

**Council Offices**  
**Woodgreen**  
WITNEY,  
Oxfordshire,  
OX28 1NB,  
Tel: 01993 861000  
[www.westoxon.gov.uk](http://www.westoxon.gov.uk)



## **Planning Services**

Reply to : Kim Hudson  
Email : [kim.hudson@westoxon.gov.uk](mailto:kim.hudson@westoxon.gov.uk)

Dear Sir/Madam,

### **Draft Brize Norton Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 consultation**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Brize Norton Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 consultation.

We welcome the progress that has been made since the Regulation 14 consultation in September 2023 and having reviewed the plan, we consider this to be well structured and presented, using images and photographs to make it interesting and visually pleasing. In addition, there is a succinct number of policies which are clearly focused on a number of issues of importance to the local community.

The comments of the Council's Planning Policy team are outlined below. We have structured this in the same order as the plan itself for ease of reference. You will note that where relevant we have raised some potential concerns and suggested some possible changes which we hope you find helpful. You will also note that at the end of this response are a couple of comments received from other officers within the District Council.

### ***Glossary of Terms***

As minor observation, it would be helpful if the glossary of terms section could be amended to make it clear that once adopted, the neighbourhood plan will form part of the statutory development plan alongside the West Oxfordshire Local Plan and other 'made' neighbourhood plans that are in place in West Oxfordshire. At present, it reads as if neighbourhood plans do not form part of the development plan which is not the case.

It would also be helpful if the glossary could clarify the source and status of the area of high landscape value (AHLV).

### ***Part 2. THE BRIZE NORTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN***

The introduction is considered to be clear and concise, setting out how the Neighbourhood Plan fits in with the wider planning framework. We note that this has been further improved by including a brief timeline summarising how this stage has been reached however further information could be provided setting out the next steps and likely timeframe to adoption. It would also be helpful if the text could clearly explain that once adopted, the neighbourhood plan will form part of the statutory development

plan for West Oxfordshire. Conversely, supplementary planning documents (SPDs) do not form part of the statutory development plan and the text should therefore be amended to reflect this.

The text also refers to the plan period of 2031 and the fact that it will be necessary to review the plan from time to time. In this regard, it would be helpful if the plan could acknowledge the fact that West Oxfordshire District Council is currently in the process of producing a new Local Plan to 2041.

This section is considered to provide a good overview of the evolution and development of the Brize Norton Neighbourhood Plan to date. We note that this has been strengthened by adding more detail regarding the level of consultation to date although some further information on the key issues raised would assist the reader.

Here are some specific comments, some of which were mentioned at Regulation 14 stage which may help to improve this section further:

- Section '2.2. Designation'. This could provide a sentence to explain why this remains the most logical designation.
- Section '2.5. Draft Plan Creation', this could explain how the key issues affecting the village were identified which then fed into a draft vision and objections, from which the policies were shaped.

### ***Part 3. THE PARISH OF BRIZE NORTON***

This section provides lots of interesting facts about the village and provides a good understanding of its growth. Some minor observations are set out below.

Within Section 3.1 – Location and Context, the text refers to the population of Brize Norton as 983 (ONS 2011) and this should make clear if this is the total population of the parish as a whole. It should also clarify that the Brize Meadow development is an urban extension to Carterton which falls within the Brize Norton parish boundary rather than being an extension to the village of Brize Norton itself.

It is also suggested that a clearer present-day map of the village is included within this section.

I note the reference to the parish falling within a locally designated area of high landscape value (AHLV). It would be helpful if the source of this designation could be included as a footnote or within the main text itself – particularly as it is not a statutory designation of the Local Plan.

### ***Part 4. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT***

This section provides a useful overview of the wider planning and development context, the following suggestions are made to help ensure this is clear and concise:

#### ***Planning Context***

- It is suggested that a brief introduction of the role and status of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 is included here along with the date of adoption.

