not expect something like this in a “plan”

What it does say however in Ps 1 to 4 is that we want as much Affordable Housing as possible. In fact we seem to be inviting developers to build to the highest densities possible. I don’t think this is right for the village and I suggest we need a mix of new properties if we are going to have them. We need houses for families with children as well as starter homes otherwise growing families will have to leave the village if there is an overemphasis on small dwellings.

P5 touches on the matter just mentioned but it begs the question of who decides what is “the balanced housing mix required by the village” at any point in time.

P6 refers to “housing need” but it is unclear if this relates to the applicant’s need or the communities. If the latter how will that be determined and would it not be better to introduce some concept of the extension being proportionate and appropriate? Also perhaps some recognition of the importance of the views of neighbours would not go amiss?

Economy Policies

Para 1 is rather conservative. What is wrong with encouraging new businesses and employment?

Are there any business developments we wish to discourage eg those with undesirable environmental or social effects – or is that what para 2 means? Should there be a reference to broadband provision?

Tourism and Leisure Policies

This section seems a bit muddled about why we might wish to promote tourism and leisure.

Leisure/sporting facilities presumably aim to benefit residents, while tourism does not necessarily do so: indeed, as para 2 acknowledges, they bear costs which must be weighed against the putative benefits to businesses.

This section should also recognise the historical and recreational value of the Rivers Thames and Thame. Many people use the river and some reach Dorchester that way, which should be encouraged.
### Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

- The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the sustainable development of the area.
- The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).
- The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations, and
- Provisional conditions are met in relation to the plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order.

### SOODC Response on Pre-Submission Consultation Draft [Dorchester-on-Thames Neighbourhood Plan, May 2016](#)

**Appendix 5 South Oxfordshire District Council Comments on the 2016 Pre-Submission Consultation Draft [Dorchester-on-Thames Neighbourhood Plan](#)**

**Part 1: Matters of General Conformity**

Only a draft neighbourhood plan that meets each set of basic conditions can be put to a referendum and be made. An examiner will have to consider whether the draft plan meets the basic conditions, which are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- **Only a draft neighborhood plan that meets each set of basic conditions can be put to a referendum and be made.**
- **An examiner will have to consider whether the draft plan meets the basic conditions, which are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighborhood plans by Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.**

#### 1.1 The Neighbourhood Plan Must Specify the Period for Which It Is to Have Effect

The neighbourhood plan must specify the period for which it is to have effect. Within this paragraph it is stated that the plan will have effect for 10 years but no start and end date. It is helpful if whatever period is selected is on the front cover as well.

**Change to the plan will run from (for example) 2016 to 2032.**

- **Policy DoT 1**
- **Policy DoT 2**
- **Policy DoT 3**

#### 16 Policy DoT 1

"Developments which maintain or enhance these characteristics which have been identified in the amended Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans as contributing to the established character of the conservation areas will be supported!"

While this appears to be in general conformity with Policy OSEN3 Historic Environment in the adopted Core Strategy however is an aspiration and not a policy. A criteria based policy, which lists specific characteristics, is required to fulfill the aspiration. I understand that the parish council has contributed detailed work to the district council’s conservation officers to inform an amended appraisal and management plan the policy should (also) refer to the existing body of work from 2009.

Re-draft as criteria based policy based on identification of specific characteristics to be complied with. Add (perhaps in supporting text and not policy) reference to the published Dorchester Conservation Area Appraisal and Dorchester Conservation Area Management Plan (both May 2016) as proposed amended versions.

Consider inclusion of policy to identify possible community infrastructure requirements.

The plan needs to identify the Local List in the policy or at least in supporting text and it should be absolutely clear which buildings are included. A map would be helpful. APPENDIX 5: BUILDINGS OF LOCAL NOTE (LOCAL LIST) should show clearly why the particular buildings merit inclusion.

#### 17 Policy DoT 4

"Developments which could result in an increase in vehicular traffic and car parking must include an effective plan to mitigate any negative impact, especially in relation to car parking.

The plan needs to include the Local List in the policy or at least in supporting text and it should be absolutely clear which buildings are included. A map would be helpful. APPENDIX 5: BUILDINGS OF LOCAL NOTE (LOCAL LIST) should show clearly why the particular buildings merit inclusion.

- **Policy DoT 5**
- **Policy DoT 6**
- **Policy DoT 7**

#### 18 Policy DoT 5

"Identify clear criteria that are linked to local issues and objectives."

- **Policy DoT 1**
- **Policy DoT 2**
- **Policy DoT 3**

#### 19 Policy DoT 6

"Proposals on sites adjoining designated Nature Reserves will be favoured where they make a positive contribution to the ecology of those sites."

This needs existing natural guidance and local plan policies, which seek biodiversity gains however those policies also include seeking to prevent damage. For example in the Core Strategy to prevent development which would harm key species or to ‘local nature reserves’, unless the importance of the development outweighs the harm and the loss can be mitigated to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. The proposed neighbourhood plan does not have the same checks and balances.

Re-draft policy to reflect local issues and plan objectives.

- **Policy DoT 7**
- **Policy DoT 8**

#### 20 Policy DoT 7

"Developments which maintain, protect and enhance the green lanes, spaces and verges in the village will be encouraged."

This appears to be in general conformity with Policy CG3 Design in the adopted Core Strategy however it adds no local detail and is again a statement of aspiration not policy. The green lanes etc. need to be identified in the plan (as well as in maps). What exactly is meant by retain, protect and enhance? Describing plan scale will solve in every case or just one of them?

Re-draft policy to reflect local issues and plan objectives. Provide clear identification of assets to be protected and support ways the plan seeks enhancement.

#### 21 Policy DoT 8

"The development of Demesne Field (see 5. Other enclosures - Parish Map) for community use to safeguard the underlying archaeology would be supported."

This appears to be in general conformity with Policy CG3/S3 hardship Environment in the adopted Core Strategy in which “Proposals for development that affect non-designated historic assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset,” however Policy DoT 8 does not add anything to this. Perhaps it would be better to specify exactly what community use is envisaged and how the underlying archaeology would be safeguarded.

