

2018 Final Consultation Comments Log - Policies				
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment	Response
Historic England	33	DH 1	Pleased to note the inclusion of robust policy (DH1) to achieve positive design including for the public realm, whilst retaining and enhancing local distinctiveness	Agreed
Historic England	34	DH 2	Notes this section refers to "Grade 1 and Grade 11" buildings and recommend that this is altered to "Grade II" to reflect the way in which the grades are written in national policy and to avoid "Grade Eleven" buildings, for example. We would also suggest that the requirements for policy DH2 could be backed up by the production of an Historic Area Assessment that includes characterisation analysis incorporating a discussion around local materials and form. This can then be included as an appendix to your plan, and referenced in your policy	Modification agreed An historic area assessment could be included in the evidence documents and be referred to in the neighbourhood plan. It is not good practice technical reports in the neighbourhood plan itself. This makes for an over-thick and complex plan. Key historic area assessments are referred to in the plan.
Historic England		Assets of Community Value	Suggests that NDP could also incorporate the designation of Assets of Community Value as well. This can include local community assets such as public houses, libraries, and others. This can help protect them from being lost to redevelopment or - from the point of view of the community - undesirable adaptation. More information on this process and its benefits can be found on the Locality website. They note the inclusion of a map and a list of 'Village Assets', some of which appear from their descriptions to be good candidates for this process. They suggest also that some - for example the War Memorial, if it is not already designated - could be included on a list of 'Village Heritage Assets' that are assessed against a set of suitable criteria and then afforded the same protection as non-designated heritage assets are given in Policy DH3. See Historic England website for guidance.	Designations of assets of community value is done under non-planning legislation. If assets of community value are included, it must be in a non-statutory part of the NP. Community assets are already incorporated in the discussion part of the neighbourhood plan.
Bedfordia	22	BE 1	Supports the recognition of the importance of local businesses and employment in the village of Oakley but considers the policy should see a minor revision to recognise the opportunity for sensitive expansion of Highfield Park. Please refer to the letter submitted with these representations for further information.	This site is outside the settlement area and should not be extended.
EMC Designs		All Policies	Strongly agrees which is why I believe the site opposite the Bedford Arms goes against everything you have taken great pains to consult over and plan for.	Agreed with the policies. Site 170 has been considered and allocated. It helps meet the growth requirement.

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment	Response
Oakley AFC		All Policies	Agree	Agree
Clapham PC		All Policies	Agree. The principles of good practice in providing a plan have been completed and the Oakley plan is based on a methodical approach by the people of Oakley to support actively sustainable development. It identifies the future needs for Oakley, to ensure that the plan supports the growth of the village in a way that protects the landscape around Oakley village, and ensures key services and infrastructure are not overstretched.	Agree
Bedford BC		Policies - general	The Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of maps that illustrate how and where specific policies apply. It would be helpful if these could be combined to produce a single Policies Map.	Keep the maps that illustrate how and where specific policies apply
Bedford BC	20	HG 2	The reference to “evidence of local housing need” pre-supposes that an objective assessment of local need is being kept up-to-date, against which the developer’s justification can be judged. Who will be responsible for this? The text reference to space standards should be included in the policy (and reference made to your supporting evidence) that justifies use of this standard.	The developer will be responsible. This is a national standard.
Bedford BC	22	BE 1	A map would be useful to show the extent of the business parks.	Agreed a map to be added
Bedford BC	22	BE 2	You should define what is meant by “the existing centre of Oakley” so that the Council will know how to apply the policy.	Changed to show the centre of Oakley by a boundary
Bedford BC	24	BE 4	As written, the policy sets a very high bar which may not be achievable in all situations. The word “must” should be changed to “should wherever reasonably possible”. The requirement to “not impact negatively on the functionality of the existing telecommunications infrastructure” is unlikely to be capable of assessment by the Council. Further explanation is needed or it should be deleted. The supporting text refers to a requirement for a “connectivity statement” to be submitted with planning applications. This would require an amendment to the Council’s Local Validation List for Planning Applications. I am not aware that you have reached any agreement with the Council that such a change can be made and until that has been agreed the requirement in the Neighbourhood Plan could not be enforced.	The wording to BE4 changed. Telecommunications infrastructure deleted. There is no reason why a new development should not incorporate high speed connectivity within sites as this is within the control of the developer. This makes all developments ready for higher speed services, when the wider infrastructure is provided. It is for the LPA to decide whether it amends its local validation list. This to be discussed with the LPA