- The text currently lists out a number of relevant local plan policies but could usefully be expanded in relation to the settlement hierarchy of the local plan and the fact that Brize Norton is defined as one of a number of villages, perhaps with reference to Policy OS2 and H2 in terms of the overall approach to the scale of new development in such locations.
- It might also be useful to make some brief reference to relevant national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other relevant guidance.
- Where reference is made to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, it would be advisable to check with Oxfordshire Council to ensure that the text reflects their current programme of work.
- It should be made clear that the West Oxfordshire Design Guide is a supplementary planning document (SPD). It should also be corrected to state that the Design Guide SPD was adopted in 2016, not 2018. This Design Guide provides some useful background context that could also usefully be referred to in more detail here. As an example, Section 4 provides some useful information about local character. Also, Section 5.1 of the Guide provides details regarding settlement type including linear and dispersed settlements and their characteristics and Section 5.4 sets out information on the pattern of each settlement, all of which could be referenced given the earlier reference to settlement type made in Section 3.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

#### *Development Context*

- I would question whether it is appropriate to comment on the suitability of future sites and whether there will be a future need for development within the Parish. This needs to be assessed through the emerging Local Plan 2041 and be evidence led.

#### *Housing Development and Site Allocation*

- The text states that ‘proposals for limited development will be supported where they are in keeping with local character and are proportionate in scale and meet local housing needs, and/or provide employment, services, and facilities’. However, such an approach is not reflected in any of the proposed plan policies and is not consistent with the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 which does not require local housing need to be demonstrated in a village such as Brize Norton. This sentence should therefore be deleted or significantly amended to reflect Policies OS2 and H2 of the Local Plan.

### **Part 5. OUR SUSTAINABILITY CHALLENGES**

As previously suggested, this section could be restructured to make it easier to follow. At present, it presents a number of issues on a ‘thematic’ basis including connectivity, social, economy and heritage etc which are largely drawn from previous consultation and SWOT type analysis. It was advised that the relevant challenges under each theme are not clearly identified and the plans which are included are not clearly explained.

It was suggested that it would be clearer to the reader what the main issues facing Brize Norton Parish are by providing the relevant context for the rest of the plan, which appear to include:

- Protecting important green spaces and green corridors
- Encouraging wildlife and biodiversity

- Climate change including an increased risk of flooding
- The threat of future housing development
- Ensuring good levels of connectivity including to the open countryside
- Traffic, road-use and parking
- Out-commuting and a lack of opportunities for local job creation
- Protection and provision of community services and assets
- Protection of Parish character and heritage
- Protecting the rural setting and landscape of the village
- Coalescence with Carterton

I note that reference has now been made to these relevant issues but their connection to each theme is still weak in places and could usefully be strengthened.

A simple table for each 'theme' or topic would clearly identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats that have been identified and this could be supplemented with relevant illustrations/maps/images etc.

I also have the following specific observations to make:

- Sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 could be combined (or separated to consider active travel under one section and vehicular travel under another). Further commentary could be provided regarding some of the potential improvements and solutions.
- Section 5.2.3 (Heritage). This section makes reference to the desire to establish a Conservation Area but with no details as to the extent or what streetscapes merit this designation.
- Section 5.3 makes reference to the issue of home working stating that BNPC will support the availability of shared workspaces. This could usefully be reflected in Policy CF1 – Community Facilities and Infrastructure to give it more weight.

## ***Part 6. THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN VISION AND OBJECTIVES***

As previously advised, the vision could reflect more strongly on the importance of community facilities, green spaces and village character so it relates more closely to the objectives which should flow from the vision. Also 'sustainable' is quite a broad phrase – perhaps it could reflect more clearly what is meant by this in the context of Brize Norton.

The Brize Norton Vision Map on p35 could be better supported through an explanatory note or text to explain what the map is seeking to illustrate or achieve or how it links to the vision or objectives.