Consider adding a green infrastructure policy in line with Natural England’s comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section or Policy no.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Suggested change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Policy DoT9 (suggested change)</td>
<td>&quot;Development on suitable windfall sites, which exceed the required percentage of affordable housing will be permitted.&quot; This policy is unnecessary because national policy already states what housing may be allowed in the Green Belt. As written, this policy might result in exceeding the allowed percentage by 1 home, which is not possible based on national guidance.</td>
<td>Suggest this policy is removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>3.3.1.below Policy DoT9</td>
<td>While the objective of increasing affordable housing is appreciated, the text accompanying the policy suggests that the neighbourhood plan should set lower thresholds for affordable housing in Dorchester, which is contradictory. Such thresholds would have to be set in the Local Plan and only then where there is robust evidence to support it.</td>
<td>Remove reference to lower thresholds or provide detailed and robust evidence for this to be changed through the emerging Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>Policy DoT10, paragraphs 1-4 below the policy, and map on Appendix B</td>
<td>&quot;Proposes for the development of small scale affordable housing schemes on rural exception sites in suitable locations within the parish boundaries where housing would not normally be permitted will be supported provided they are in accordance with Policy H10 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2015.&quot; This policy is unnecessary and simply states what rural exception sites are. It would be more appropriate to include a policy to identify a specific site or sites where local people would prefer to see development, subject to guidance from the Green Belt. This must be based on robust evidence. With regard to references to allocations in the site specific paragraphs (1-4) and on the map (Appendix B) the district council offers to support the neighbourhood plan group in resolving how to express the process of site allocation of sites in the Green Belt, which can only be changed through a Local Plan. The site surveys and descriptions are useful but need to be part of a robust site selection methodology. The Department for Communities and Local Government has a useful toolkit for this process. Provide evidence to show need for affordable housing and map sites exactly how proposals might benefit the local community and demonstrate in the text that Dorchester does have the prime position...as tourist destination.</td>
<td>Provide evidence to show need for particular balance of housing mix. Re-draft policy based on locally specific criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>DoT11</td>
<td>&quot;Small scale infill developments that relate well to the character of the surrounding area and contribute to maintaining a balanced housing mix will be supported.&quot; This appears to be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy but could be tightened up to define what aspects of character the developments should relate to, for example landscape and/or historic character. Also the surrounding area could refer to South Oxfordshire or the immediate fieldscape.</td>
<td>Provide evidence to show need for particular balance of housing mix. Re-draft policy based on locally specific criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>DoT12</td>
<td>&quot;Applications for new buildings will be encouraged to exceed the minimum required environmental performance.&quot; This is a worthwhile aim but could potentially conflict with national policy as set out in the NPPF particularly paragraph 173 (Ensuring viability and deliverability &quot;...Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened.&quot;) This may be obsolete if the plan contains some processes by which such schemes will be actively encouraged.</td>
<td>Re-consider this policy and consider methods for actively encouraging higher environmental performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>DoT13</td>
<td>&quot;Proposes for all new homes to be built in Dorchester should provide one -off street parking space for each bedroom, unless otherwise justified having regard to site-specific circumstances and Oxfordshire County Council parking standards.&quot; This policy, like DoT12, could potentially conflict with the viability requirements of the NPPF as discussed in DoT12 above.</td>
<td>Re-consider this policy and consider methods for actively encouraging higher environmental performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>DoT16</td>
<td>&quot;Recognising Dorchester’s prime position as an Oxfordshire tourist destination and also the historical and recreational value of the River Thames itself, development proposals will be encouraged where they promote tourism for the benefit of local businesses and the community as a whole.&quot; Similar concerns as in DoT15 above. Unconditional encouragement could be in conflict with other policies in the neighbourhood plan and Core Strategy.</td>
<td>Re-draft policy based on locally specific criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>DoT17</td>
<td>&quot;The village already has a number of sporting and leisure facilities. Proposed developments which broaden and extend the use of these facilities by residents and visitors will be supported.&quot; Similar concerns as in DoT15 and DoT16 above. Unconditional encouragement could be in conflict with other policies in the neighbourhood plan and Core Strategy.</td>
<td>Re-draft policy based on locally specific criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Policy No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Suggested change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The numbering throughout is a little inconsistent e.g. most of the paragraphs I've referred to below on page 4 are apparently in 1.1.</td>
<td>Check numbering format including making the site selection numbers look like starting again with paragraph numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The input data as regional planning was abolished. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was commissioned jointly by all Oxfordshire Councils</td>
<td>Replace Regional Council's housing needs assessment with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), commissioned jointly by all Oxfordshire Councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The plan will stand for a period of 15 years. Needs start and finish dates and also could mention potential for additional replacement plans</td>
<td>Add intended dates from and to e.g. 2016-2031 of 2013 to align with emerging Local Plan and “unless changing circumstances require a replacement plan to be prepared.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Dorchester’s Neighbourhood Development Plan, once approved by a community referendum, should include examination</td>
<td>Consider adding historic environment and heritage assets somewhere in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The SHMA is just the document – built environment and housing may be thought by some people to mean the same thing. You may wish to add historic environment and heritage assets somewhere on here as included in the plan.</td>
<td>Consider using a diagram to explain NDP process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>“before the Parish Council APM” uses an acronym that is not recognised by many people</td>
<td>Replace APM with Annual Parish Meeting if that is what it stands for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Numbering and acronyms need to be consistent.</td>
<td>Decide whether using NP or NDP for Neighbourhood Plan or Neighbourhood Development Plan and make sure they are explained early on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Specific about the status of the village in the emerging Local Plan will be out of date if included in the Submission draft.</td>
<td>Change “… with particular regard to conformity with national policy and guidance and local policy in the Development Plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>…with particular regard to National and Local Plans is not accurate.</td>
<td>Change “… with particular regard to National and Local Plans” to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speculation about the status of the village in the emerging Local Plan will be out of date if included in the Submission draft.</td>
<td>“… with particular regard to conformity with national policy and guidance and local policy in the Development Plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The last sentence before the bullet points seems to be missing some words</td>
<td>Check sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1.5</td>
<td>Other opinions exist that might contradict this statement about unparalleled archaeological potential.</td>
<td>It might save argument to add something like “arguably of unparalleled…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1.5</td>
<td>Other opinions exist that might contradict this statement about unparalleled archaeological potential.</td>
<td>It might save argument to add something like “arguably of unparalleled…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.1.5</td>
<td>The last sentence before the bullet points seems to be missing some words</td>
<td>Check sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.1.5</td>
<td>Other opinions exist that might contradict this statement about unparalleled archaeological potential.</td>
<td>It might save argument to add something like “arguably of unparalleled…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Sounds unduly negative</td>
<td>Remove “yet another”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I like the summary of policies page, but you will need to make sure any changes are reflected here too.
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Bishops Court Farm

- Says there has been no change in farming practice from arable to grazing (current appearance confirms this). We will delete all or second half of “which have recently been fenced in as a response to a change in farming practice from arable to grazing (4.1.3)
- References to affordable housing, increased housing stock, rural exception sites, housing infill etc., already considered and addressed within draft plan as it stands.
- Tourism – should we include reference to the active encouragement of rural diversification as an economic driver for Dorchester, as suggested? We agreed to refer to this by way of an expanded policy with in the “Economy” section.

Dorchester Residents

- Queried the name “Abbey View Meadow”, with which she is unfamiliar, within the text and appendices. The term is correct & Geoff Russell has advised resident as such.
- A number of suggested drafting changes, expansions etc. to the text which we considered.
- No suggested changes to policies proposed and no textual changes therefore incorporated.
- Spotted a typo on page 30 – currently DOT11 – change “area” to “also”. Text to be updated
- Observations on the SWOT analysis.
- Observation on the need for affordable housing – no amendment prompted.
- Suggestion that the PC sponsor a new Tourism Action Group – maybe a good idea but not an appropriate NDP inclusion.

Overy Residents

- 3 separate items all referring the NDP’s reference to flood risk in Overy and requests to remove from 4.2.2 “The Thame has a wide catchment area……”. We have agreed to make this change.
- A separate suggestion in the Butcher note that the Historic Environment section should include a policy concerning the ongoing maintenance of existing village flood defence systems. Having discussed this, we agreed that this important point relates more to ongoing Village “housekeeping” than being a specific NDP issue.

Environment Agency

- “No detailed comments” – no action.

Friends of Dorchester and Long Wittenham Open Spaces (FODLWOS)

- A number of detailed responses discussed in detail and agreed to reflect a number of the group’s requested changes. See separate appendix 7.

Natural England

- No specific comments as no proposed development site allocation, but a suggestion that we make reference to The North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in section

4.2 – establish whether Parish boundary is actually contiguous, and then include this reference if appropriate.

OCC

- No comments

SOCA

- A number of detailed responses, see separate appendix 8.

SOHA

- Feedback covers the Belcher Court issue which continues to be something of a “moving feast”. Given the pending covenant issues, we agreed it was correct that current text should be retained

Thames Water

- A request to include a policy on Water & Wastewater Infrastructure. “Developers need to consider the net increase in water and waste water demand to serve their developments and also any impact the development may have off-site further down the network if no/low water pressure and internal/external sewerage flooding of property is to be avoided.” There is a request that developers engage with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity. This will be incorporated into the Housing section.
Appendix 7: Feedback from FODLWOS on the Pre-Submission Draft 2017
3. Dorchester-on-Thames
3.1. Overview

3.1.1. Snapshot of the village

Dorchester-on-Thames is a small village in South Oxfordshire which is loved and enjoyed by those who live there as well as by many visitors. Despite having a resident population of a little over 1,000 people, it is considered by many to be a dynamic village with a diverse range of community activities that enrich the lives of its inhabitants.