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment	Response
Bedford BC	28	LE 1	<p>The policy heading refers to “Sensitive Landscapes” although the policy and supporting map refers to “significant landscape areas”. A consistent term should be used to make the policy clear.</p> <p>The policy refers to the supporting map for the boundaries of “significant landscape areas”, however it is not clear from the map which these are (the map includes a number of colour shaded areas, none of which is defined in a legend).</p> <p>The supporting map shows “Local Gap” and “Important Landscape Views”, however these are not defined in the text or referred to in the policy. The policy refers to “the setting of significant landscape area” without defining what is meant. This could be difficult to interpret when considering planning applications.</p>	<p>Heading changed</p> <p>Map replaced with an annotated one</p> <p>Local gap is a saved policy in the Borough Local plan 2030’</p> <p>Significant landscapes detailed in the Bedford Borough Ouse Valley Landscape Characteristic document</p>
Bedford BC	30	LE 3	<p>The supporting map suggests that you intend the policy to apply to surrounding parishes. However, the policies in your Neighbourhood Plan cannot apply outside of your Neighbourhood Area. The supporting map should therefore be changed.</p>	<p>Map modified to show that it they do not apply outside the neighbourhood area</p>
Bedford BC	35	DH 2	<p>The requirement to use “authentic” materials is unlikely to be considered reasonable except for listed buildings or in conservation areas. It is also not entirely clear what it means and therefore the term should be deleted.</p>	<p>Text changed to durable.</p> <p>The authentic materials made to specific locations. e.g. Duke of Bedford cottages.</p>
Natural England		All Policies	<p>No comment but refer NDP Group to document Neighbourhood Planning and the Natural Environment: information, issues and opportunities</p>	<p>Habitat Assessment been undertaken.</p>
Environment Agency		All Policies	<p>No longer able to provide bespoke advice but suggest consider document - Planning Advice Guidance.</p>	<p>SEA considered.</p>
Lincroft Academy	29	LE2	<p>Has no specific comments to make. Comments on Policy ONP LE2: Local Green Space are considered specifically against the third question on green space detailed further below with particular reference to the school’s sports pitch and playing field provision at the southern end of Station Road.</p>	<p>Possible site allocation previously considered. Sports field has community value and creates separation.</p>
Oakley Business	19	HG1	<p>The development of site 171 does not protect the rural nature of the village surrounding the area. It will cause traffic and transport issues.</p>	<p>Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform with the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it becomes a statutory document.</p>