In terms of the proposed objectives, I note these are set out on a thematic basis which is sensible. It is also recognised that these have been bolstered as advised previously but some further work could be done to improve this further such as ensuring each objective is placed under the most appropriate heading and there may also be scope to define these further. For example, under the environment objective it states 'to protect important green spaces from development'. Could this include some text about improving these spaces for residents and biodiversity and link this to improved connectivity through green corridors? As another example, under the 'sustainable development' objective, could this

be refined to explain what the PC considers to be sustainable development (for example development that respects the character of the village and established pattern of development perhaps?). National planning policy is based on a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The role of the neighbourhood plan is to explain what that means in the context of Brize Norton Parish. Also, could this be expanded to consider design and development standards? Current national policy places a considerable emphasis on the importance of good design. Some of the objectives currently placed within this section may be better placed under the environment theme. Finally, the objective relating to infrastructure could be made more positive by not just talking about loss of facilities but needing to enhance and improve for the benefit of the local community including use of CIL when introduced by WODC.

## **Part 7. POLICIES**

The draft plan includes 8 policies as follows:

- CLH1 – Landscape Character
- CLH2 – Key Local Views
- CLH3 – Strategic Buffer Zones and Settlement Areas
- CLH4 – Village Character and Design
- CLH5 – Heritage Assets and Environment
- ENV1 – Local Green Spaces
- CF1 – Community Facilities and Infrastructure
- SD1 – Sustainable Development

As a general observation, it is very helpful for neighbourhood plans to include a limited number of policies such as this to ensure the plan is focused and simple to apply in a development management context. It is also helpful to clearly explain which overall objectives are intended to be delivered by which policy as is the case here.

Below I have provided some feedback regarding each of the 8 proposed policies. The commentary focuses in particular on the policy text but I have also provided some feedback on the supporting text.

### **Policy CLH1 – Landscape character**

Policy CLH1 focuses on landscape character and in summary seeks to ensure that proposals for new residential development:

- Retains and respects key views where practicable.
- Does not adversely impact the character of the village.
- Minimises light pollution.
- Retains and enhances the key components of the rural landscape character of the parish (agricultural land use, open views, pattern of hedgerows etc).
- Protects natural assets where possible.

In reading through this policy, I am encouraged that a number of observations previously raised have been addressed although I am still of the opinion that this policy creates a degree of overlap/repetition with Policy CLH2 – Key Local Views.

Concerns were previously raised that cross-referencing the Landscape Character Assessment in Appendix 09 which identifies a total of 34 key views results in the policy being unduly restrictive, contrary to national and local policy. I note that the supporting text now clarifies that the plan does not seek to protect all views listed in this assessment although this is not made explicitly clear in the policy wording itself.

It should also be made clear why certain views have been specifically identified and others not. They are cited as being the ‘most important’ but it is not clear how that conclusion has been reached.

### **Policy CLH2 – Key Local Views**

Policy CLH2 identifies 9 key views. As set out in the policy, the overall intention is to maintain and enhance these key views and protect them from development that would undermine their character and identity.

The supporting text provides some useful background information regarding the landscape features in the designated area, some areas of which are more closely related to Carterton than Brize Norton village in terms of proximity.

In terms of the policy itself, it is not entirely clear how the 9 key views which have been identified relate to the 34 key views identified at Appendix 09 and cross-referenced in Policy CLH1. Although supplementary text is included to explain this relationship, this still creates confusion in my opinion and reinforces the fact that the issue of seeking to preserve key views should be dealt with as a combined policy. As outlined above, it would also be helpful if additional text could be included to explain how the 9 key views have been selected and why others are not shown on the plan or referred to in the policy.

Aside from this, revisions to the policy text itself are welcome which now requires development proposals to have regard to the key views identified and for proposals to seek to maintain and enhance these where possible. This approach should also be reflected more strongly in the supporting text.

### **Policy CLH3 – Strategic Buffer Zones and Settlement Areas**

Policy CLH3 is a lengthy policy that seeks to address a number of issues. In essence it seeks to identify two buffer zones and an area of sensitivity to change which will be protected from development in terms of their character and openness – the intention being to maintain the soft transition between Brize Norton, RAF Brize Norton, and Carterton, and preserve the setting of the village in its wider rural landscape.

It was previously suggested that these areas are referred to ‘areas of sensitivity to change’ or something similar, potentially shown as a more general star or circle on the map – rather than having a specifically defined boundary. Whilst the area to the north of Carterton is now referred to as an area of sensitivity to

change, it is still defined on the map as a hard boundary and there are also two specific areas (A&B) which are defined as strategic buffer zones.