• It is steeped in history, its origins dating back 6,000 years, and much of its evolution is still clearly in evidence in the landscape today.
• It is surrounded by beautiful countryside, including both the River Thame and the River Thames, Wittenham Clumps and the Hurst Water Meadow, all of which are easily accessible to residents and visitors alike and provide almost unlimited opportunities to walk and explore. The Thames Path, a national trail passes close by. Access to open spaces at Days Lock Meadow, The Dyke Hills, meadows and nearby Dyke Hills are valued by villagers and visitors.
• It boasts a number of interesting and varied buildings in and around the picturesque High Street, including the majestic Dorchester Abbey and the adjoining accredited Museum.
• Commercial facilities include a village shop, hotels and restaurants, tea-rooms, hair salon, and other small business premises.
• Community run facilities include the village hall, allotments, a large recreation ground with a sports pavilion, tennis courts and children’s play area. Recreational activities are also enjoyed on the rivers Thame and Thames, meadows and nearby Dyke Hills.
• It offers its residents and visitors a range of cultural and recreational leisure facilities through its many clubs and associations.
• Its pre-school and primary school, and other facilities for young families, provide the opportunity for children to begin their development and early education without the need to travel outside the village.
• People like living in Dorchester. If they move they tend to do so within the village. Residents who remain here through their retirement appreciate the range of facilities suitable for their particular age group.

3.1.3. SWOT analysis

Strengths:
• Attractive village, many listed buildings
• Dorchester Abbey, major tourist attraction, largest public building in South Oxfordshire for public events
• Dorchester Abbey Museum, accredited by the Arts Council
• Locations for episodes of Midsomer Murders and other television or film productions
• Good hotels, tea-rooms and small supermarkets
• The Fleur de Lys pub and the former site of the Post Office registered as community assets
• Distinctive landscape character of the River Thame and its valley, excellent vistas
• Good area for walking and cycling; footpath network
• Managed wildlife sites
• Strong community spirit with high level of voluntary activities

Weaknesses:
• Few premises for small businesses and retail units
• Limited public transport
• Inadequate parking
• Uncoordinated promotion of tourism
• Vulnerability of conservation areas and nearby green areas

Opportunities:
• Collaborate with the Environment Agency and other environmental organisations to sustain and protect the natural environment
• Support the Hurst Water Meadow Trust in maintaining, enhancing and extending wildlife sites, especially along the Thame
• Smaller housing units will meet the needs of the young and the elderly
• Improved facilities for leisure and recreation will give better quality of life for all ages
• More parking spaces will ease congestion and encourage visitors
• Work with University of Oxford Institute of Archaeology and like-minded organisations to understand and protect archaeological sites
• Explore the potential for hydro-electric power
• Support the Friends of Dorchester and Little Wittenham Open Spaces in applications for village green status to preserve village access to Days Lock Meadow and Dyke Hills

Threats:
• Loss of employment due to commercial premises change of use to domestic dwellings
• Risk of flooding to low-lying houses
• Risk of further gravel extraction which will bring more traffic and damage the local environment
• Risk of coalescence with Berinsfield
• Risk of damage to important unprotected archaeology by development
• Risk of exclusion of villagers to Days Lock Meadow and Dyke Hills and the loss to the community of important and highly valued recreational areas, following the erection of fencing, and reduction in the traditional path widths by fencing paths 10 and 22 and exclusion of access to footpaths (which have not yet been recorded on the Definitive Map)

Interest groups helping to protect and preserve the integrity of the village environment alongside the parish council

The Thames Path, a national trail passes close by. Access to open spaces at Days Lock Meadow, The Dyke Hills, meadows and nearby Dyke Hills

Archaeology and like-minded organisations to underpin, understand and protect archaeological sites

Managed wildlife sites

Strong community spirit with high level of voluntary activities

Few premises for small businesses and retail units

Limited public transport

Inadequate parking

Uncoordinated promotion of tourism

Vulnerability of conservation areas and nearby green areas

Collaborate with the Environment Agency and other environmental organisations to sustain and protect the natural environment

Support the Hurst Water Meadow Trust in maintaining, enhancing and extending wildlife sites, especially along the Thame

Smaller housing units will meet the needs of the young and the elderly

Improved facilities for leisure and recreation will give better quality of life for all ages

More parking spaces will ease congestion and encourage visitors

Work with University of Oxford Institute of Archaeology and like-minded organisations to understand and protect archaeological sites

Explore the potential for hydro-electric power

Support the Friends of Dorchester and Little Wittenham Open Spaces in applications for village green status to preserve village access to Days Lock Meadow and Dyke Hills

Risk of exclusion of villagers to Days Lock Meadow and Dyke Hills and the loss to the community of important and highly valued recreational areas, following the erection of fencing, and reduction in the traditional path widths by fencing paths 10 and 22 and exclusion of access to footpaths (which have not yet been recorded on the Definitive Map)
3.3. History

- The first permanent settlement was a late Iron Age town in the southern part of the parish covering 60 hectares in an area defined by both rivers and the massive double bank and ditch of the Dyke Hills.
- The Dyke Hills gradually fell into disuse following the Roman invasion in the first century AD when a fort was established to the north of the Dyke Hills, quickly followed by a walled town laid out on a grid pattern with its outer limits marked by the line of Wittenham Lane and Wallingford Lane. There were also substantial extra-mural settlements to the north, south and especially to the east beyond the River Thames.
- In the Anglo-Saxon period following the Roman withdrawal, Dorchester became an important centre of Christianity with the first cathedral founded in 610. By 1140 the cathedral had been refounded as an Augustinian monastery which survived until its dissolution in 1538. The Abbey church was then adopted as the parish church.
- After the time of Alfred the Great, Dorchester lost its regional importance to other centres at Oxford and Wallingford. The main road, which crossed the Thames by means of a stone bridge from at least the C12, ensured that the settlement enjoyed a modest prosperity by providing hospitality and accommodation for travellers. From the late medieval period this service function was enhanced by almsgiving to the shrine of St Birinus, the founder of the first cathedral. The trade continued to prosper through the coaching age.
- Agriculture was the main occupation down to the C19 when the car factory in Oxford allowed some of the inhabitants to earn their living outside the village and tourism gradually became of increasing importance to the village economy. There are a number of small businesses within the village and the agricultural presence is maintained by three farms and the cultivation of the surrounding fields and meadows adjacent to the Thames. Of particular note, early attempts to level the Dyke Hills for the convenient landfill gave rise to the regulations which today is the foundation of the preservation of sites of national historical importance. The Dyke Hills was the first ever nationally recorded ancient landscape.
- Gravel, which because of its free-draining qualities first attracted prehistoric man to settle in Dorchester, has since World War II greatly altered the appearance of the landscape in the northern part of the parish. The relentless demand for aggregates for the construction industry has led to a string of man-made lakes which are now designated County Wildlife Sites and largely used for various leisure purposes.

4.1.3. Analysis of the village outside the conservation areas

To the north there are areas of mostly twentieth century housing lining the Abington Road, the Old Oxford Road and the south side of the Drayton Road interspersed with lakes formed from the worked out gravel pits. The Minster Recreation Ground is a prominent open green space. Other areas of modern housing fringe the village to the east accessed from Martins Lane and Manor Farm Road. Beyond the Hurst Water Meadows (owned and managed by a local Trust on behalf of the community) and Dorney is an open landscape. To the south there is another area of twentieth century housing in Tenpenny and Orchard Haven with productive agricultural fields and water meadows beyond. The area to the west is all open agricultural land apart from a scatter of modern houses on the west side of Wallingford Lane. Both these areas are crossed by a network of popular footpaths which have recently been fenced in. The meadow at the south-eastern end of the bridge are separated from Dorchester by Old Bridge Meadow (also owned by the Hurst Water Meadow Trust) and a field used for event parking.