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment	Response
Optimis on behalf of site 166	19	HG1	Disagree. Conclusion - the purpose of this representation is to strengthen the Oakley NDP prior to its adoption. The site which is the subject of this representation has been favourably assessed by Bedford BC. A Highways consultant has confirmed the suitability of access in response to comments raised in both the Site Assessments 2017 and the ONP. The proposed development is flexible in terms of the number, design, positioning and size of dwellings so that it can be developed to accord with policies and aspirations set out in the plan. We are of the opinion that ONP HG1 is too restrictive in its wording to allow for appropriate development outside of the allocated development sites. We would also note that ONP HG1 does not comply with BBC policy 3S and as a result can be considered that in its current form the ONP is not in conformity with the development plan and is "unsound."	The emerging local plan is not strategic local policy, in terms of meeting the basic conditions. However, the evidence behind the local plan may be part of the evidence base for the NP. It is reasonable to focus growth primarily in the settlement boundary, but allow infill elsewhere. The allocated sites cater for growth. Delete the First paragraph/sentence. The next paragraph amended to read: Housing Development will be supported where it involves development of allocated sites or sites within the Settlement Boundary and where it does not encroach into the rural area outside of the settlement Boundary. The first sentence of the policy is confusing- it is a statement of purpose rather than policy. The policy does not make explicit provision for the development of allocated sites. The policy does not make provision for allocated sites. Interpretation to be changed.
Resident	15 - 20	Housing Policies	Oakley together with other small villages, should be producing a plan to show both local and national government bodies that urban housing through the conversion and use of existing structures and sites is a far better use of land which would result in less damage to countryside, devalue fewer rural properties and prevent the need for inconvenience and disruption that comes with building new properties. The plans submitted for Oakley are short-sighted, policy pleasing and in my opinion disgraceful.	Disagree as the National Government Policies encourage housing in settlement areas based on local need.
Resident	39	TR1/DH1	We agree with building of new houses but parking on Station Road and in Lincroft is a major issue which needs to be addressed. Parking in Lincroft is making it dangerous for traffic as people are parking on bends and across narrow driveways. This will only become worse.	Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform with the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document
Resident	34 39	DH1 TR1	There is no reason why mediocre 1950s design should be perpetuated. There should be a one way traffic flow in Station Road & High Street	The Oakley Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to keep to 1950s design. This has been looked at previously and not supported.

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
Resident	39	TR1	Agree other than where business causes consequent indiscriminate parking including on pavement. Hazel Kaye.	Agreed Local businesses and Oakley Parish Council try to mitigate this.
Resident	39	TR1	20 house site is bad because roads will be affected.	Noted and will be addressed at the planning stage using Borough Local Plan and Oakley Neighbourhood Plan polices when it is statutory.
Resident	39	TR1	How can causing a dangerous road situation comply. The Beds Arms is a listed building & has already been hit by traffic.	See above
Resident	39	TR1	What village? With all the building the "village" is finished. Already a lot of houses being built in Parrott's Yard. Traffic and transport will be a joy. Hundreds of extra traffic movements every day. The road under the railway bridge will be more fun than it is now.	The NPPF states that development should be considered and housing need of each settlement
Resident	19	HG1	According to the Neighbourhood Plan policies (January 2017) the consultation evidence showed that there was a clear preference for development on small sites of less than 10 homes. However, the development policy then changed the site definitions to: small developments (less than 20 dwellings), medium developments (20 – 40 dwellings). It also stated that development should prioritise brownfield sites first. Neither of the allocated sites are small sites of less than 10 homes and both are on agricultural land. Furthermore, if the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that part of the agricultural land off Station Road is suitable for residential development of 30 dwellings, it will be difficult for the local planning authority to resist the Bedfordia Group's proposals for development of the whole of the land east of Station Road and that company has every incentive and sufficient financial resources to take a full planning application for that scheme through all the necessary appeal processes.	This has been considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Group and the Oakley Parish Council. There is a lack of Brownfield sites in Oakley. Land surrounding Oakley is listed agricultural Land. Any future development on unallocated land will be resisted and subject to Borough Local plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a Statutory document.
Resident		All policies	I agree but do the money men?	
Residents x 69	35	DH2/TR1	Development of site 171 does not protect the rural nature of the village and will cause traffic and transport issues.	Impact on the setting of the listed building can be positive as well as negative. They were very carefully considered by the NP group and will be considered as part of the planning application. Archaeological interest will be conditioned as part of the planning application if necessary. Oakley is not in the mineral plan.

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
				All land surrounding Oakley is Grade 1 or 2 Agricultural land. Coalescence and a defensible barrier were considered carefully. Site to remain but reduced to 10.
Resident x 49		All Policies	Agree	Agree