

Oxspring NDP – First Draft Plan Informal Consultation – December 2015

Response Table

| Vision and Objectives / Policy / Paragraph No. | Comments | Steering Group consideration and proposed changes to the Draft Plan |
|--|---|---|
| Vision and Objectives | | |
| | Affordable housing is essential to allow our families and future generations to remain in the village of which they were born and grew up in, whilst offering the opportunity for elderly residents to downsize and comfortably remain in the village also. | Accepted. Amend OS1 last sentence: Affordable housing will be provided in schemes of 15 units or more and must be fully integrated (i.e. “pepper potted”) with market housing, in new developments and Affordable housing will be allocated in the first instance to those with a local connection. |
| | Windfall housing and infill housing schemes would not bring the community wide benefits required and if not adequately scrutinised and controlled will result in the most ridiculous housing development schemes ever, we currently have one of such distaste ongoing at present which is utterly unacceptable. | Not accepted. The NDP has been prepared to be in conformity with the emerging and adopted strategic local planning policies of Barnsley Council. It would not be appropriate for the NDP to allocate land for a significant new housing schemes. Policy OEN4 sets out landscaping and building design for guidelines for new development. No change. |
| | The future has to be planned and prepared for, then shared(?) to by us all as a consensus. | Noted. No change. |
| | It sets out a model which everyone can adhere to whether they are residents or interested parties. | Noted. No change. |
| | The village has to remain a rural village which the | Accepted. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Plan seems to be aiming for. | The plan has policies to address this. No change. |
| | Maintaining the village as a rural village should be the main vision. | The vision includes the wording: " To maintain the character of a rural village" in the first sentence. No change. |
| | I fully endorse the details shown in the draft vision and / objectives as shown for our village. The village has so much to offer and every development carefully considered to benefit the village and its residents and not the financial gain of developers. | Noted. No change. |
| | I think the vision and objectives recognises the improvements that can be made by "managed changes", whilst retaining character of Oxspring village. | Noted. No change. |
| | We support green energy but not large wind turbines. | Noted. The Plan recognises the potential opportunities associated with the proposed employment site for green energy schemes in the supporting text. No change. |
| | We need to retain the village's rural character whilst making available affordable housing for local people at limited locations. Self-sufficient energy production should not include wind farms as these are unsightly and inefficient. | Noted. The Plan promotes sustainable design in new development to reduce and adapt to the effects of climate change. No change. |
| | Keep Oxspring small, rural and neighbourly. | Noted. No change. |
| | We need this plan to safeguard the future of Oxspring. | Noted. No change. |
| | Do not want to lose the village feel Oxspring has at present. | Noted. No change. |
| | Whilst we agree with the Vision & Objectives in | Noted. |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| | principle, particularly where maintaining the character of the Village and striving for the wellbeing of the Villagers is concerned, we struggle to see how this can be achieved without allowing Development of a certain size in order to fund, finance and justify them. | Other forms of funding may also be available and the Parish Council is committed to identifying funding from other sources as well as developer contributions. No change. |
| | Character of the village is important and historic areas should be priority. | Noted. No change. |
| | | |
| Draft Policy OH1 | | |
| | 6.1.1 – percentages are wrong – do not have 150% or 129% - it is 50% or 29%. | This information came from an email from Barnsley Council dated 16 Nov 2015: “... I believe, from my conversation with Amy, that the Oxspring Parish Council referred to the updated SHMA and specifically Figure 3.1 (page 42) on the link included here Barnsley SHMA 2014 Update Final Report Based on that assumption the median figures for Oxspring Parish 2000-2014 are as per the table below. The calculations are based on the total number of sales for the parish over that period (less than 400) and average out at only 26 per annum. Prices have increased from £138,995 in 2000 to £179,500 in 2014 and increase of 129%. Prices peaked in 2010 at £272,000 NB: the SHMA in item 3.1 quotes the Borough peak being in 2010 but the chart indicates it was 2007. |

| Oxspring Civil Parish | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Year | Median House Price |
| 2000 | £138,995 |
| 2001 | £118,000 |
| 2002 | £120,475 |
| 2003 | £154,000 |
| 2004 | £184,990 |
| 2005 | £154,750 |
| 2006 | £179,975 |
| 2007 | £214,500 |
| 2008 | £165,000 |
| 2009 | £232,500 |
| 2010 | £272,000 |
| 2011 | £159,000 |
| 2012 | £170,000 |
| 2013 | £210,000 |
| 2014 | £179,500 |

The SHMA Update (in the link) provides the following information:

3.10 Prices in Barnsley have been consistently lower than the median prices for Yorkshire and the Humber and England. Overall, prices have increased from £44,000 in 2000 to £110,000 in 2014, an increase of 150%. Prices peaked at £110,000 in 2010 and again in 2014.”

Therefore the 150% figure is correct.
No change.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p><u>However the figure of 129% quoted for Oxspring Parish is incorrect; it should read 29%.</u></p> <p>Amend to 29%.</p> |
| | No large housing estates agree local people get first allocation i.e. older age at Willows. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Fully support small scale infill housing – plus housing for 1 st time buyers, young people, elderly, disabled gives a good mix of residents in the village. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | The local infrastructure will not support single large developments. Barnsley Council have no plans for infrastructure development. | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | <p>Barnsley Council Informal comments:</p> <p>I note that policy OH1 has been amended to reflect advice on consistency with national and local planning policy. I do have one outstanding concern with the final element of the policy. It is my recollection that I advised you to contact colleagues at Berneslai Homes (Julie Griffiths or Bob Cartwright) to establish if your proposed ‘local connection’ requirement for affordable housing allocation was consistent with Barnsley housing allocation policy. It would be helpful to know that you have resolved this potential conflict.</p> | <p>Accepted. This was followed up again, with the response set out below:</p> <p>“Good morning Ann</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding a copy of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for the Oxspring parish. The Council’s Lettings policy is generally an overarching policy covering the entire borough. Although the lettings policy does not have specific local connection criteria for individual communities, in reality, because the vast majority of applicants on the waiting list wish to remain in their own communities, the majority of homes are allocated to people who already live within the same community.</p> <p>I have attached a copy of the Lettings Policy for your information. The specific section dealing with ‘Local Connection’ (7a(ii)) can be found on page 12 of the policy.</p> <p>I hope that this is of assistance.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Bob.</p> <p>Bob Cartwright FCIH</p> <p>Amend Plan.</p> <p>Refer to the Local Connection part of the lettings policy Local Connection – at the end of the second paragraph. Add in additional wording: “Affordable housing for rent will be let in accordance with Barnsley Council’s Lettings Policy for Local Connections as set out in Appendix II”</p> <p>Include the appropriate section of the Lettings Policy in an Appendix.</p> |
| | Oxspring has enough larger houses and really only needs affordable houses. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Younger people are needed to keep the village active. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Oxspring does not have the infrastructure to support a larger housing stock. Proposed broadband. School. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Support the inclusion of Affordable Housing, but if they are only available on Schemes of 15 Houses or more, where would they be located and how could they become a reality? It looks like the Oxspring Fields Site shown on detail received recently is the only one that could possibly do this. | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>This is in line with the emerging Local Plan policy for affordable housing and it is possible that one or more schemes may come forward over the Plan period. The Policy also supports a mix of house types and sizes and encourages the provision of smaller houses in schemes of between 2 and 9 houses (0.4ha).</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Oxspring Fields is in the green belt, largely located outside the Parish area and is not supported in the Plan. Other sites within the settlement boundary may come forward over the Plan period.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | I would support any development that would benefit businesses locally. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Plan recognises that new development should be appropriate to Oxspring and that not all development would be acceptable.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | | |
| Draft Policy OH2 | | |
| | Need to emphasise more affordable homes in the village. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The need for more affordable homes is set out in para 6.1.4 in the Plan.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Personally I think this is the best way forward. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Objections to any green belt land which disrupts the habitat of wildlife and rural setting. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Green belt is a strategic matter for Barnsley Council and cannot be addressed through a NDP.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Fully support carefully considered, sensitive property extensions and re-use of agricultural buildings. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Redevelopment existing former agricultural building will be in keeping with the area. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Don't know. | The green belt is protected in national and |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| | I am generally in support of this policy but would wish to see a stronger approach towards an opposition of any new domestic buildings on green belt land. I'm not sure if the wording in the last sentence indicates this. | strategic local (i.e. Barnsley Council) planning policies and is not something a NDP can address. No change. |
| | Large developments are not required to keep the village still "a village" | Noted. No change. |
| | Fit within the character of the village. | Noted. Design policies promote development to fit with the character of the village. |
| | If the latest Development being undertaken in Oxspring is anything to go by, then infill sites as suggested here must be avoided at all costs, because if the result of any new infill sites are the same as the scheme off Roughbirchworth Lane with the oversized Houses shoe-horned in, then god help us, it's a disgrace and should never had been approved for this size and type of properly!! | Not accepted. The Policy is in general conformity with local strategic planning policies which recognise Oxspring's role in the settlement hierarchy as a village within the green belt. The emphasis is on development on small infill sites therefore rather than large housing sites. The Plan includes policies to guide design including scale, height and massing and if made, future development will be required to address these policies. No change. |
| | As above. | Noted. No change. |
| | | |
| Draft Policy OEN1 | | |
| | This is a topic close to my heart and one which I | Noted. |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| | have endeavoured to have adopted throughout my years as a councillor, that was however back then to no avail, though the Oxspring Fields proposal appears to provide this in abundance!! | No change. |
| | It is a must. | Noted. No change. |
| | Whilst development is necessary we have to maintain one of our key assets – our environmental assets. | Noted. No change. |
| | Green belt land to be kept as “green belt” | Noted. Green belt is a strategic matter which cannot be addressed in a NDP. No change. |
| | Support this but how could this be implemented where there are only 2 Properties, surely it also depends on their location in order to be able to satisfy this aspiration fully. | Noted. The Policy includes some flexibility with the wording “.. proposals will be encouraged wherever possible ..” . The responsibility will be on the developer to argue that the requirements are not possible e.g. viable in a scheme. No change. |
| | People should look at the bigger picture and take advantage from developments by increasing facilities of the village. | Noted. The Plan seeks to manage development to ensure it is appropriate to the village context. Not all development would be acceptable, but some change and limited growth is supported. No change. |
| | | |
| Draft Policy OEN2 | | |
| | This is essential in maintaining facilities of | Noted. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | outstanding function, quality and use for members of the Local community and those visiting whom benefit also. | No change. |
| | <p>Additions required – see p4 for comments. Additions to identified local green spaces:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area opposite Castle Dam belonging to Oxspring PC. Used as a picnic area and car park for walkers, fishermen and birdwatchers. 2. Two areas adjacent and part of Willow Lane footpath / bridleway either side of Willow Bridge listed building <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Oxspring side a small viewing area with a memorial seat overlooking the bridge and site of the removed weir.(both should be included in para 6.2.7 p25 though and inserted in detail in all sections and policy to p29) b. The area of land combined with the “elbow” of the dog leg of Willow Lane as it rises up the steep bank from Willow Bridge to the “hollow way” called locally Holly Lake. | <p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Add in the area opposite Castle Dam. Amend Table, Map and Policy OEN2 as required.</p> <p>The 2 areas adjacent and part of Willow Lane footpath / bridleway either side of Willow Bridge listed building are in private ownership and do not meet the criteria set out in the NPPF. They should therefore not be included in the Draft Plan.</p> |
| | Another must. | Noted. No change. |
| | Fully support – we have to fight to protect our local green spaces – once they have gone, they are gone forever. | Noted. No change. |
| | The 9 areas identified are all important to the village and should not be negatively impacted by any developments | Accepted. No change. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Barnsley Council Informal comments:</p> <p>I have an outstanding task to ensure that our greenspace register is consistent with your proposed local green spaces. In addition, I note that we have an area of land on the greenspace register at Longley Ings which isn't shown on your list of local green spaces and wondered if this was an omission?</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Add in Longley Ings. Amend Table, Map and Policy OEN2 as required.</p> |
| | <p>Barnsley Council Informal comments:</p> <p>With reference to policy OEN2, it is suggested that further clarification of the final sentence would be useful in the supporting text, to help define what you mean by 'impacts adversely on the openness of the sites or adversely affects the attributes...'</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Add in additional text to 6.2.10:</p> <p>New development could impact adversely on the openness of these sites through the introduction of built form of a scale or height or mass which intrudes upon the green space character of the area and leads to a loss of the sense of openness. The spaces should also be protected from development which impacts adversely on the very attributes for which the local green spaces have been designated. These attributes are described in Table 1 Column 3 Demonstrably Special to Local Community.</p> |
| | <p>These are well established green sites which are important to the environment of the village.</p> | <p>Accepted. No change.</p> |
| | <p>This will enhance the village.</p> | <p>Noted. No change.</p> |
| | <p>Support this but certain improvements to facilities on or near some of these areas are long overdue, i.e. community building near the Playing fields etc., so some relaxing of the protection may be needed if the community</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Plan supports investment in new facilities such as the sports field.</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | building can be delivered. | The Plan provides a positive planning policy framework for partners working with the Parish Council or other bodies to bring forward schemes where funding and deliverability allow. No change. |
| | Oxspring has some beautiful areas and assets and should be protected / preserved. | Accepted. No change. |
| | | |
| Draft Policy OEN3 | | |
| | Change is an important part of any village so long as they are well thought out and are in fitting with the general theme of the area in which they occupy. | Noted. No change. |
| | Fully support the draft policy. | Noted. No change. |
| | Barnsley Council informal comments: May I ask you to look at the drafting of policy OEN3. If you disaggregate the first sentence, it requires new development to be 'designed to reduce...the effects of climate change'. I think I know what you meant but the policy needs a slight redraft. Would 'respond' be a suitable substitution for the word reduce? | Accepted. Amend first sentence to: All new development must be designed to <u>respond</u> and adapt to the effects of climate change, particularly through the location of new development, design and construction techniques, renewable technologies, landscape and historic environment management, biodiversity, flood risk management and the use of green infrastructure. |
| | All developments must consider and plan for local surface water. | Accepted. This is included in the policy in references to flood risk management and green infrastructure. |
| | Any development in the future must support a carbon neutral approach. | Noted Sustainable design is a requirement of Building |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | Regs and planning policy cannot set out detailed, prescriptive requirements. |
| | Support this so long as they fit in with the general character and charm of the Village, and surely new Houses are designed and built to minimum Council standards anyhow!! | Noted. No change. |
| | Even though we live by / near River Don, I don't ever remember flooding, except on playing field, when maintenance of drainage was an issue and rain flowing down Sheffield Road because drains again. | Noted. The Plan has a role in supporting development which minimises contribution to climate change and seeks to mitigate any effects. Extreme rainfall events can increase risks of surface water flooding and landscaping can assist with reducing surface water runoff and flooding of water courses. No change. |
| | | |
| Draft Policy OEN4 | | |
| | Agree totally with the point being made here. | Noted. No change. |
| | Views across the valleys must not be obstructed. | Noted. No change. |
| | Fully support – recent events have shown the effects of over development and a building within flood zones. | Noted. No change. |
| | Maintaining the openness and views as described are an essential part of the plan. | Noted. No change. |
| | Agree any future development must not change the character of the village. | Noted. No change. |
| | Eco building is not cheap, which seems to contradict part of Policy OH1 the supply of | Noted. Sustainable design is required by building |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| | affordable homes, would they be exempt from OEN4. | regulations and affordable housing is not exempt from the requirements. No change. |
| | Fully Support this Policy. | Noted. No change. |
| | Any development is a shock to the system / views but over time blends into the landscape. | Noted. No change. |
| | | |
| Draft Policy OEMP1 | | |
| | This is essential in providing a facility of outstanding quality and use, for the general use of villagers, business and visitors alike, but this only seems feasible with a development like Oxspring Fields. | Noted. Oxspring Fields is not accepted. The majority of the proposed site lies outside the boundary of the neighbourhood area and is in the green belt and therefore the proposal is a matter for BMB and is not something that can be addressed in a NDP. No change. |
| | Don't know. Traffic is already an issue through Oxspring – will only support if this is given adequate consideration – and not just lip service. | Noted. The Policy already includes the wording: "Adequate provision of visitor parking and suitable traffic management measures must be provided." No change. |
| | Do not want to see any cafes opening up on the trail or toilet facilities – no-one will look after them and it will encourage vandalism. | Not accepted. The strategy of the Plan supports low key tourism development associated with the TPT as part of improving the economic diversity of the village and encouraging visitors and residents to enjoy the local countryside. Management of any facilities is not something that can be addressed through planning policy. |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| | | No change. |
| | We have much to offer and should plan to develop our visitor and tourist facilities. | Accepted. No change. |
| | Must not impact on the village. A concern will be the possible increase in traffic along the Sheffield Road from the Penistone direction. | Noted. Traffic management is included in the policy. No change. |
| | Fully Support this however again it only appears an absolute possibility with the Oxspring Fields Site that's being proposed. | Not accepted. Other proposals may come forward over the Plan period and this Policy seeks to provide a positive planning framework to support appropriate investment and increase local employment opportunities. No change. |
| | Why does Oxspring need a café / catering facilities when 2 pubs in the village already. One opens all day every day! | Noted. The Plan supports further investment in tourist related facilities to improve the offer in the village and encourage more visitors to stay and spend money there. Cafes etc. would enhance this visitor experience and provide more choice for residents, whilst supporting employment opportunities. No change. |
| | | |
| Draft Policy OS1 | | |
| | The community buildings in particular are essential and something that a lot of time, effort | Noted. Oxspring Fields is not accepted. The majority of |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | and determination has been put in to bring forward but again all this has proved to be of little use, bearing in mind we are still no further forward. The facilities remain just an aspiration yet are key to maximising the potential for the sport and playing field areas in the locality etc. all to the benefit of the villagers and visitors that would use them, this does only seem likely the proposed Oxspring Fields Project. | the proposed site lies outside the boundary of the neighbourhood area and is in the green belt and therefore the proposal is a matter for BMB and is not something that can be addressed in a NDP. No change. |
| | Yes but disappointed you have removed the proposal on the school – you cannot just believe the Council on this – you need to try a bit harder – happy to advise. | Noted. The school proposal was removed on the advice of Barnsley Council as set out in para 5.4.3. Proposals in a NDP have to show viability and if a proposal such as a new school does not have the support of Barnsley Council then this would be difficult to evidence. No other evidence of other parties wishing to pursue this project have come forward through the NDP consultation process. |
| | Don't know | Noted. |
| | Correction required – see p4 Correction to para 6.4.2 it should say "... funding from Sport England and the Football Foundation was not secured" and not the National Lottery. I have reported this error previously. | Accepted. Amend wording as suggested. Funding from Sport England and the Football Foundation was not secured... |
| | Support to some extent. The school should make more use of the sports field. | Noted. This is a matter for the school. No change. |
| | I support the policy but the provision of changing / toilet facilities must be very carefully considered not only for design but for maintenance – cleaning costs involved etc. | Noted. This is a detailed matter and should be considered at the design stage if a proposal comes forward. No change. |
| | Barnsley Council informal comments: | Accepted. |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>Finally, with reference to policy OS1, can I ask you to think about the wording of the second sentence. What would you want us to do with a planning application that included only some of the elements in the bullet points. As currently worded, it is suggested that we would have to refuse such an application. You might want to think about including text to explain why any scheme must be comprehensive, or amending the policy to allow for the prospect of a sequence of planning applications/schemes.</p> | <p>Amend wording to:</p> <p>Such proposals must include all <u>or a combination of the elements of the following</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New club facilities / sports pavilion including changing rooms and other rooms and facilities for wider community use; and • An improved playing field. |
| | Sports field, changing rooms, toilets needed. | Noted. All these are covered in the policy. No change. |
| | Don't know. | Noted. No change. |
| | Fully Support this however yet again it only appears an absolute possibility with the Oxspring Fields Site that's being proposed, unless Barnsley Council have a plan and funds in place to provide it. | Not accepted. Investment in the sports field is not reliant on the Oxspring Sports field site coming forward. Other funding opportunities may become available over the Plan period. |
| | A new facility for sports is ideal but being spoken about for 40 years and never happened! | Noted. The Plan is for a lengthy period of time (up to 2033) and it is important that it provides a positive framework for future investment in local facilities, when other funding may become available for implementation. |
| | | |
| Draft Policy OM1 | | |
| | Access should not be targeted at Roughbitchworth alone, the parking issues created here as a result would worsen an already | Not accepted. The access points identified are the principle existing access points. No additional access |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | problematic issue we have to contend with on a daily basis. Other access points should be considered as alternatives where abandoned or unsympathetically parked cars aren't as great an issue. | points have been put forward for detailed consideration. No change. |
| | Access to the trail could be improved at the back of the school. | Policy OM1 already states: "Proposals which provide safe, level, ramped access onto the Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) will be supported." This provides general encouragement to proposed improvements related to access to the TPT. No change. |
| | The TPT is a major asset for our village is well used and a must for disabled people, young mothers with wheelchairs. People regularly commute with Penistone – better access is a must especially at Roughbirchworth Lane. | Accepted. No change. |
| | The TPT is an important local asset and improving access for parents with buggies, cyclists as well as the infirm will have a significant impact on the use by the local community. | Accepted. No change. |
| | Don't know. | Noted. No change. |
| | New access needed in the village for cyclists, pushchairs, disabled. New level ramp needed. Those steps are lethal. | Accepted. Points included in the policy already. No change. |
| | Roughbirchworth access to the trail is a constrained area (spatially). Difficult to see how access improvements here can be made without taking land from (?) the school. | Noted. The policy supports the principle; detailed design issues are a matter for consideration later, if and when funding to support the proposals is secured. |
| | Agree may help to support OEMP1 and OS1. | Noted. |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | No change. |
| | <p>Don't know. Wouldn't a new access from the football field be a safer option?</p> <p>It would be safer for disabled people, families and cyclists to prepare their mode of transport in the car park rather than on Roughbirchworth Lane. Access for construction would also be easier.</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>The PC are keen to promote the need for several new access points.</p> <p>Add in additional wording: "In particular, proposals for access improvements will be encouraged at the Roughbirchworth Lane access point (T2 on Map 2 above) and if possible, from the sports field car park"</p> |
| | <p>We support ease of access onto the Trail certainly, but why only at the Roughbirchworth Lane side of the Trail, what about improving access toward Conoco or at the Ant Hills area?</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Policy generally supports investment in accessibility and does not preclude other schemes coming forward.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | <p>One of Oxspring's major assets the TPT should be accessed for all.</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>The Plan refers to the TPT throughout the document and recognises the benefits and opportunities for investment in tourism related activity it represents.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | | |
| Other comments | <p>Change is an important part of any village, community or neighbourhood and we should embrace it as we need to move with the times, whilst planning and providing for our future generations in the process also. In addition to</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Oxspring Fields is not accepted as the majority of the area lies outside the designated area in another parish and it is in the green belt and therefore it is a strategic matter which cannot be</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>this, it is important to encourage newcomers into our village to ensure that local business and the economy associated with that continues to thrive.</p> <p>See detailed attachment setting out history and involvement with various developments in and around the village and support for Oxspring Fields proposal as a means for securing investment in new housing and community facilities.</p> | <p>addressed in a neighbourhood plan. No change.</p> |
| | <p>Oxspring is a beautiful place let us keep it this way as long as possible.</p> | <p>Accepted. No change.</p> |
| | <p>Overall I would like to see all efforts put towards retaining a rural village. If people want cafes, shops then move nearer to a town. People choose to live in villages like Oxspring for a reason. They want clean open spaces, wildlife, a quiet life. I support some ideas of the plan and understand the need to have control over what goes off a have a say against developers who do not care about our village but who try to buy us off by offering to fund new play areas so they can build hundreds of houses. I was also under the impression Barnsley's plan shows no housing development planned for Oxspring as they will have met their requirements by the building in Penistone. Let's not encourage any building when it's not needed.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Plan supports small scale economic development and diversification which supports Oxspring's role as a small village in the green belt. This will help to ensure a sustainable future for the settlement.</p> <p>The Plan is in conformity with the strategic planning policies of Barnsley Council and does not support large scale new housing development.</p> |
| | <p>I think that the Draft NDP is an excellent document and I fully support it. The people who have prepared it deserve our praise and thanks!</p> | <p>Noted. No change.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------|
| | <p>Whilst Oxspring is to develop it must be considered as per the vision and objectives and not the requirements and aims of property developers who are only in it for profit. We have a need to attract young people and keep our own young people whilst maintaining a good mix of residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional people – many now work regularly from home – high speed broadband is therefore essential. - Sports facilities should be improved working together with local sports groups and Oxspring School. - Development of our assets – TPT, River Don, Bower Dell, Pinfold etc. - Try to generate enthusiasm from our residents (apathy can only work against the village) - Continue to encourage employers into the village. | |
| | Excellent work. In line with feedback I have heard from local residents. | Noted. No change. |
| | The plan is well written and it is difficult to see why any of the local residents would not support it. Some development is inevitable (and even welcomed) so it is important to local residents that these developments remaining small in scale and in keeping with the existing character of the village, while also providing suitable accommodation for the current young adults living within the village. | Noted. No change. |
| | Hunshel Parish Council does not wish to make any comments / additions to the Oxspring | Noted. No change. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>footpath/improved riverside access', the plan is a 15 year plan and therefore I do not think that the task of an improved riverside access across such time scales & given any future 106/CIL contributions for future developments in the village/parish is "UNDELIVERABLE". Of course it is not easy either, particularly due to land ownership & maintenance issues. In my opinion, however it is a more realistic aspiration say, than a 'sustainable energy-hub' (given current government policy!!!). Moreover, consider for example the future development of Employment site P2 –Sheffield Road. Could such future proposal not include provision for riverside access & extension of footpath? Notwithstanding the above, my recollection is that there was no steering group in place at the point in time this decision was taken & in any case it might be best to change the words 'Steering Group' to "Parish Council". Ultimately, the decision to include or exclude such "aspirations" (Deliverable or Not) should be allocated to a more representative group i.e. the Parish Council. If I was still in the Steering Group, I would continue to argue in favour of protecting the land along the riverside for the future development of a public amenity & to facilitate opening up new/improved access to the riverside in time and as appropriate. In my opinion, not to safeguard such land now is a lack of vision & a missed opportunity for the future of the village.</p> | <p>Council and approved by the Parish Council in the published draft plan for informal consultation.</p> <p>However, Policy OM1 should be amended to include the following: "Proposals for improved pedestrian access down to and along the river to the north east of the proposed employment site and to the north of G4 will be encouraged".</p> |
| | <p>Page 12 (4.2): "Marrtree (?) Industrial State"</p> | <p>Noted. Amend to Marrtree Business Park (referred to as</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | this on various websites) |
| | <p>Page 14 (5.1.4) : “Policies in the NDP should address the need for more smaller homes suitable for older people and first time buyers as identified in the Summary of Housing Needs & Capacity Assessment Advice Notes for Oxspring Neighbourhood Plan (2014)³”</p> <p>From memory, I believe that the URS “Housing Needs Assessment’ referred to a need in the local market for 3 & 2 bedrooms homes. There was no evidence provided that justified more homes for older people (this group have already a higher representation in the village than say across Barnsley). Furthermore, this group usually have to rely on public services which unfortunately are not all that accessible locally. However, my understanding is that the aspiration of the Draft NP Policy Statement & Barnsley emerging LP was/is to provide ‘sustainable communities’ i.e. communities where there is a good mix of tenure representation- age, social, ethnic, etc. ... This is reflected later on in the Draft NP document.</p> | <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend text of 5.1.4:</p> <p>Policies in the NDP should address the need for more smaller homes suitable for people wishing to downsize, the elderly and first time buyers as identified in the Summary of Housing Needs & Capacity Assessment Advice Notes for Oxspring Neighbourhood Plan (2014)¹ and in response to changing trends nationally related to the ageing population.</p> |
| | <p>Page 15 (5.2.5): “There are opportunities for Oxspring NDP to support community led renewable energy schemes, as part of wider objectives to address climate change. The Draft NDP has a role in supporting such schemes where appropriate, with a focus on the identified</p> | <p>Noted but this remains an aspiration for the NDP and the Plan covers a long timescale so funding opportunities may change in the future.</p> <p>No change.</p> |

¹ <http://www.oxspringplan.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Housing-Needs-Housing-Capacity-Summary-15-Oct-14.pdf>

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>employment site as a possible “Green Energy Hub”.</p> <p>Unfortunately, regrettably & despite UN’s Paris agreement for Climate Change mitigations, the UK’s Conservative Government & ‘Mr Osborne’ decided in the Autumn that there would be no further support for local communities in the form of grants to promote, investigate, develop Community-led Sustainable Energy schemes..... Instead the Government will support Nuclear Energy & Gas. .. (This will be led by the Chinese Government & not the local community!) http://www.carbonbrief.org/analysis-uk-government-quietly-slashes-renewable-energy-forecast So there are no opportunities to support community led renewable energy schemes. Except of course if we all pulled together for a better deal with the utility providers (good luck with that!)... In my opinion, such initiative could not reasonably qualify as a ‘Green Energy Hub’.</p> | |
| | <p>Page 15 (5.2.7) : “The types of renewable energy schemes considered suitable in terms of landscape impact are likely to be solar energy schemes and water powered schemes using the River Don. Such schemes would be required to be supported by detailed feasibility studies and ecological, landscape and visual assessments”.</p> <p>I can appreciate that to ‘suggest the nature/type of future sustainable energy sources for Oxspring as solar or water-power’, is arguably satisfying ‘local politics’. However, there is no technical</p> | <p>Noted but this remains an aspiration for the NDP and the Plan covers a long timescale so funding opportunities for feasibility studies etc. may change in the future.</p> <p>No change.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>evidence that currently suggests 'water schemes or solar' are the best options for the purpose. I believe that at most all that could be said/argued is that local preference 'suggests' these two options are the least objectionable ... However I think such position would be unhelpful for any future advice/discussion.... Should there be any future open, reasonable & scientifically-evidence based & objective discussions about the subject Notwithstanding, & considering the earlier point made above (re 5.2.5) it is all, unfortunately, now rather academic.</p> | |
| | <p>Page 16 (5.4.3) : "However the draft policy included proposals for a new school on the same site, and this proposal has not been taken forward into the Draft Plan, due to viability issues and lack of support from the Borough Council".</p> <p>My recollection is that Barnsley Council invited representations to be made on local school provision through the LP consultation process. At the time of writing/publishing Oxspring NP proposed Policy Statement draft document (summer /autumn 2014), the LEA had not completed their school needs assessment/review which is to inform/ accompany the emerging LP. In my opinion subject to a final review of emerging LA policies, it would be more reasonable & accurate to say that "the allocation of a new school is subject to the LA as per their document blah, blah, blah...." In any case & as you may know, the Conservative Gov really likes local people taking control over their lives (or so</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The wording ion the NDP was amended in line with advice from Barnsley Council.</p> <p>The PC / SG are not aware of any proposals at the current time from parents / other groups, and indeed none have come forward through this informal consultation process. Therefore there is no basis for including the proposal and supporting policy in the NDP.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>the rhetoric goes...) & in their wisdom, Central Gov's Department of Education have set in place the Education Funding Agency, which will support 'FUND' the construction & establishment of 100's of new 'Independent... Free' schools.... (i.e. independent & free from the LEA). So, should future or current parents/or Board of Governors at Oxspring school be inclined to sort out once and for all their accommodation issues, they might wish to take advantage of the considerable & generous EFA subsidies & start their new 'Oxpring independent/Free...' school elsewhere(Where?)...</p> | |
| | <p>Page 16/17 (5.5.3): As per point 2.9 above page 1 of this document.</p> | <p>Noted – see above.</p> |
| | <p>Page 27 & 28 (6.2.10): As per earlier points. Furthermore, I believe that the Riverside walk /verge should be included in the list of areas of special recreational value & protected Local Green Spaces.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The area referred to belongs to the parish Council but the gradient is very steep and there are no proposals at present to develop such an expensive scheme. Such proposals are supported generally in Policy OM1 (as amended).</p> |
| | <p>Page 32 (point 7) Draft Policy OEN4 Landscape and Building Design Guidelines: "The scale of built development will be crucial to its successful integration. Low rise, two storey properties are likely to be most successfully accommodated into this rural landscape"</p> <p>The Residential Design Guide for South Yorkshire which is Barnsley Council adopted policy specifies technical requirements to meet Code level 5 & 6. Arguably to meet such requirements (i.e.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The aspirations to incorporate sustainable technologies have to be balanced against ensuring new development is successfully accommodated into the existing village setting and character.</p> <p>As a compromise, the wording could be amended to say: 7. The scale of built development will be crucial</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>incorporate relevant technologies) properties are more likely to be (a height of) three storeys not two. Furthermore, there are already a number of homes (even within more recent housing developments) which are three storeys high; therefore there is a perfectly viable precedent in the village.</p> | <p>to its successful integration. Low rise, two storey properties are likely to be most successfully accommodated into this rural landscape. Exceptions to this may be appropriate where it is demonstrated that a third storey is required to accommodate technologies to maximise energy and resource efficiency.</p> |
| | <p>Page 35 (6.3.5): “In addition, the site is considered to offer significant opportunities for developing a community-led or commercially driven, green energy hub. The site adjoins the River Don offering potential opportunities to harness water power, and may be suitable for solar or other low carbon energy schemes. Consultations with local residents such as the questionnaire in 2015 demonstrated that although there was significant interest in renewable energy schemes provided they were sympathetic to local landscape and 35 Oxspring Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan v2 – September 2015 35 character, there would be little support for more wind energy schemes in the area. Therefore this type of energy scheme would not be supported on the site.” & Page 35 (6.3.8): “Proposals for sustainable energy schemes and low carbon technologies on this site will be encouraged as part of the development of a sustainable community energy hub for Oxspring”.</p> <p>Please refer to previous point made on page 1 (RE Page 15 paragraph 5.2.5 & Page 15 RE</p> | <p>Noted. This policy and wording is supported by Barnsley Council and there is no reason to delete the supporting text from the NDP. There is no policy for site as it is currently in the green belt, but the supporting text sets out the PC’s aspirations for the site if it comes forward, so it is reasonable to include it at this stage.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>paragraph 5.2.7). In my opinion it might be best to delete this paragraph/policy completely from the NP. If there was in the future a genuine commercial interest, Barnsley emerging LP already has a policy in place to support such development. Furthermore, I cannot see how the NP would & could argue, for example against any farmer/landowner who in the future might want to install their own local wind turbine for their own domestic/business use. Recommendations might be made about turbine size, etc. which will require evidence & justification to support it.</p> | |
| | <p>Page 35 (6.3.7) (2.): “Schemes will be required to protect and enhance existing landscape features within and around the site including dry stone walls, mature trees and woodland areas”</p> <p>Please refer to earlier comment above (page 1) i.e.: (...) “However, consider for example the future development of Employment site P2 – Sheffield Road, should such a scheme/development not include provision for new riverside access & extension of footpath links?”</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to comments relating to pp27 & 28 (6.2.10) above.</p> <p>No further change.</p> |
| | <p>Appendix 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were two meetings with local developers to gain a wider understanding of future development proposals/opportunities. These were informal meetings in nature & included the developer for Sawmill Court (Penistone) & Mike Shields. I cannot remember the exact dates. • “06-Mar-15: Resignation of chair of Steering Group. Verbal resignation to two other SG | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The notes refer to written records of meetings. No change.</p> <p>Amend text re second bullet point: 30-Mar-15: Resignation of chair of Steering Group. Verbal resignation to two other SG members.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | members.” I would be grateful if you could please remove reference to my name in this table, as there is no reference to anybody else (rightly so) that resigned at that point or earlier? | |
| | <p>Further general points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the consultants drafting the Basic Conditions Statement and Consultation Statement? • Have you or consultant sought advice on the viability statements? Who will prepare Strategic Environmental Assessment following screening by LA? • I’m sure that you will take the opportunity to celebrate the contributions & efforts made by all of us over the last few years towards the ‘inception, development & hopefully birth’ of the NP in the next/final versions of the Plan/accompanying documents. • I believe the quality of desk-top publishing of the Draft NP Plan could be better if it followed the design format developed by the local graphic designer of previous documents & webpage. I think what I’m trying to say is that the document is visually not very inspiring.... Even if it is just a draftWouldn’t you agree? | <p>Yes – consultants will be drafting the basic conditions and consultation statements, using information provided by the SG and PC.</p> <p>Viability statements are not required in NDPs. The evidence base is provided in background documents and the supporting text in the plan.</p> <p>Insert acknowledgements after front page.</p> <p>Insert logo.</p> <p>The PC / SG may consider appointing a graphic designer to produce the final, published version of the plan if funds are available at the end of the process. This version is produced using a standard Microsoft word programme and the planning consultants appointed do not provide graphic design expertise as part of the package of support for NDPs.</p> |
| | I have read through all the document, and in my opinion it is extremely well presented and easy to understand. All the policies make sense and would make Oxspring an even better place to live and bring up a family. I am very impressed and clearly a lot of detailed work has gone into this. You have our full support. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| | Nothing further to add to the plan. But thanks to | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | the neighbourhood plan team for their efforts and obvious hard work and endeavour. | |
| | Main concern is does Oxspring have sufficient infrastructure and suitable broadband to support business development. Possible increase in traffic into the village from Penistone direction could be an issue for residents along Sheffield Road. | Noted. Broadband is being rolled out across the country and improved provision should support rural areas such as Oxspring. The Plan recognises the concerns about traffic impacts and includes support for improved traffic management. |
| | It seems to us that whilst the Draft Consultation Document overall aims to have the interests of the Residents in mind, it really does fall short of offering some confidence and assurances that any of them could be delivered without some Development of a size or sizeable area, certainly not the desperately needed Affordable Housing for Local People, this being an area of particular interest to us, because you state that this is only a requirement on sites with 15 Houses or more, which I'm told would bring 4 maybe at most!!, so is it not right to say that you can offer the assurances of delivering on the various benefits to be had, but a Housing Scheme like the one being proposed off Sheffield Road or Roughbirchworth Lane will be needed to provide the relevant funding?, I'm sure the answer to that is yes so our point would be then why isn't one or the other being more actively supported? | Not Accepted. The Plan has to be in general conformity with local strategic planning policy and therefore only small scale development appropriate to the village location, facilities and green belt status can be supported. Existing assets and facilities are supported in the Plan. No change. |
| | Think about supporting the assets of the village (i.e. 2 pubs, 1 post office) when considering any development to safeguard employment and facilities. Also when developments are proposed get the best deal for the village as a whole and | Noted. No Change. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | not individual gains. | |
| PB Planning and others – Oxspring Fields Proposal | See detailed representations provided as separate documents, setting out a proposal for approximately 150 new houses, community park, tourism facility and various other community benefits on land within the green belt and largely within Hunshelf Parish. | Not accepted. The proposed site lies within the green belt and is largely outside the designated neighbourhood area for Oxspring. This is a strategic matter for Barnsley Council and is not something the NDP can address. |

Summary

A number of written representations were submitted. The majority of completed forms and other written submissions were from local residents and households (representing more than 1 person). There were also responses from a neighbouring parish, Hunshelf PC and some detailed informal comments from Barnsley Council. Most policies were overwhelmingly supported, with some minor changes proposed and accepted. There were concerns that the Plan should aim to maintain the rural character of Oxspring as a small village within the green belt, with support for policies to protect open spaces and to guide an appropriate mix of small scale new housing development. There were also some concerns about encouraging more business / tourist development in the village in relation to potential traffic impacts. In addition, there were suggestions for additional open spaces / local green spaces and for an additional access point to the Trans Pennine Trail. Many comments supported the overall strategy of the Plan and recognised the hard work of the steering group over a long period of time in preparing the document.

Several detailed submissions were received from a local land owner and their developer partner and planning consultant in support of the proposed Oxspring Fields Development. However, this proposal is not something the NDP can address: the site largely lies outside the neighbourhood area and is in the green belt and is therefore a strategic matter for Barnsley Council. Therefore, detailed responses have not been provided to this proposal within the table.