4.1.6. Proposals

These proposals are important elements in the management of the historic character of Dorchester. They have been produced in accordance with the advice contained in Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment published by the then English Heritage (2014). It is recognised that they will need to be taken forward outside the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

1. That the revised appraisal maps as set out in Appendices 1 & 2 are formally approved by SODC.
2. That the buildings set out in Appendix 5 are formally adopted by SODC as a local list of non-designated heritage assets.
3. That the Dorney conservation area should be revised to include the field between Dorney Lane and the A4064 as shown on the appended map, Appendix 2.
4. That the Dorchester Conservation Area should be revised to include the Dorney Field.
5. That the village access to open spaces be preserved by application for village green status for land in the Dyke Hills and Days Lock Meadow.
6. That Applications to register and where appropriate amend the Definitive Map held by the Highways authority is undertaken within the statutory expiry date for registration, that is to 2026.
is important. However, there are locations within the village which either frame the view out into the open countryside or into the built up area in a way which asserts the importance of the Abbey in particular. A selection of these views has been added to the Appraisal Maps for both Dorchester and Denby (Appendices 1 and 2).

In Denby the area of land known as the Hunt is a highly-valued amenity for the community and the well-managed footpaths provide a variety of views both inward and outward. A belt of trees with a traditionally laid hedgerow running north-south in the eastern sector (Appendix 2). Traditional hedgerows bring a biodiversity of species and we actively support the wildlife corridors that they represent. Where necessary we will engage with the Countryside Officer at SDC to ensure hedgerow regulations are complied with to ensure that environmental biodiversity continues to flourish.

4.2.4. Policies

DoT 4: River Impact
Any developments or changes of use of land likely to have an impact on the River Thames or River Thame will be supported only if it protects and/or enhances biodiversity, is greater than obvious adverse impact on the village’s outward appearance and attractiveness. The history of Dorchester and its historic buildings attracts tourism. The Museum is a popular visitor attraction. Countryside walkers and cyclists visit or pass through the village. Days Lock Meadow is a favourite site for meandering and picnicking.

More recently, tourism has been markedly increased through the international popularity of “Midsomer Murders”. Additionally, Dorchester benefits from being close to the Earth Trust at Little Wittonham. Annual events such as Arts Week also bring visitors.

Tourism can place an additional strain and burden on the resources of the village. Visitor parking is limited to the public car park in Bridge End plus on-street parking, with the latter having the obvious adverse impact on the village’s outward appearance and attractiveness.

Additional public parking is available at either end of the village – Abbey View Meadow to the south and part of the recreation ground to the north, although restrictions apply to both these locations which are therefore only made available for special events.

However, if properly managed, tourism can add to the village’s economic well-being by providing welcome custom and support to its retail enterprises. In 2004-06 a Tourism Working Group was set up to review tourism in the village and to gather data, identify projects and improve the opportunities presented by tourism whilst trying to minimise its impact. Certain improvements were made, including signage and information display boards at key access points.

Leisure for residents and visitors is also well-established. There are a variety of clubs and societies catering for a range of interests. Amenities include the Abbey, Abbey Guest House, village hall, recreation ground including the recently constructed tennis courts, sports pavilion, hotels, guest houses, pubs, cafes and tea rooms. The recreation ground has host to a number of well-established sports including football, cricket and tennis.

There are allotments in the centre of the village. Sailing is available at the lakes off the Abingdon Road and fishing is available on both Rivers Thames and Thame, and on the lakes. Residents and visitors have a wide choice of footpaths to walk both locally and further afield, including the Hurst Water Meadows. Carnvial and fancy are popular activities on the Thames although their boats are required to be protected around Days Lock. We are negotiating with WADC to be restored and access from the river to be made available to ensure that the benefits from tourism continue.

4.5.3. Policies

DoT17: Business and Employment
Developments which retain support and enhance existing retail, commercial and home working businesses and employment, whilst protecting the agricultural nature of the area and maintaining the character and natural environment of the village, will be encouraged.

DoT18: Tourism and Leisure
Developments which support tourism and leisure enterprises which are based on the conservation and enjoyment of the qualities of the area will be supported. We are committed to providing safe footpaths and bridleways, recognising the large number of walkers and cyclists who visit the Thame path and the need for additional paths into the village to be accessible to the elderly and disabled persons.

5. Summary of policies

All the policies in this plan will be considered against the prime objective as set out in paragraph 4.1.1. “To nurture and protect the natural and built environment of the village for future generations to enjoy.”

The sensitive management of the exceptional historic and natural environment of Dorchester should underpin all development decisions in order to provide for a sustainable future for the village. The enjoyment and understanding of this unique community will be dependent on a robust strategy for periodic monitoring of ways by which this objective can be achieved and it demands that the Parish Council should set up a quinquennial review for the duration of the plan. Where appropriate the Parish Council may be assisted by groups, such as FASG and FOGAW (which are recognised as having been formed to represent the interests of the area hence enabling the work of the parish council to continue).

5.2. Natural environment, wildlife and biodiversity
Appendix 8: SODC Comments on the 2017 Pre-Submission

DoT4. Any developments or change of use of land likely to have an impact on the River Thames or River Thame will be supported only if it protects and/or enhances biodiversity, is greater than the 10m buffer recommended by the EA, and provides continued tranquillity and enjoyment of the natural environment for the public, for example, through managed sustainable tourism, education and leisure purposes.

DoT5. Development on sites likely to have an impact on Community Meadows as shown on the Policy Map will be supported only where they make a positive contribution to the ecology of those sites.

DoT6. Development will be supported only when it retains, protects and enhances for future generations to enjoy, local green infrastructure (green spaces and verges) including all bridleways and footpaths as identified on the Policy Map together with those paths which are yet to be recorded on the Definitive Map but for which there has been long-standing (in excess of 20 year) customary use. Paths as yet unrecorded will be subject to applications prior to the statutory deadline of 2026, in order to preserve access for future generations.

DoT7. Alternative land uses in the areas shown in the Policy Map representing the most versatile and highest quality agricultural land in the Parish will only be supported where they protect agricultural employment and protect the non-renewable land resource.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Section/Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Executive Summary final paragraph (page 4)</td>
<td>This final draft of the Plan is now provided for review and consultation with residents, following which any possible amendments arising from this review will be considered by the Parish Council and NDP team. The Plan will be revised as appropriate prior to submission to statutory consultees and the local planning authority; then for independent examination, before being put forward for referendum within the Parish and then, hopefully, formal adoption.</td>
<td>Please delete the highlighted text “statutory consultees and”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction – Paragraph 3, 4 and 5 (page 5)</td>
<td>This does not, however, give us free rein to decide anything we want. Neighbourhood Development Plans must still meet the policies of District Councils' Local Plans and must also take into account the relevant Regional Councils' strategic assessment of housing needs and other development issues. They must also comply with European and national legislation.</td>
<td>Amend wording to: This does not, however, give us free rein to decide anything we want. Neighbourhood Development Plans must meet basic conditions and legal requirements. We suggested a few minor modifications to make it more precise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2. What is in this document? (page 6)</td>
<td>This document sets the strategic direction of settlements in our district are set by the council’s adopted Development Plan. Neighbourhood plans enable communities to develop a shared vision and policies that help them get the right types of influence the planning system. Neighbourhood plans give communities a stronger voice in shaping their future.</td>
<td>Amend wording to: 2.2. What is in this document? (page 6) This document sets a shared vision for Dorchester on Thames.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Section/Policy</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Natural Environment, Housing, Economy, Tourism and Leisure. The Page 6 background and issues related to each of these are considered under paras. 4.1 to 4.5. These lead separately to a number of policy proposals, and these are summarised in paras. 5.1 to 5.5.</td>
<td>development for their area where their ambition is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the district.</td>
<td>and policies for the Built Environment, Natural Environment, Housing, Economy, Tourism and Leisure aimed at shaping the development and growth of the local area. The Page 6 background and issues related to each of these are considered under paras. 4.1 to 4.5. These lead separately to a number of policy proposals, and these are summarised in paras. 5.1 to 5.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.3. The main issue

Without question, the main issue has been housing (how much, where, when, size, affordability?) complicated by changes in perceived requirements. Will Dorchester continue to be designated a small village with no specific housing allocation or a large one with a required housing provision? The recent draft proposals for the 2031 Local Plan would require the SODC to meet greatly increased numbers of houses. This has led to a series of draft and redrafted housing policies as the NDP has sought to meet each new demand. It is believed that the housing policies as now presented will fully meet SODC

It is important that the neighbourhood plan is as up-to-date as possible.