Whilst the intention of the policy is understood, it is relevant to note that the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 does not seek to delineate any sort of buffer zones on the rural fringe of any of its towns and villages. We therefore have concerns that the specific delineation of an area or areas, primarily for the purpose of keeping that area free from built development will set a precedent for other towns and villages to look to do likewise. Whilst we fully recognise the importance of avoiding harmful coalescence and loss of character/impact on setting, there are other ways in which this policy objective can be achieved.

There is also a risk in defining a specific boundary that other areas beyond those boundaries are construed as not being sensitive to change or coalescence. The text of the plan itself acknowledges that there are key areas of the village where coalescence is a relevant consideration and yet those are not delineated on a map.

In the interests of progressing the policy through examination, as previously suggested, we consider that the policy would benefit from being re-titled to something along the lines of 'Protecting the setting and character of the village'. It would also benefit from having an introductory line within the policy before it considers the various criteria.

Specific reference to specific strategic buffer zones should be removed from the policy, maps and supporting text as such an approach does not accord with the Local Plan 2031 or national policy. The specific delineation of the two defined buffer zones and an 'area of sensitivity to change' should be removed from maps altogether or, at the least, be replaced with less specific symbols (e.g. a star).

Removing the current degree of specificity implied by the policy and maps, would be consistent with the approach taken by the Hailey Neighbourhood Plan examiner where a similar issue was raised.

Reflecting the above concerns, we would respectfully suggest a number of specific amendments to the policy as outlined below.

- Criterion i – This should be reworded simply to state the following: Any proposals which, either individually or cumulatively, lead to unreasonable coalescence of Brize Norton with Carterton and which would cause a harmful impact on the character and rural setting of the village will not be accepted.
- Criterion iii - This should be re-worded to state that that street/ external lighting will not be permitted where these create a harmful impact on the character and rural setting of the area.
- Criterion iv – Reference to significant incursions into the open countryside should be removed as this is too restrictive. It could be re-worded to state that development will not be permitted where it will create coalescence, result in the loss of identity of separate settlements and fails to protect or enhance the local landscape and setting of settlements and the Kilkenny Country Park.

- Criterion v - Wouldn't any proposal which causes demonstrable harm be resisted? Reference to solar farms not being permitted under any circumstances should be removed as this will depend on the harms and is too restrictive. We would suggest the criteria is re-worded as follows – 'Proposals which would cause demonstrable harm in terms of impact on the setting and character of the village will not be supported'.
- Criterion vi – Reference to criteria set by the Parish Council is not defined and should be removed.
- Criterion vii – In addition to removing reference to the two strategic buffer zones, it is recommended that the final part of the criteria be reworded to '...retained where possible and enhanced'.
- Criterion viii – I remain of the view that the issue of preserving and enhancing green corridors is considered elsewhere or as a standalone policy as it doesn't appear to logically sit with the overall intention of this policy which relates primarily to protecting the character and setting of the village.
- Criterion ix – It is recommended that this is re-worded to require the character and appearance of important open spaces and other features within the village to be protected (see Policy OS2 of the Local Plan 2031).
- Criterion x – this would be better placed in the supporting text.

#### **Policy CLH4 - Village Character and Design**

Policy CLH4 essentially seeks to ensure that residential development proposals are well designed and protect and enhance the village's character and identity – in particular its distinct linear form.

The supporting text provides some useful background information regarding the pattern of development in Brize Norton and this has been further improved by providing more information regarding the different character areas and what makes them distinctive.

A number of revisions have been made to this policy as previously suggested and these amendments are welcomed.

I note that the last bullet point in this policy covers many separate issues including environmental health (noise, odour etc) and these do not appear to be directed related to this policy?

As a final general observation, there may be specific characteristics of the village which could be mentioned in the policy drawing from the design code work which has been carried out. This is an opportunity to clearly set out what is meant by high quality design in the context of Brize Norton and the policy should be as locally distinctive as possible.



### **Policy CLH5 – Heritage Assets**

I note that this is a new policy which has been included since the last version of the neighbourhood plan was prepared and this is welcomed.

The purpose of this policy is to conserve and enhance heritage assets and their setting.

Detailed advice is provided from the Council's Conservation and Design Officer separately but some broad policy comments are provided below:

- I would suggest that Section i is included as introductory text within the policy.
- I would question the relevance of traffic to heritage assets, this would be better placed in a policy concerning the impacts of traffic travelling through Brize Norton village such as congestion, air quality, safety etc.
- As a general observation, the policy could be bolstered to refer to particular heritage characteristics to make it more locally relevant.

### **Policy ENV1 – Local Green Spaces**

Many of the sites identified form important local green spaces and the aspiration of safeguarding from residential development is understood and supported. However, it should be recognised that appropriate development which supports the function of these spaces may be beneficial so it may be better to state that new development will be supported where it enhances the function/ appearance of these.

I would question the proposed designation of the SUDS area (LGS1) as it is not immediately obvious how this area accords with the criteria for LGS designation.

I note the intention to designate Kilkenny Country Park as LGS and would point out that it is already identified in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 and protected by virtue of Policy EH5.

### **POLICY CF1 – Community Facilities and Infrastructure**

The overall intention of Policy CF1 is to ensure that residential development is supported by the necessary infrastructure including arrangements for the management and maintenance of key assets.

In this respect it sits within the context of Local Plan Policy OS5 which requires all new development to deliver or contribute towards the timely provision of essential supporting infrastructure, either on-site or through a financial contribution.

As mentioned above, the supporting text of the plan earlier mentions the issue of home working and the fact that BNPC will support such provision. This policy would seem to be an obvious place to give that

aspiration more weight with reference to policy support for proposals that supporting increased home, remote and co-working space.

The supporting text of the proposed policy could helpfully refer to the Council's Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which can be accessed [here](#). The SPD provides detailed guidance to developers, infrastructure providers and local communities on likely infrastructure requirements for developments in West Oxfordshire and contains useful information which can be used to guide this policy.

Please note that CIL is currently not in place in West Oxfordshire although we are working towards its progression. Further information regarding the progression of CIL can be accessed [here](#).

In terms of the policy itself, I note that this has been amended to make this less prescriptive as advised.

### **Policy SD1 – Sustainable Development Policy**

National Policy (the NPPF) and the West Oxfordshire Local Plan are both based on a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Policy SD1 seeks to articulate what sustainable development means in the context of Brize Norton which is helpful and appropriate. However, I note that the policy covers a very wide range of issues and whilst all are related to sustainable development in its broadest sense, the topics are quite diverse and perhaps need to be broken down into separate policies or absorbed into other policies already listed. Specific observations on the policy as currently drafted are set out below.

The first bullet point refers to avoiding flood risk. Whilst this is fine, I would question what it adds in terms of decision-making over and above the NPPF and the Local Plan both of which address this issue in some detail.

The second bullet point refers to water efficiency. I would observe that this is already addressed in the Local Plan through Policy OS4 – Prudent Use of Natural Resources so again question what value this is adding to the neighbourhood plan.

The third bullet refers to the need to conserve 'and' enhance the landscape but it may be more appropriate to state 'and/or' to provide some flexibility. This may also be better placed within Policy CLH1 Landscape Character?

I note that the policy refers to the need to provide a 10% biodiversity net gain in line with national requirements. This may also benefit from being a standalone policy or incorporated within a policy regarding green spaces, green corridors and ecological improvement. Having a separate policy would also allow you to set out a clear approach towards off-site gains where on-site may not be achievable.

The fifth bullet point relating to accessibility would be better placed with a transport policy. Effectively you are requiring development to be supported by a range of sustainable transport modes which could be more clearly set out.

We welcome the intention to apply net zero emissions bearing in mind that the UK government has made a commitment to net zero by 2050 and reducing emissions forms a key element in National Planning Policy. It is embedded in the Local Plan 2031 and the Council Plan which sets a target of reducing emission by 50% by 2030 (based on 2008 levels) and aims to set a pathway to achieving net-zero growth by 2050. Anything more ambitious than this would need to be supported by robust evidence.

I note the specific reference to the diversification of farmland to deliver more woodland but I am not clear how this will be achieved through new development which is unrelated to the areas mentioned in the policy.

I would also suggest that the final bullet is reworded such that major development assesses the impact on traffic flows and subsequent noise, pollution and disruption through the village both, during both construction and completion phase.

### ***Part 8. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING***

I would suggest that the introductory text is expanded to talk about the importance of implementation and monitoring as this is an essential part of a strategy to ensure the policies are achieved. It also allows progress to be checked and can help inform if action needs to be taken or if plans need to be adapted.

The table sets out a number of criteria to monitor the proposed policies. This would benefit from including a timescale column. Also some of the criteria could be expanded upon. For example under the delivery partners column - landowners, the County Council and the community could be added. In addition, the 'measures to be used to monitor progress' column should be expanded to include other relevant indicators other than just the assessment of applications. This could be a wide range of indicators and you may wish to review the indicators of the Local Plan Delivery and Monitoring Framework in Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 2031 to help assist you.

### **Other feedback**

Below I have set out revised comments received from other departments within the Council who were consulted on the Neighbourhood Plan:

### ***Comments from the Climate Change Manager at West Oxfordshire District Council***

#### **Policy CLH4**

- *'They aim to achieve net zero operational carbon on-site through ultra-low energy fabric specification, low carbon technologies and on-site renewable energy generation.'*
- *'Maximise opportunities to retrofit existing buildings.'*
- *'Demonstrate attempts to minimise embodied carbon.'*

Policy CLH5

- *'Opportunities to retrofit Brize Norton's designated and non-designated historic heritage assets are maximised.'*

Policy SD1

- *'Aim to achieve net zero carbon in operation and to minimise embodied carbon in all new build and existing buildings.'*
- i *'...avoid increased flood risk from either...'* At the end of the paragraph add: *'Implement sustainable drainage systems to minimise flood risk.'*
- vii *'Encourage diversification of farmland to deliver habitat enhancements, especially in Nature Recovery areas, Natural Flood Management areas and utilising farmland in the northern and eastern parts of the parish.'*
- Include renewables and EVCPs as separate points from vii.

Implementation and monitoring

- More effective if KPIs are included alongside each policy rather than as a final section.

***Comments from Senior Conservation and Design Officer at West Oxfordshire District Council***

See Appendix 1.

**Summary**

In summary, good progress has been made since this was last reviewed which we welcome and overall this is a thorough and well-written document. However, there are a number of key areas which need further revisions particularly regarding the proposed delineation of strategic buffer zones and protection of key views as outlined in this response.

I trust this is of assistance and if you require any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Kim Hudson

Principal Planning Policy Officer

## Appendix 1

General:

The maps are too pixelated, it is difficult to zoom in to identify anything.

Regarding Appendix 06 Document B Heritage Assets – there is no reference to Historic England – the List: <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/map-search?clearresults=True>. Although British Listed Buildings website is okay to use if HE's website is down, I consider the most important reference for listed building must be HE's list.

It would be very useful to have a list entry number against each listed building, and even better if they are mapped – this will be easier to locate structures. Once the Parish have a full list, I can check it again.

Nevertheless, although a listed building will have a stand-alone list entry, in many cases there could be other structures (including walls, features) that are listed by virtue of being of a certain age and being within the curtilage. For example, farm complexes can have multiple buildings within its curtilage. This should be acknowledged as a caveat within the text. See HE's guidance: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/listed-buildings-and-curtilage-advice-note-10/heag125-listed-buildings-and-curtilage/>

Historic England states: there will need to be a clear strategy and methodology for identifying non designated heritage assets. Historic England's guidance sets out how to do this: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7/heag301-local-heritage-listing/>. In this case, I do not see a methodology. This would be extremely useful because it demonstrates why the assets were identified and why the Parish consider them important.

I do recommend a heritage specialist should help with this appendix before we it is included in any Made NP\*.

I cannot comment on references to the Brize Norton Design Code, I have not seen it.

---

### POLICY CLH5 - HERITAGE ASSETS POLICY

- i. ~~Brize Norton's designated historic heritage assets and their setting and key views both above and below ground, including listed buildings, scheduled monuments and conservation areas will be conserved and enhanced for their historic significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character, and sense of place (\*Appendix 06 Document B Heritage Assets).~~

*There are many types of significance - inc. historical, architectural etc. It would be better not to specify just historic.*

- ii. ~~The main road through Brize Norton village, Station Road, is a busy road that has a detrimental impact on heritage assets. Proposals for further development should have regard to the "Traffic in Villages" toolkit developed by Hamilton-Baillie Associates in conjunction with Dorset AONB Partnership as well as the Brize Norton Design Code.~~

*How does traffic have a detrimental impact on heritage assets - this is not explained in the introduction text: is it the appearance, to the setting, or harm to historic fabric etc.?*

*I'm not sure this policy is positioned in the correct area. I wonder if this should be in an a traffic sections, the AONB or Environmental or Design section? It can still refer to heritage, as this is of course important.*

- iii. Proposals for development that affect non-designated historic assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and to the significance of the heritage asset as set out in

the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023) and with regard to the Brize Norton Design Code.

- iv. Whilst this policy mainly relates to standing buildings, this policy notes the importance of other heritage assets such as archaeological sites, locally listed buildings, or areas of identified historic landscape character / historic settlement pattern of Brize Norton, the route of former Roman roads, and the deserted medieval villages of Astrop and Caswell will be conserved and enhanced for their significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character, and sense of place (\*Appendix 06 Document B Heritage Assets) as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023).

*Whether designated or non-designated - all of the elements mentioned in this policy (archaeological, locally listed, etc.) are considered heritage assets. It doesn't need to be explained. This policy can specifically relate to the important assets such as historic landscape character / historic settlement pattern, roads, and inc. Astrop and Caswell that the Parish wish to pay special attention to.*

## 6.2 Objectives

Objectives have been grouped under four themes:

### CHARACTER, HERITAGE, AND LANDSCAPE

- To conserve and, where possible, enhance the intrinsic character of the Parish of Brize Norton.
- To avoid coalescence with RAF Brize Norton and Carterton
- To preserve the high-quality and accessible countryside setting of the village, open landscapes, and key views
- To conserve designated and non-designated heritage assets both above and below ground for their historic significance and their contribution to local distinctiveness character and sense of place.

And, also in 7.1: To conserve designated and non-designated heritage assets both above and below ground for their historic significance and their contribution to local distinctiveness character and sense of place

7.1 CHARACTER, HERITAGE AND LANDSCAPE	
<b>OBJECTIVES</b> To maintain and enhance the distinctive character and identity of the village in particular relation to the surrounding landscape and rural setting.	<b>POLICY</b> CLH1 - LANDSCAPE CHARACTER
To preserve the high-quality and accessible countryside setting of the village, open landscapes and key views.	CLH2 - KEY LOCAL VIEWS
To avoid coalescence with RAF Brize Norton Carterton. To protect the green spaces in the gaps between the three sub-areas	CLH3 - STRATEGIC BUFFER ZONES AND SETTLEMENT AREAS
To conserve and, where possible, enhance the intrinsic character of Brize Norton	CLH4 - VILLAGE CHARACTER AND DESIGN
To conserve designated historic assets both above and below ground for their historic significance and their contribution to local distinctiveness, character, and sense of place	CLH5 - HERITAGE ASSETS

In relation to POLICY CLH1 - LANDSCAPE CHARACTER POLICY – ensure that it is not confused with Historic landscape character (description of HLC below):

**What is Historic Landscape Character (HLC):** The historic and archaeological processes which have influenced the modern landscape. The specific characteristics of an area or district, and what makes that place special or distinct. It recognises that all parts of the landscape – from the Iron Age hillfort to the 1960s housing development – have historic value and contribute to the landscape in which we live.