Please review this section and reference the emerging South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2033 – Second Preferred Options (direct link here)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Section/Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Heritage section General comments</td>
<td>Comments from SODC Conservation Officer: The NDP should introduce a Dorchester and Overy Heritage Area - likely to be the extended boundaries drawn on the existing conservation area maps - then they will be in a really strong position to protect those extended areas with their policies. If they leave it as is I think there would be potential for developers to argue that the areas are outside the designated conservation area so the statutory tests and policies they have written do not apply. I really think if they turn it around so that the area is specific to the neighbourhood plan then the policies will have much greater weight. It could be a really long time before we re-appraise Dorchester so all their hard work would be for very little. I do not think there is any strength in referring to the area as the ‘amended conservation area’ because it hasn’t been formally amended so has no weight and arguably the policies not be sufficiently robust as a result. We have made a number of suggestions which we hope will make your policies more robust and based on a defined plan area that has weight from the moment the neighbourhood plan is adopted rather than relying upon the local authority adopting a boundary revision – which is</td>
<td>We recommend that the NDP introduces a Dorchester and Overy Heritage Area. The extended boundaries drawn on the existing conservation area maps may be used to mark the boundary of the locally identified proposed heritage area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.1.4. Conservation Area Character Studies

The conservation area character studies were approved by SODC on 2 September 2004. They have stood the test of time and provide a comprehensive analysis of the intrinsic character of Dorchester and Overy. Apart from a few minor alterations to take account of subsequent changes and discoveries, the text and the policies remain an essential tool in the positive management of the historic environment. A number of the potential enhancement schemes set out in the associated Management Plans approved by SODC on 16 June 2005 have been implemented. Please see comments and recommendation number 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Section/Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6              | 4.1.4. Conservation Area Character Studies | unlikely to happen in the near future. If I can make the attached comments more clear or if you would rather have an annotated version of the plan please let me know. I should point out these comments are made without the benefit of seeing the maps so I can’t actually comment on the acceptability of the proposed area or its suitability but the wording of the accompanying text and policies is considered acceptable subject to the proposed modifications. | Replace the highlighted text with “Proposed updated Appraisal and Management Plans”.

### Page 20

The appraisal maps which accompanied the character studies for Dorchester and Overy sought to show important views, walls, trees, open spaces and buildings of local note as well as listed buildings and the conservation area boundary. However, in our view the maps are deficient in that they omit some significant views and do not include the boundaries of the Scheduled Ancient Monuments which are such an important part of the historic character of Dorchester (Appendix 3). Although the text of the character study emphasises the importance of boundary walls to the appearance of the village, many of them are not marked on the maps. Accordingly we have revised the maps to include the additional boundary walls and significant views. (Appendices 1 and 2). There is some confusion about the status of the undesignated buildings which are marked as of ‘local note’ and these have been deleted from the revised text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Section/Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7              | Page 20        | A new subheading is needed here in order to help the following sections to be read as separate from the ‘4.1.6. Proposals to SODC’ and therefore make the policies more robust. It is important to note that the district does not have a published district wide local list. | Amend wording to: Dorchester and Overy Heritage Area Following assessment of the designated conservation areas of Dorchester and Overy, a number of areas outside of the designated boundaries have been identified as worthy of inclusion within a defined heritage area. This Dorchester and Overy Heritage Area is shown in Appendices 1 & 2 and discussed below. The appraisal maps which accompanied the character studies for the designated conservation areas of Dorchester and Overy sought to show important views, walls, trees, open spaces and buildings of local note as well as listed buildings and the conservation area boundary. However, in our view the maps are deficient in that they omit some significant views and do not include the boundaries of the Scheduled Monuments which are such an important part of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Section/Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on the appraisal maps. Only two of them are included on the separately published District-wide list of &quot;buildings of local interest&quot;. In the interests of clarity all these buildings should be added to that list. We have compiled Appendix 5 to give their addresses and a brief statement of their interest and marked them on the revised maps. Appendix 5 also includes those buildings outside the conservation areas which are of local interest and which should be treated as undesignated heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
<td>historic character of Dorchester (Appendix 3). Although the text of the character study emphasises the importance of boundary walls to the appearance of the village, many of them are not marked on the maps. These features are identified on the Dorchester and Overy Heritage Area maps in Appendices 1 &amp; 2. There is some confusion about the status of the undesignated buildings which are marked as of 'local note' on the appraisal maps. We have compiled Appendix 5 to give their addresses and a brief statement of their interest and marked them on the revised maps. Appendix 5 also includes those buildings outside the designated conservation areas which are of local interest and which should be treated as undesignated heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1.5. Archaeology Final sentence</td>
<td>Please see comments and recommendation number 5</td>
<td>Amend wording to: “…The Demesne Field, which is currently outside the Dorchester conservation area, also contains evidence for important underlying archaeological remains. Amend wording to: “…The Demesne Field, which is currently outside the designated Dorchester conservation area, also contains evidence for important underlying archaeological remains (Appendix 4)”. This area has been included within the Dorchester and Overy Heritage Area (see Appendices 1 &amp; 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.6. Proposals</td>
<td>The council’s conservation officer recommended that these are re-ordered so that point 1 becomes point 4 to emphasise the priorities. Other proposed modifications relate to comments number 5.</td>
<td>Amend wording to: 1. That the buildings set out in Appendix 5 are formally adopted by SODC as a local list of non-designated heritage assets. 2. That the Overy conservation area should be revised to include the field between Overy Lane and the A4074 as shown on the appended map. Appendix 2. 3. That the Dorchester Conservation Area should be revised to include the Demesne Field. Appendix 1. 4. That the Dorchester and Overy Heritage Area maps are used to inform boundary extensions and revise the detail captured on the 2005 adopted Appraisal and Management Plan maps, as set out in Appendices 1 &amp; 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Section/Policy</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attractive walls… which make such an important contribution to the character of the conservation area’. However, the Appraisal Map only identifies a small selection of these Page 22 walls. Paragraph 2 - Page 22</td>
<td>The importance of all these walls as marked on the amended Appraisal Map (Appendix 1) should be a material consideration in any development proposals that might affect their integrity. Some of them are in a poor condition and a revised Management Plan should include their appropriate repair as an objective of enhancement.</td>
<td>draws particular attention to ‘the many attractive walls… which make such an important contribution to the character of the conservation area’. However, the SODC Appraisal Map only identifies a small selection of these walls. Paragraph 2 - Page 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Views and trees (Page 22)</td>
<td>There is no Views policy in the policies section. There is sufficient evidence here to add one if desired along the lines of: Development should preserve or better reveal those views and vistas which contribute to the significance of Dorchester and Overy and the heritage assets within them, as shown on the maps at appendices 1&amp;2. Development proposals should identify how a scheme has been informed by these important views and proposals that would preserve these views and the contribution they make to the important setting of a number of heritage assets will be looked on favourably.</td>
<td>Please consider adding a policy relating to views and replace “Appraisal Maps for both Dorchester and Overy” at the end of paragraph 1 with “Dorchester and Overy Heritage Area Maps”…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Buildings of local note (Page 23) The justification for adding further buildings of local note is set out in Appendix 5. It includes two buildings outside the conservation area and provides a reasoned explanation for those buildings which were previously simply identified on the Appraisal Maps. Having provided this additional information it is hoped that the District Council will formally adopt the Appendix as a list of undesignated heritage assets.</td>
<td>Please see comments and recommendation number 5</td>
<td>Amend wording to: The justification for adding further buildings of local note is set out in Appendix 5. It includes two buildings outside the designated conservation area and provides a reasoned explanation for those buildings which are currently simply identified on the designated Conservation Appraisal maps (2005). It is also hoped that the District Council will formally adopt the Appendix as a local list of undesignated heritage assets. These assets are considered non-designated heritage assets in line with assessment criteria in the Historic England Advice Note 7: Local Heritage Listing and are awarded material consideration under paragraph 135 of the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Extension to Overy Conservation Area &amp; Extension to Dorchester Conservation Area” (Pages 23 and 24)</td>
<td>Please see comments and recommendation number 5</td>
<td>Please re-label this section: Dorchester and Overy Heritage Area: Description of the areas outside the designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Section/Policy</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DoT 1: Historic Environment (page 24)</td>
<td>Developments which maintain or enhance the historic environment as identified in the amended Dorchester and Overy Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Plans as contributing to the established character of the conservation areas as set out in Appendices 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this Plan will be supported. As the NDP proposes amendments to the appraisals and plans, this policy is necessary until such time as the local authority formally adopts the proposals. The evidence base for the amendments is described in 4.1.6 above.</td>
<td>Please see comments and recommendation number 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>DoT 2: Buildings of Interest (Page 24)</td>
<td>Please see comments and recommendation number 5</td>
<td>Please omit the word “amended” when referring to the local list in the first paragraph of the policy. Please delete the last part of the policy: “As the NDP proposes additions to the local list this policy is necessary until such time as the amended list is formally adopted by the local authority. The evidence base for inclusion on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Section/Policy</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>DoT 3: Traffic and Car Parking (Page 25)</td>
<td>This is not a heritage policy and has no supporting evidence/text.</td>
<td>Please merge this policy with DoT 11 or create a dedicated parking policy. Please also consider re-labelling Policy DoT 11 removing mention of the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17             | DoT 4: River Impact                  | Neighbourhood planning policies should be positively worded and should not place blanket restrictions. | Amend wording to: DoT 4: River Impact Any developments or change of use of land likely to have an impact on the River Thames or River Thame should:  
• protects and/or enhances biodiversity, 
• Be located 10m away from banks of the river, and 
• Preserve the tranquility and enjoyment of the natural environment for the public, where possible. |
<p>| 18             | DoT 5: Community Meadows             | Neighbourhood planning policies should be positively worded and should not place blanket restrictions. | Amend wording to: DoT 5: Community Meadows Development proposals on sites likely to have an impact on the identified Community Meadows on the Policy Map should make a positive contribution to the ecology of those sites. |
| 19             | DoT 6: Green Infrastructure          | Neighbourhood planning policies should be positively worded and should not place blanket restrictions. | Amend wording to: DoT 6: Green Infrastructure Development should retain, protects and enhance, for future generations to enjoy, local green infrastructure (green spaces and verges) including all bridleways and footpaths as identified on the Policy Map. |
|                | 4.3.3 Policy Justifications           | Development will be supported only when it retains, protects and enhances for future generations to enjoy, local green infrastructure (green spaces and verges) including all bridleways and footpaths as identified on the Policy Map. | DoT 6: Green Infrastructure Development should retain, protects and enhance, for future generations to enjoy, local green infrastructure (green spaces and verges) including all bridleways and footpaths as identified on the Policy Map. |
| 20             | DoT 7: Agricultural Land Use         | Please see comment number 19                                             | Amend wording to: Alternative land uses in the areas shown on the Policy Map, representing the most versatile and highest quality agricultural land in the Parish should be protected for agricultural employment opportunities and protect the non-renewable land resource. |
| 21             | 4.3.3 Policy Justifications Paragraph 1 | Planning policies should be clear and precise. Please clarify whether ‘small’ family homes relate to ‘small’ in size or ‘small’ in bedroom numbers. | Amend wording to: The policies in the plan support infill development where it is appropriate to its existing surroundings and where it helps to maintain a balanced housing mix within the village. This includes small family homes in suitable locations, or homes suitable for older people, with a predominance of smaller homes to meet the established demand. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Section/Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Affordable Housing (Page 33)</td>
<td>This section mentions Belcher Court, a sheltered scheme that SOHA are re-developing.</td>
<td>We would suggest that the Parish Council talks to SOHA directly about their plans for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Policy context (Page 35)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood plans should be based on the most up-to-date evidence. The evidence base behind the district council's emerging local plan is fundamental to the policy context of this section. You have accurately captured the fact that the adopted Core Strategy does not promote site allocations in this area. It would be helpful to clarify that whilst the emerging local plan proposes growth of 5% to 10%, the neighbourhood plan is unable to allocate sites for housing due to greenbelt constraints. This would more accurately set the context for your support of rural exception schemes. The Council will work closely with parish councils and local communities to progress rural exception schemes however there is no requirement that these must be supported or initiated by the Parish Council.</td>
<td>Please review the wording to address the concerns raised by the council. Please delete: &quot;and it is supported or initiated by the Parish Council&quot; at the end of the second sentence. The emerging Local Plan does not specify site size for rural exception sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24            | Policies DoT8 and DoT9 (page 35 and 36) | Response: Dorchester-on-Thames draft Neighbourhood Plan  
From: Housing Development  
Date: 221 April 2017  
Please amend policy DoT8 to:  
Small scale infill developments will be supported where they respect national designations such as Green Belt, reflect the character of their immediate area in terms of scale, design and layout. Schemes of eleven or more dwellings will be required to demonstrate that the mix of dwelling types and sizes is appropriate and relate to the needs of current and future households in Dorchester. This should recognise the need for one, two or three bedroom dwellings.  
Amend policy DoT9 to:  
20% of all new Affordable Housing in Dorchester provided by the plan will, on first lettings only, be subject to a local connection.  
A local connection is defined as:  
a) a person who is resident in the NDP area. The residency will need to be permanent and have lived in the area at least six months out of the last 12 or 3 years out of the last 5, or  
b) a person who is in permanent paid employment or has a fixed term contract for a minimum of one year or permanent offer of paid employment in the area, or is self-employed and works predominantly in the area or  
c) a person with close family (grandparents, parents, legal guardian, adult siblings) living in the area or  

Our comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan version are:  
The Neighbourhood Plan refers to National, County and District housing and planning policies to set the context and framework for the proposed polices DoT8 and DoT9.  
DoT8 Housing infill developments  
SODC policy requires that on all developments of 11 units or more 40% must be affordable with 75% rented and 25% shared ownership. In ANOB areas developments between 6 – 10 units will incur a financial contribution for affordable housing in lieu of an affordable home.  

DoT9 Affordable housing for local people.  
All affordable housing delivered has to be available to meet a district wide need, although the Councils Allocations Policy does enable up to 20% of new build affordable rented homes to be allocated to households with a specified local connection on first lettings only. This can only apply on sites large enough to deliver at least 5 affordable homes for rent. To give an example a site of 20 new homes would require a District level affordable housing requirement of 40% with the resulting units being split 75/25 rent/shared ownership respectively. In this instance that would mean 8 of the units would be affordable with 6 for rent and 2 for shared ownership, with 1 of the rented units being specified for a local connection.  

Terms of scale, design and layout.  
Schemes of eleven or more dwellings will be required to demonstrate that the mix of dwelling types and sizes is appropriate and relate to the needs of current and future households in Dorchester. This should recognise the need for one, two or three bedroom dwellings.  

Amend policy DoT9 to:  
20% of all new Affordable Housing in Dorchester provided by the plan will, on first lettings only, be subject to a local connection.  
A local connection is defined as:  
a) a person who is resident in the NDP area. The residency will need to be permanent and have lived in the area at least six months out of the last 12 or 3 years out of the last 5, or  
b) a person who is in permanent paid employment or has a fixed term contract for a minimum of one year or permanent offer of paid employment in the area, or is self-employed and works predominantly in the area or  
c) a person with close family (grandparents, parents, legal guardian, adult siblings) living in the area or  

Please amend policy DoT8 to:  
Small scale infill developments will be supported where they respect national designations such as Green Belt, reflect the character of their immediate area in terms of scale, design and layout. Schemes of eleven or more dwellings will be required to demonstrate that the mix of dwelling types and sizes is appropriate and relate to the needs of current and future households in Dorchester. This should recognise the need for one, two or three bedroom dwellings.  

Amend policy DoT9 to:  
20% of all new Affordable Housing in Dorchester provided by the plan will, on first lettings only, be subject to a local connection.  
A local connection is defined as:  
a) a person who is resident in the NDP area. The residency will need to be permanent and have lived in the area at least six months out of the last 12 or 3 years out of the last 5, or  
b) a person who is in permanent paid employment or has a fixed term contract for a minimum of one year or permanent offer of paid employment in the area, or is self-employed and works predominantly in the area or  
c) a person with close family (grandparents, parents, legal guardian, adult siblings) living in the area or  

To achieve Affordable Housing that is allocated with a priority for local people in perpetuity the Neighbourhood Plan has explored Rural Exception Schemes, for these to go ahead it will mean updating your housing needs survey, which should be under 5 years old as a general rule, to comply as part of the evidence base for the instigation of developing a Rural Exception Site. As a housing development team we work pro-actively with parishes to explore this option further.

We would recommend that the draft policy is slightly re-worded to comply fully with the allocations policy of SODC.

Whilst we recognise that the Neighbourhood Plan team has taken account of the SHMA, Government Welfare reform, introduced since the production of the SHMA, has seen a significant increase in the demand for two bedroom accommodation for rent with a reduction in demand for larger rented family homes due to the changes in eligibility for Housing Benefit.

Although the demand for 3 and 4 bedroom properties has reduced there is a need for some families to have access to larger 3 bedroom houses with capacity for 6 bed spaces if they are not currently eligible for 4 bedroom accommodation. The SHMA recognises that, whilst the demand for one bedroom accommodation is also high for rented units, this

size of accommodation provides less flexibility in meeting changing household need and that there is potential for greater turnover as a result of household moves. Changes in Housing Benefit payments also impact on the eligibility of single people in particular for a self-contained unit. The requirement for councils to meet the needs of homeless families may also indicate a need for a bias away from one-bedroom to two bedroom provision. The demand for two-bedroom shared ownership properties is much higher than for one-bedroom properties, therefore the overall affordable housing mix may be more suitably delivered with a higher proportion of two bedroom properties than is indicated in the SHMA guidance. In general, it is anticipated that the mix of affordable housing should reflect the significant demand for two bedroom units for both rented and shared ownership tenures with a reduction in one-bedroom accommodation and an adjustment to the number of larger homes.

If the Neighbourhood Plan team would like any further advice or help in drafting these policies please do get in touch with the Housing Development team at SODC.

It is also worth the Neighbourhood Plan team looking through the housing white paper.

Jan Phillips
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Section/Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>DoT 11 Conservation Area Development - Parking Proposals for all new homes to be built within the Dorchester Conservation Area must area provide an effective plan to mitigate the impact of additional on-street parking.</td>
<td>Please see comments and recommendation number 16</td>
<td>Merge this policy with Policy DoT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>DoT 14: Tourism Recognising Dorchester’s prime position as a national and international tourist destination and also the historical and recreational value of the River Thames itself, development proposals will be encouraged where they promote tourism for the benefit of local businesses and the community as a whole without having an adverse impact on the village’s character and natural environment</td>
<td>This policy could be merged with DoT 18: Tourism and Leisure</td>
<td>Please consider merging this policy with Policy DoT18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>DoT 16: Peace and Tranquility The peace and tranquility of the village is highly valued by its residents and those who visit. Any development related to tourism and leisure which could increase the level of general disturbance or bring about an increased demand for or loss of car parking should include measures of mitigation.</td>
<td>Paragraph 123 of the National Planning policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that planning policies should aim to: • avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development; • mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions; • recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established; and • identify and protect areas of tranquility which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.</td>
<td>Amend wording to: The peace and tranquility of the village is highly valued by its residents and those who visit. Any development that gives rise to significant levels of noise and traffic should include measures to mitigate significant negative effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>DoT 17: Business and Employment Planning policies should be clear and precise.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amend wording to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Section/Policy</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developments which retain support and enhance existing retail, commercial and home working businesses and employment, whilst protecting the agricultural nature of the area and maintaining the character and natural environment of the village, will be encouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development proposals for enhancing retail facilities, facilitating home working, and creating employment opportunities will be encouraged. These developments should not have any significant adverse impact on the village’s character and natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>DoT 18: Tourism and Leisure</td>
<td>Developments which support tourism and leisure enterprises which are based on the conservation and enjoyment of the qualities of the area will be supported.</td>
<td>Please see comment number 26 This policy could be merged with DoT 14: Tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 9 List of Key Consultation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>HARD COPY</th>
<th>DIGITAL REF.</th>
<th>INTERNET REF.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2005</td>
<td>Publication of Parish Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distributed to all households in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.07.2012</td>
<td>PC informal meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First steps by PC, led to plans for 1st village meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2012</td>
<td>Review (Follow-up) of 2005 Parish Plan in Dorchester News (Dorchester News)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refers back to Parish Plan 2005, and reviews options, issues, and next steps. Taster event is ‘All our yesterdays’ 3-day exhibition in Village Hall, 5-7.10.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep/Oct 2012</td>
<td>PC pre-launch publicity for 1st Parish meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DN is distributed to all households in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10.2012</td>
<td>1st Parish open meeting re NDP</td>
<td>Planning for Dorchester’s future</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitated by Anton Nath (ORCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
<td>Report of above meeting in DN</td>
<td>Planning for Dorchester’s future</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary analysis of results, main issues identified as housing (affordability, size, location) and environment (rural and built)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.12.2012</td>
<td>1st NDP Steering group meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.01.2013</td>
<td>2nd Steering group meeting</td>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of progress of NDP and CLP. No formal minutes, notes on back of agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2013</td>
<td>Formal agreement with SODC</td>
<td>Dorchester proposed Neighbourhood Plan area consultation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes timeline for actions to date by SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.03.2013</td>
<td>Analysis of 21.10.2012 questionnaire</td>
<td>Dorchester on Thames Key issues as of Jan 2013</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-it notes collated on 20pp of A4, main issues related to CLP items plus availability of housing used in numerical order by topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.02.2013</td>
<td>CPRE Workshop</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Plans – getting started workshop, Didcot, Village Hall</td>
<td>email Mark S 20130110</td>
<td>4 places reserved</td>
<td>Are feedbacks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2013</td>
<td>DN April (30th and May)</td>
<td>Planning for Dorchester’s future – April update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>SO/D consultation on parish boundary, work on vision and objectives for NDP and CLP, announcement of Public Consultation at APM on 15 May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 9 List of Key Consultation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>HARD COPY</th>
<th>DIGITAL REF.</th>
<th>INTERNET REF.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.04.13</td>
<td>Brookes Uni workshop</td>
<td>On ND planning, attended by Chairman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>May issue</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Included inserts and answer slips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.05.2013</td>
<td>Annual Parish Council Meeting</td>
<td>NDP Public Consultation prior to APM</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Discussion and feedback on above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.06.2013</td>
<td>Feedback from Public Consultation</td>
<td>Attached to MS email 24.06</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Some useful comment on housing, but rest is mostly on CLP issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.07.2013</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul/Aug 2013</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>July update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Green page item in DN introduced for all NDP reports, then used for Parish Council notices as well. Approval of Vision and Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.08.13</td>
<td>CS Note</td>
<td>Amended schedule attached</td>
<td>20130820_NDP Tracker.xls</td>
<td>Schedule, fairly basic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.10.2013</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20131017_NDP October 17 meeting notes.doc</td>
<td>Routine updates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>October update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Schedule and budget submitted to SODC, priority areas for discussion summarized, input welcomed. CLP issues on main concerns buses and parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.11.2013</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20131128_NDP November 28 meeting notes.doc</td>
<td>David Chetwin had agreed to chair, but group agreed he should be asked to comment on final draft. PC was asked appoint a new chair familiar with Dorchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NDP meeting Feedback from Excellent turnout. Feedback recorded.
20140319_draftNDP

### Chairman’s Report
INTERNET REF.
Minutes Drafting review

### July/August update
20140422_Dorchester
Chairman’s notes

### Discussion of impact of Local Plan 2031 and draft 4 of Public consultation
Work continues on plans and policies. By end of March group expects to have finalized options for each of the village objectives

### June update
Dorchester News May update yes

### July update
Dorchester News June update yes

### July/Aug update
Dorchester News July/August update yes

### NDP meeting Minutes
25.03.2014

### NDP meeting Minutes for 17 April meeting
30.04.2014

### PC’s APM Chairman’s Report
May 2014

### NDP meeting April update yes
June 2014

### NDP meeting Minutes
July 2014

### NDP meeting Minutes
July/Aug 2014

### NDP First Review yes
Minutes

### NDP meeting
Chairman takes Chair

### First Review yes
Minutes

### SDLT leader’s comments, no risk of declassification

### NDP response to Local plan 2031 forwarded by PC to Greenbelt discussion and PC recommended refusal of Abingdon Rd development

### Very useful feedback, only circulated within NDP

### Finalising Pre-submission draft

---

**Appendix 9 List of Key Consultation Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>HARD COPY</th>
<th>DIGITAL REF.</th>
<th>INTERNET REF.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>January update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Draft NDP</td>
<td>Subgroup objectives for NDP and CLP agreed, now working on possible plans and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.02.2014</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes attached</td>
<td>20140224_NDP_Febuary_2014_draft_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>MS resumed chair. More feedback on London conference, Great Coxwell NDP used as template for Dorchester’s summary document. Routine updates and action points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2014</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>February update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20140319_draftNDP_Document_1_19.03.2014.doc</td>
<td>Work continues on plans and policies. By end of March group expects to have finalized options for each of the village objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.03.2014</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20140319_draftNDP_Document_1_19.03.2014.doc</td>
<td>1st draft of NDP document 2014, with cover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.04.2014</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes attached for 17 April meeting</td>
<td>20140422_Dorchester_NDP_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>Details of action points and SODC responses to queries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.04.2014</td>
<td>PC’s APM</td>
<td>Chairman’s Report</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>NDP summarised: CLP matters now being taken forward by PC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>April update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Drafting options. Many villagers attended AgeUK event in Village Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>May update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Update on NDP at PC’s APM On 30 April. Newcomer’s meeting included NDP displays. Consultation on draft plan deferred to the autumn. New information on Rural Exception Sites means NDP cannot allocate Affordable Housing to specific areas. Helpful advice from SODC staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>June update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Nothing new in this brief update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/Aug 2014</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>July/August update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>SODC’s staff gave critical analysis 3rd draft of the plan, greatly welcomed by NDP. Implications of new SODC Local plan 2031 to be assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.07.2014</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20140719_NDP_S_7_July_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>Discussion of impact of Local Plan 2031 and draft 4 of NDP. Concern about proposed settlement reorganisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.08.2014</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20140825_NDP_August_23_meeting_notes</td>
<td>Potential for 5 houses in Abingdon Rd site. Draft 5 of the Plan reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Appendix 9 List of Key Consultation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>HARD COPY</th>
<th>DIGITAL REF.</th>
<th>INTERNET REF.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>September update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20140925_NDP_Sep 25_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>NDP response to local plan 2031 forwarded by PC to SODC. Detailed critique of Settlement Hierarchy, SHMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10.2014</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20140925_NDP_Sep 25_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>PC recommended refusal of Abingdon Rd development. Detailed SODC comment on Draft 6, to be confirmed in writing. No concern about Hurst trustees comments of use of Thames, Desmesne field policy proposal for woods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>November update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2nd draft of plan finished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11.2014</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20141117_NDP_October_23rd_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>Abingdon Rd owners wish to discuss. MS to take forward further amendments to Draft 6. Village consultation fixed for January 15 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.11.2014</td>
<td>January consultation</td>
<td>Slides for presentation</td>
<td>20141117_NDP_January_consultation_v2.pptx</td>
<td>All slides on file</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.01.2015</td>
<td>Public consultation</td>
<td>NDP round 1 review</td>
<td>20140131_NDP_January_2015</td>
<td>Excellent turnout. Feedback recorded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2015 (delivered late Jan)</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>January update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Full details of programme for Public Consultation. Most important event in whole NDP process. Public participation urged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>March update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from many attendees, now being analysed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.09.2015</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20150921_NDP_September_25th_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>Change of PC committee membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.10.2015</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20151028_NDP_October_25th_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>Drafting review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12.2015</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>20151218_NDP_December_23rd_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>Chris Smith stands down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.01.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Chairmen’s notes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Hill takes Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.02.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Chairmen’s notes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.02.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Chairmen’s notes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2016 (delivered late Jan)</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>PC public meeting Desmesne Field, Green Belt declassification</td>
<td></td>
<td>SODC – leader’s comments, no risk of declassification foreseen, unless NDP does not complete its Plan asap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.01.2016</td>
<td>Public consultation</td>
<td>Greenbelt discussion and site review</td>
<td></td>
<td>SODC leader’s comments, no risk of declassification foreseen, unless NDP does not complete its Plan asap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.02.2016</td>
<td>Feedback from 31st January consultation</td>
<td>Photos Spreadsheet analysis</td>
<td>20150215_NDP_31stJanuary_meeting_notes.doc</td>
<td>Winsted email 15.02.2016</td>
<td>Very useful feedback, only circulated within NDP members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 16.03.2016 | NDP meeting | Finalising Pre-submission copy | 20160316_NDP_31stMarch_meeting_notes.doc | |}
### Appendix 9 List of Key Consultation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>HARD COPY</th>
<th>DIGITAL REF.</th>
<th>INTERNET REF.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>April update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.05.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>May update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reminder of consultation opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.07.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Chairman’s notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>July update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.08.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions re allocation issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.09.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions re allocation issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.10.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>October update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2016</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>November update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.12.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Chairman’s notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>December update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.12.2016</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Map review</td>
<td>Included N Draycott to review online map layers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review NDP draft v11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.01.2017</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Map review</td>
<td>Included N Draycott to review online map annotations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review NDP draft v12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.02.2017</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Included N Draycott to review online map legends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.02.2017</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Review NDP draft v12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2017</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>February update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.03.2017</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.03.2017</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.03.2017 to 08.05.2017</td>
<td>Public &amp; statutory consultation</td>
<td>Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="https://www.dorchester-on-thames.co.uk/ndp/plan-v1-1.pdf">https://www.dorchester-on-thames.co.uk/ndp/plan-v1-1.pdf</a></td>
<td>Feedback recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>April update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.05.2017</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.05.2017</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Selection of consultant to produce Basic Conditions Statement. Further review of feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.05.2017</td>
<td>Annual Parish Meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Public meeting, update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.06.2017</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Review First draft Consultation Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>June update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.07.2017</td>
<td>NDP meeting</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review NDP final v5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>July update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2017</td>
<td>Dorchester News</td>
<td>September update</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Update re target Submission end August/Early September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DORCHESTER-ON-THAMES

NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN