

1. Introduction and Background

The two sections below refer to **2.) The Main Planning Issues** and **3.) Landscape Matters**, particularly with regard to Policy SV9, raised in the representations of agents and consultants on behalf of landowners.

The nature of the responses on behalf of some of the landowners appear somewhat selective in their references, rather than examining the context of the development of the plan over a 5 year period, during which National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) Local Plan and administrative changes required further engagement with parish residents. Although the Consultation Statement (volume 3) is comprehensive in examining the scope, approach and details provided over the 5 year period, we trust that the Parish Council providing context/background will give a greater appreciation of material factors involved in developing the Neighbourhood Plan.

Clearly, a major factor also affecting residents has been the 3 large-scale building developments approved by the Planning Inspectorate on the edge of Lower Shiplake in the last five years. Although two of the three sites (comprising 135 new dwellings) are technically in Harpsden, our neighbouring parish, they rely on Shiplake for their day-to-day services and facilities.

SODC, appreciating the impact of these developments on Shiplake parish, initially recommended that the impact was such that the new developments in this area should be credited to the total quantum of development taking place at Shiplake for the purposes of deciding whether they had met the Local Plan policy H8 target. This was subsequently 'reversed' and the dwellings were credited to Henley and Harpsden's Joint Neighbourhood Plan (JHHNP) for administrative reasons and consideration that Shiplake, comprising two smaller villages, did not have any allocation to build additional housing within the SODC Local Plan. Correspondence concerning the attribution of the Thames Farm dwelling numbers initially to Shiplake parish, and latterly to Harpsden parish, is referenced on page 124 of Consultation Statement and the correspondence itself, and a map of affected land, produced by SODC at the time, can be found at the links in the footnote below.¹

It is also notable that 6 of the new sites, put forward by site promoters at the recent public presentations for inclusion in Henley and Harpsden's draft updated JHHNP, are on the settlement edge of Lower Shiplake and generally promoted as being in Shiplake. Why? They are 10 minutes' walk to the Lower Shiplake shops, pub, river and railway station and a short drive to the community halls and schools. Henley is 2 miles away by car on the busy A4155. At this stage none of these sites have been proposed in the JHHNP but neither Thames Farm nor Wyvale (assumed 135 dwellings in total) were proposed in the original JHHNP either, yet they were both allowed on appeal.

Consider also, that, with a population density of 4.4 persons per hectare, Shiplake is one of the most densely populated smaller villages in South Oxfordshire, which has an average SODC population of 2 persons per hectare (as referenced in the Shiplake Villages Plan Report 2014), residents have appreciated the requirement for proportionate and appropriate housing development as referenced in the 2017 Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire. A good example of this, relevant to new dwellings development and housing requirements in the parish, is the

¹ <https://www.shiplakevillages.com/page-content/documents/1626676209-Ricardo%20RiosSettlementsemail071218.pdf>
<https://www.shiplakevillages.com/page-content/documents/1626676136-Thames%20Farm%20AttributionHJ24052018.pdf>
<https://www.shiplakevillages.com/page-content/documents/1628678081-New%20Boundaries%20Proposed%20by%20SODC.pdf>

Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version: Response of Shiplake Parish Council to Selected Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

provision of social housing primarily for the elderly. Both Shiplake Cross and Lower Shiplake benefit from such 'post war' housing. More recently in the 1970's period, Sydney Harrison House was built for the elderly comprising 32 dwellings, mainly flats but also some small bungalows. Close to the centre of Lower Shiplake with its railway station, pub, butchers, small garage, Corner Shop & Post Office it was ideal for its intended age group, such that it also became the centre for many community clubs for all residents of Shiplake e.g. bridge, local history, art appreciation, women's institute etc. An integrated community. Alas, European regulations required it to be upgraded/redeveloped. Originally, it was feared it would simply be sold for private development of housing but following very active lobbying by the parish council, it was agreed with SOHA that it be developed with the required much higher specification for 12 social housing units for the elderly, partly funded by the development and sale of 4 semi-detached dwellings on the site (16 in total). Now completed with a regrettable loss of 16 flats, but the benefit of continued availability of appropriate high quality social housing (c/o SOHA) for the elderly and other housing (4 units) for young families, all reflects housing needs as expressed in the 2017 Neighbourhood Plan survey and prior to that, in the Shiplake Villages Plan Report 2014.

The above provides background to SODC's latest update (27/01/2022) of the total net additional dwelling numbers permitted within the parish between 2011 and 1st April 2021.

The update indicates that 95 net additional dwellings have been permitted in the Parish between 2011 and 2021. A copy of the data from SODC is **appended to this note**.

This is considerably in excess of the 5% growth (32 dwellings) that was originally suggested as being an appropriate / desirable level of growth for a 'smaller village' in Local Plan policy H8.

In reviewing the deliverability of these permitted dwellings, we note that Reserved Matters for the Retirement Village 65 units were approved by SODC's Planning Committee on 15/02/2022 meaning that it is to be regarded as deliverable, and of the other 30 dwellings, almost all are either already built or nearing completion (15 are recorded as completed and 13 under construction, but that was at April 2021; the situation has moved forward and more have been completed since then).

Although not included in the above figures, from a wider Shiplake perspective, the two large sites (Thames Farm and Wyvale) are both at the Reserved Matters stage and both are anticipated to be completed within SODC's Local Plan period (135 dwellings in total with outline planning permission on these two sites).

Additionally the above figures do not include dwellings permitted since 1st April 2021.

Responses to specific points raised under the heading of Main Planning Issues are provided below in the section: 2) The Main Planning Issues

2. The Main Planning Issues

The following statement has been made in response to the representations made on behalf of Victoria Land by Ridge and Partners LLP dated 7th December 2021 (response 44), Savills on behalf of Bolney Court Inc (response 47) dated 8th December 2021, Savills on behalf of Phillimore Estate (response 48).

The various statements set out the reasons why the respondents consider that the Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan (SVNP) is not in conformity with the 'basic conditions' for Neighbourhood Plans.

The basic conditions are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

The main planning issues raised in these representations relate to:

- whether the SVNP delivers sufficient housing to meet its needs;
- whether the SVNP allows for affordable housing; and
- is the infill policy in conformity with that of the Local Plan and National Policy.

Landscape matters in these representations are dealt with in Section 3. below.

A. Does the NP Deliver Sufficient Housing to Meet its Needs?

The Ridge and Partners representation states that with regard to the District 5 year housing land supply and in particular recent appeal decisions in 2021 (the Neighbourhood Plan is abbreviated to SVP):

"... the Local Plan is currently failing to deliver the required housing to meet its needs. The Parish, in their omission of site allocations, are withdrawing from the opportunity to maintain a supply of housing. It is our concern that principal issues facing the NPA are not recognised or addressed in the pre-submission version of the plan.

It is our view that the SNP fails to address inequalities and to support the district in maintaining a healthy level of supply. The adopted SODP strategy will inflict a general decline in services and facilities, especially for 'Smaller Villages'. These concerns are heightened by the Parish's proposed strategy which adopts an inflexible approach to growth."

Specifically, with regard to the housing approach taken by the Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan, Ridge and Partners state:

"...the SNP relies upon a number of schemes that have been delivered outside of its NPA to provide justification for their stringent housing policies.

the housing need for Shiplake has not been met and will continue to be unmet if the SNP continues as currently drafted

Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version: Response of Shiplake Parish Council to Selected Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

Therefore, we propose that the SNP's strategy is revised and that at least a 5% growth requirement is reinstated into the plan.

The representation by Savills on behalf of Bolney Court (response 47) states that:

3.2 These reflect the provisions of the adopted Local Plan (e.g. Policy H1), much as policy SV1 of the SNP reflects the provisions of Policy H16 of the Local Plan. However, the policies entirely fail to address the requirements of Policy H8, which contains the "expectation" that Neighbourhood Plans will plan for growth commensurate with the scale of the settlement (equating to a 5-10% increase in households as compared to 2011 Census data)

The following paragraphs seek to respond to the above comments.

South Oxfordshire District Local Plan 2035 has a clear settlement hierarchy as set out in Appendix 7 of the Plan:

- Towns
- Larger Villages
- Smaller Villages
- Other Villages

Lower Shiplake and Shiplake Cross are both classified as Smaller Villages.

The overall strategy for the District as detailed in Local Plan Policy STRAT1 sets out the strategy for the hierarchy of settlements, with the main focus of development being the towns. This then filters down the hierarchy to Smaller and Other Villages, as covered by criterion viii) which allows development that is:

"supporting Smaller and Other Villages by allowing for limited amounts of housing and employment to help secure the provision and retention of services"

Local Plan Policy STRAT2 confirms that housing should be delivered in accordance with the spatial strategy as set out in Local Plan Policy STRAT1 and as per the locations in Local Plan Policy H1.

The strategic allocations generally relate to the towns and larger villages, which is followed by Neighbourhood Plan allocations. The key issue is that Neighbourhood Plans are not expected to allocate where they are a 'Smaller or Other Village'.

The supporting text to Local Plan Policy H8 at paragraph 4.37 clarifies that:

"Smaller Villages, as defined in the settlement hierarchy (Appendix 7), have no defined requirement to contribute towards delivering additional housing (beyond windfall and infill development) to meet the overall housing requirement of South Oxfordshire. There is a sufficient supply of housing from strategic allocations and from existing planning permissions, which means that the less sustainable settlements will not be required to offset the housing requirement."

This clarifies that there is no 'expectation' for Neighbourhood Plans to allocate housing. The Shiplake Neighbourhood Plan has been positively prepared following extensive public consultation. The policies set out a range of options for further housing development which include infill, conversion of buildings and the redevelopment of brownfield sites.

In 2011 the parish had 630 homes. An agreed appropriate 5% increase as set out in criterion 2 of Policy H8 would require 32 dwellings to have been completed since April 2011. The 5%

Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version: Response of Shiplake Parish Council to Selected Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

increase was discussed by the Local Plan Inspector in his Main Modifications and agreed that this level was appropriate for Smaller Villages. This level of increase is seen by numerous Local Planning Authorities as a standard figure for settlements of this scale.

Since this time, the area to the north of Lower Shiplake has been the subject of major development applications allowed on appeal, totalling approximately 135 dwellings. Whilst the parish boundary runs to the south of these sites, such that they are outside the Plan area, their proximity means that they are located physically closer to Shiplake than any other settlement and use the services therein.

It appears that the analysis, undertaken by Ridge and Partners and Savills in support of their representations, fails to consider all of the properties built within the Plan area since April 2011.

In particular, paragraphs 3.5 of the Savills response (on behalf of Bolney Court) states that the larger sites to the north of the Plan area are commitments only. In this regard therefore, the SVNP Steering Group consider that it is entirely pertinent to look at those sites which have been developed.

On this basis, there have been 95 dwellings granted permission between 2011 and April 2021, of which approximately 28 have been completed or are under construction, 65 remain extant with reserved matters approved and a further 2 dwellings have outline permission. It is therefore clear that the Parish has met the 5% figure without counting those dwellings adjacent to Shiplake but beyond the parish boundary. Indeed well over 10% additional dwellings have been permitted between 2011 and April 2021, compared to the 2011 base figure of 630 homes.

Paragraph 4.37 of the Local Plan in relation to delivering additional housing in Smaller Villages sets out that housing allocations will be supported:

“provided that the levels of growth are commensurate to the size of the village”

The development of settlements does not solely relate to boundaries on a plan. If the wider area is considered alongside the Plan Area, then new housing development amounting to (95 dwellings within the parish plus 135 dwellings adjacent to the parish boundary) approximately 230 new dwellings have been permitted in the environs of the Shiplake villages, or an increase of dwellings in the area of 36.5%.

It is established that the ability to integrate new development is a fundamental aspect of whether or not new development can become a successful part of an existing community. On this basis, it would be unreasonable to expect that the Shiplake Villages should seek an increase over the existing level of development which has been accommodated to date and that which is still permitted by the policies within this Neighbourhood Plan.

On this basis, if a 5% growth requirement was added to the Plan as is suggested in the above representations, there is significant risk that the Parish would not have sufficient services, facilities or infrastructure to accommodate such rapid levels of growth. It would certainly be the case that growth would not be commensurate with the size of the village.

Furthermore, it should be noted that public consultation throughout this process has identified that local residents are not in favour of further major residential development within the Plan period. Given the scale of recent developments in the area, residents are concerned the Plan

Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version: Response of Shiplake Parish Council to Selected Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

period may see significant levels of growth over and above 5% (or indeed 10%) and therefore this Plan has been written taking this into account.

This is contrary to the comment made in the Ridge and Partners statement, which states that:

“The 2017 Survey shows that 47% of the responders were of the view that development should, if required, take place on the edge of the settlements. However, it is apparent that the SNP has ignored these responders and instead imposes stricter measures and unjustified evidence to support their housing needs strategy.”

This statement does not reflect the consultation process throughout the Plan and each of the drafts consulted upon. The initial survey reflected the position at the time before the major development was permitted to the north of the Parish. Further consultation then made it very clear that following this, the parish would not be growing at a rate acceptable to parishioners.

B. Does the SVNP Allow for Sufficient Affordable Housing Within the Parish?

The following paragraphs seek to respond to the above question.

The SVNP does not have to cover all topics, particularly where sufficient policies exist either nationally in the NPPF or locally in the Local Plan. In this instance the supporting text of the SVNP makes it clear in paragraph 6.2.11 that these matters are covered elsewhere. In particular this is covered by SODC Local Plan policies H9: Affordable Housing and H10 which deals with exception sites and entry level housing schemes.

It is noted that small scale, minor development would not deliver affordable housing, as the trigger of a net gain of 10 or more dwellings is unlikely on the sites likely to come forward during the Plan period. In response however, rural exception sites can be brought forward as stand-alone developments without the need for large scale development / enabling development under Local Plan Policy H10. In view of this, there is no reason why the SVNP should include a policy to duplicate that which already exists elsewhere.

It should also be noted that the two large sites outside but adjacent to the parish boundary will provide affordable housing that will be physically adjacent to Lower Shiplake and available to the wider community.

C. Is the Infill Policy in Conformity With That of the Local Plan and National Policy?

The representation by Ridge and Partners states that:

“...it appears that the SNP is looking to adopt an approach that is not in general conformity with the SODP’s definition. The SNP under Policy SV1 emphasises that infill development can only come forward within the built-up area of villages. The definition in the SODC does not restrict infill to built up areas. Policy H16 does not include reference to built up areas and permits infill within settlements. In the case of the SNP, the settlements are Lower Shiplake and Shiplake Cross. We believe the SNP definition is more restrictive and not in general conformity within the SODP definition and should allow similar flexibility that meets the NPA’s needs.”

Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version: Response of Shiplake Parish Council to Selected Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

The SNP under Policy SV1 emphasises that infill development can only come forward within the built-up area of villages. The definition in the SODC does not restrict infill to built up areas. Policy H16 does not include reference to built up areas and permits infill within settlements.

The Parish Council do not agree that Neighbourhood Plan Policy SV1 is not in general conformity with the Local Plan. The wording of Neighbourhood Plan Policy SV1 states:

“Within the built-up area of the villages, infill development and redevelopment of previously developed land or buildings will be supported...”

Local Plan Policy H1: Delivering New Homes makes it explicitly clear that infill sites are to be within ‘Smaller or Other Villages’.

“3. Residential development on sites not allocated in the Development Plan will only be permitted where:

iv) it is infilling, and brownfield sites within [our emphasis] Smaller and Other Villages as defined in the settlement hierarchy; or

Local Plan Policy H8: Housing in the Smaller Villages again uses the term ‘within’.

“1. The Council will support development within [our emphasis] the Smaller Villages in accordance with Policy H16. Where a Parish Council wishes to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan and make housing allocations within it to support further growth, the Council will support this.”

Finally, Local Plan Policy H16: Backland and Infill Development and Redevelopment again clearly states ‘within Smaller Villages’:

“1. Within [our emphasis] Smaller Villages and Other Villages, development should be limited to infill and the redevelopment of previously developed land or buildings.

2. Infill development is defined as the filling of a small gap in an otherwise continuous built-up frontage or on other sites within [our emphasis] settlements...”

Therefore it is established that all policies clearly highlight that infill sites are to be ‘within’ the village. The clarification of infill also reiterates that this should be within the village. This is further evidenced by criterion 3 of policy H16 which states:

3. Where a proposal encompasses residential development of land behind an existing frontage or placing of further dwelling/s behind existing dwelling/s within the existing site, the proposals should demonstrate that:

...iii) development would not extend the built limits of the settlement.”

The reference here to the built limits of the settlement again goes to evidence that the ‘built-up area of the villages’ as set out in the Neighbourhood Plan policy is clearly in accordance with that of the Local Plan for ‘Smaller Villages’.

Policy SV1 solely relates to infill development and redevelopment of previously developed land or buildings within the built up area of the villages. It should also be noted that with regard to development outside of the villages such as the redevelopment of brownfield sites for example (Local Plan policy H1 criterion 4), this is clearly supported by other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan such as SV2 and SV3.

3. Landscape Matters (particularly with regard to Policy SV9, raised in the representations of agents and consultants on behalf of landowners)

A. Background

The Glover Report² recommendations were accepted in principle by the Government in January 2022³ and we are informed by the Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB) that consultation regarding the Chilterns is being planned for later this year 2022. An extract from the Glover report is reproduced below to provide greater clarity of context of the values of the landscapes, which are appreciated and taken advantage of by a wide range of visitors including ramblers, walkers, cyclists, anglers, river users, swimmers etc....particularly so in Shiplake during COVID and continuing. The report states (page 63):

'We think that the NPPF should make a reality of its promise that 'great weight' should be given to national landscapes by issuing new advice that will secure confident delivery of this aim by both public and private sector players. In situations where such cases are determined with the expert advice of the National Infrastructure Commission, we urge the government to give the strongest emphasis to its commitment to our national landscapes. They should not be the place for major intrusive developments unless, as is stated in the NPPF they are truly in the national interest without any possible alternative locations being available. Such guidance should also help ensure that our proposed new third purpose (social and economic development which enhances the first two purposes; see the Living in Landscapes chapter for our recommendation on this) will be effectively implemented...'

Both the Cotswolds and the Dorset proposals are strong candidates, alongside the Chilterns, to be considered for National Park status.

We are pleased to note that the Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB) responses to the Neighbourhood Plan at both consultation stages very strongly supported the findings of the SVNP Landscape Character Assessment.

B. Responses to Landowners: Policy SV9

The following comments are to be read in parallel with the responses to both the Examiner's Questions and the comments by SODC.

Savills and HDA on behalf of Bolney Court Inc

Re: Blanket approach to designation of PLCA3 as a valued landscape

² See the report at this link: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/designated-landscapes-national-parks-and-aonbs-2018-review>

³ See Government response to Julian Glover's Review of England's Protected Landscapes Report here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/landscapes-review-national-parks-and-aonbs-government-response>

Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version: Response of Shiplake Parish Council to Selected Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

It is noted that there is no objection to the inclusion of PLCA1, 2 and 4 as valued landscapes. The same approach was used for all four PLCAs. Otherwise please see our response to SODC's comments regarding a 'broad brush' approach.

Re: Lack of evidence to support the designation

The Assessment provides extensive evidence to support the designation. Savills do not suggest that the level of evidence is inadequate for the other PLCAs. The approach taken to PLCA3 was no different.

Re: The Local Plan does not include any local valued landscape designations

The decision by the local authority not to investigate whether any of the land outside of the AONB would fall within a local valued landscape does not preclude the NDP from doing so in accordance with NPPF 174. Please also see our response to SODC's comments.

Re: The significance of PLCA3 is raised to the level of the AONB.

This is plainly not the case. The NDP wishes to introduce local valued landscapes at a Neighbourhood Plan level. The protection of the AONB is of the highest level in accordance with NPPF 175-177 with protection of a local valued landscape commensurate with its status.

Re: PLCA3 should not be included as a local valued landscape

HDA say that the semi-enclosed dipslopes are not rare. The Shiplake Parish Landscape Character Assessment shows that the overall semi-enclosed dipslope character of PLCA3 is extensive throughout the Chilterns AONB (see SODC LCA), although little of this landscape type is found along the Thames Valley and Fringes outside Shiplake Parish. As such it represents a rare example of where this AONB landscape type extends down into the Thames Valley and creates a pastoral, rather than wooded setting, to the river landscape⁴.

There are several comments that the part of PLCA3, which includes houses (for example Mill Lane), is developed and therefore is at odds with the designation of a valued landscape. Firstly, these areas were included as they are of a very low density with very large gardens with the typical boundary tree and hedgerow pattern and therefore were of a rural, rather than urban, character. Secondly the inclusion of developed areas is very common in National parks, AONB's and District areas of special landscape. Local examples include the village of Kidmore End and even larger settlements such as Nettlebed in the Chilterns AONB. The areas at Shiplake make a positive contribution to the semi-enclosed dipslopes. A Valued Landscape may include settlement of a rural and sub-urban character. Technical note 02/22 on Valued Landscapes under Cultural Heritage does not debar settlements where they 'make a particular contribution to distinctive sense of place'. There is also an emphasis in 02/22 on 'a general absence of intrusive or inharmonious development' as being unsuitable in a Valued Landscape. It does not preclude all development, especially that which is not intrusive or inharmonious as here.

HDA cite the Essex appeal findings. Paragraph 174 makes it clear that a Valued Landscape may be defined in a development plan i.e. a Neighbourhood Development plan. The merits of the land in question in Essex are not known, so no conclusion can be drawn from this example.

⁴ See Shiplake Parish Landscape Character Assessment p.29

Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version: Response of Shiplake Parish Council to Selected Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

HDA conclude that one defining characteristic of PLCA3 is the sense of enclosure created by well treed and hedgerow bound boundaries. This is one feature alongside those set out in the Assessment. This is a positive attribute which sometimes does assist in screening individual plots. A landscape does not need to be an open agricultural one to be a valued landscape, nor should areas of very low density very well treed and maintained housing, which do not detract from the landscape, be excluded. PLCA3 is rural in character. It is also a well maintained area of mixed pasture, arable land, with very large gardens.

HDA query the contribution to the setting of the AONB. NPPF does not provide guidance on what constitutes the setting (176 provides guidance on assessing the impact of development). The Chilterns AONB, however, does this in its Management Plan and the concept in the Assessment has been supported by the AONB. The wider, rather than the immediate, setting of the AONB is more than the open PLCA4 here at Shiplake. From a visual aspect, views from the edge of the AONB are of layers of tree cover across PLCA3, which form much more than a treed background as they are extensive, providing a landscape of their own, and also form the foreground of the hills beyond and the River Thames landscape. The very fact of the tree cover diminishes the impact of the very low-density housing and the more built-up edge of Shiplake. As a landscape, PLCA3 is typical of the semi-enclosed dipslopes landscapes of the AONB.

The findings of the local appeal decisions are site specific and based on the evidence put forward at the time. The Examiner is free to make his own judgement based on the evidence presented to him.

HDA query the contribution to the Thames-side landscape. PLCA3 makes an essential contribution to the character of the river corridor. Views out towards the AONB, which can be seen in many places on the horizon, include the wooded and tree covered PLCA3, which forms a transitional landscape of high value to the benefit of the Thames landscape.

Re: Kilnpits, Bolney Lane should not be included as a local valued landscape

With the recent permissions, Kilnpits sits next to more urbanising development to the west and abuts the village of Lower Shiplake to the south; but it retains its open rural character which is reinforced by the open landscape character of the land to the north and the wooded landscape to the east. There is a high level of intervisibility with the land to the north, not only in winter but also in summer, which reinforces the rural qualities of Shiplake and also those of the open landscape to the north. It is typical of the balance of open pasture, wooded area and tree cover of the Semi-enclosed Dipslopes which extend eastwards in PLCA3; and westwards outside of the Parish on the far side of the Thames Farm, merging with the AONB (see Assessment Figure 2).

The loss of this part of the semi-enclosed dipslopes landscape to development at Thames Farm should not set a precedent for further losses in PLCA3.

As part of PLCA3, Kilnpits makes a contribution to both the AONB and River Thames landscape. It is also key to a strong sense of rural transition experienced in walking from the river (along the Thames Path) along Bolney Lane up to the AONB at Woodlands Road.

Ridge on behalf of Land at Plough Lane

PLCA3 should not be included as a local valued landscape

Shiplake Villages Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version: Response of Shiplake Parish Council to Selected Regulation 16 Consultation Responses

As above this response only objects to the inclusion of PLCA3 as a valued landscape. There seems to be no issue with PLCA1, 2, or 4. Please also see our response to Savills and HDA's comments on the presence of development in the area.

It is agreed that there is a change in character between PLCA4 and PLCA3 as highlighted by Ridge, which in part is formed by the A4155. This does not lead to the conclusion that PLCA3 does not meet the criteria for a local NDP Valued Landscape. At the time of all the appeals there was no allocation of a Valued Landscape in the area, which would have been supported by NPPF 174 and its predecessor para 170 a).

The land at Plough Lane should not be included in a local valued landscape

This plot of pasture land is not that small and is bounded by open fields to the south and open fields and a farmstead to the west. The farmstead is a rural landmark which benefits from its open setting including this site. The settlement of Shiplake Cross lies to the north-west only.

With reference to the Assessment Figure 2, it can be seen that areas of former semi-enclosed dipslope in the SODC Landscape Assessment have been altered through the loss of hedgerows, so that they are now more akin to the open fields of PLCA4. The NDP Assessment made that adjustment, which left the land at Plough Lane the sole remaining piece of semi-enclosed dipslope landscape west of Shiplake Cross. This does not devalue its worth and its rural character.

APPENDIX – SHIPLAKE PARISH PERMISSIONS AND COMPLETIONS STATUS AS AT 1ST APRIL 2021

| Site REF | Site Size | Site Name | Description | Parish | Outline Permission | Outline Permission date | Full/RM permissions | Full/RM permission date | Gross num. homes | Net num. homes | Completion Status April 2021 |
|----------|-----------|---|---------------------------------|----------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| 686 | Minor | 9 Orchard Close Shiplake Cross RG9 4BU | Demolition of existing dwelling | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P14/S4104/FUL | 08 June 2015 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 687 | Minor | Briar Cottage Baskerville Lane Lower Shiplake RG9 3JY | Demolition of existing dwelling | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P15/S3705/FUL | 05 January 2016 | 2 | 1 | Complete |
| 688 | Minor | Brookfield Mill Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3LW | Variation of condition 2 on a | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P16/S4222/FUL | 15 February 2017 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 690 | Minor | Chelford House Reading Road Lower Shiplake | Erection of a two-storey 5-b | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P14/S1361/FUL | 17 October 2014 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 691 | Minor | Chelford House Reading Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3JN | Erection of a new dwelling w | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P15/S0020/FUL | 20 April 2015 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 696 | Minor | Devonvale and Little Vale Mill Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3LN | Demolition of existing dwelling | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P15/S4041/FUL | 31 March 2016 | 4 | 2 | Complete |
| 697 | Minor | Dormers Bolney Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3NT | Demolition of existing house | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P15/S3056/FUL | 24 December 2015 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 700 | Minor | Howe Crowsley Road Shiplake RG9 3LE | Demolition of existing bunge | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P12/S2661/FUL | 22 January 2013 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 702 | Minor | Land to rear of The Gables Station Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3JR | Demolition of existing buildin | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P15/S3709/FUL | 03 May 2016 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 705 | Minor | Shiplake Grange Plough Lane Shiplake Cross RG9 4DD | Demolition of existing 2-stor | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P11/E1013 | 24 August 2011 | 2 | 1 | Complete |
| 706 | Minor | The Dog House, Bolney Road, Lower Shiplake RG9 3NS | Replacement dwelling with g | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P18/S2167/FUL | 19 September 2018 | 1 | 0 | Under construction |
| 707 | Minor | Vale Cottage, Northfield Avenue, Lower Shiplake RG9 3PB | Erection of a 2.5 storey 5 be | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P19/S1939/FUL | 24 September 2019 | 1 | 0 | Under construction |
| 708 | Minor | Waynflete Station Road Shiplake RG9 3JS | Demolition of existing triple | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P11/E0033 | 11 May 2011 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 709 | Minor | Willow End Bolney Road Lower Shiplake | Demolition of existing bunge | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P14/S0988/FUL | 04 June 2014 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 710 | Minor | Willows Reach Mill Lane Lower Shiplake RG9 3LY | Demolition of existing dwelling | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P17/S2985/FUL | 02 February 2018 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 711 | Minor | Winona Bolney Trevor Drive Lower Shiplake RG9 3PG | Erection of a replacement d | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P16/S3933/FUL | 30 January 2017 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 713 | Minor | Yule Lodge New Road Lower Shiplake Oxon | Demolition of existing dwelling | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P14/S0483/FUL | 30 May 2014 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 1027 | Minor | Gateways, Station Road, Shiplake | Erection of new dwelling wit | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P10/E0951 | 24 September 2010 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 1039 | Minor | The Four Sycamores, Mill Road, Lower Shiplake (in the parish of Shiplake) | Erection of new dwelling and | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P07/E0167 | 22 March 2007 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 1064 | Minor | CaxtonBolney RoadLower ShiplakeRG9 3NS | From 1998 onwards the boa | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P12/S1228/LDE | 01 August 2012 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 1121 | Minor | Chiltern Lodge, Station Road, Shiplake | Erection of two storey five-b | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P11/E0578 | 14 September 2011 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 1177 | Minor | QuickwoodPlough LaneShiplake CrossRG9 4DD | Demolition of existing house | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P12/S0670/FUL | 20 September 2012 | 2 | 1 | Complete |
| 1497 | Minor | Rivermead Cottages 3 Mill Lane Shiplake | Erection of two storey side e | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P14/S2195/FUL | 15 September 2014 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 1498 | Minor | Grays Lodge Bolney Trevor Drive Lower Shiplake RG9 3PG | Erection of a new dwelling. | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P16/S0203/FUL | 11 March 2016 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 1499 | Minor | Land adjacent to The Gables Station Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3JR | Variation of condition 2 of Pl | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P16/S1246/FUL | 06 June 2016 | 1 | 1 | Under construction |
| 1500 | Minor | Chestnut House Station Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3JS | Three bedroom, 2 storey de | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P16/S2140/FUL | 25 October 2016 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 1622 | Minor | Tower House, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake, RG9 3JN | Erection of two storey four-b | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P17/S1247/FUL | 22 August 2017 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 1669 | Minor | The Cobb, The Crescent, Lower Shiplake, RG9 3LL | Demolition of existing house | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P17/S2813/FUL | 26 September 2017 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 1682 | Minor | Land to rear of The GablesStation RoadLower Shiplake RG9 3JR | Erection of a detached two s | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P17/S1948/FUL | 30 October 2017 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 1688 | Minor | Land off Mill Road, Lower Shiplake | Erection of two two-storey 5 | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P17/S2130/FUL | 03 November 2017 | 2 | 2 | Complete |
| 1743 | Minor | Lashbrook Chapel, Mill road, Lower Shiplake, | Change of use from an anci | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P15/S4337/FUL | 28 April 2017 | 2 | 1 | Complete |
| 1777 | Major | Sydney Harrison House, Mill Road, Lower Shiplake, RG9 3NE | Removal of existing building | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P16/S2593/FUL | 28 February 2017 | 16 | -16 | Complete |
| 1810 | Minor | The SpringsMill RoadShiplake RG9 3LN | Subdivision of dwelling to fo | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P18/S0178/FUL | 13 March 2018 | 2 | 1 | Complete |
| 1832 | Minor | Old Court Cottage Baskerville Lane Lower Shiplake RG9 3JY | Demolition of existing house | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P18/S0483/FUL | 06 July 2018 | 3 | 2 | Complete |
| 1834 | Minor | Christmas CottageCrowsley RoadLower Shiplake RG9 3JT | Erection of a detached 4-be | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P17/S3024/FUL | 08 May 2018 | 2 | 1 | Complete |
| 1835 | Minor | SaffronsStation RoadLower Shiplake RG9 3JP | Demolition of existing dwelling | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P17/S3160/FUL | 04 May 2018 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 1848 | Minor | Dulverton, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake RG9 3JN | Demolition of existing dwelling | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P19/S0693/FUL | 02 August 2019 | 4 | 3 | Complete |
| 1909 | Minor | 3-4 Rivermead Cottages, Mill Lane, Shiplake RG9 3LZ | Erection of two storey side e | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P18/S1616/FUL | 15 August 2018 | 2 | 1 | Complete |
| 1913 | Minor | FairwindsNew RoadLower Shiplake RG9 3LH | Proposed replacement dwel | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P18/S1801/FUL | 28 August 2018 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 2016 | Minor | Land adjacent to Kingsley House, Crowsley Road, Lower Shiplake RG9 3LU | Erection of 1.5 storey detach | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P18/S3354/FUL | 11 January 2019 | 1 | 1 | Complete |
| 2051 | Minor | Raleith Reading Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3PH | Demolition of existing dwelling | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P17/S1118/FUL | 29 March 2019 | 1 | 0 | Under construction |
| 2092 | Minor | Mount Ida, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake RG9 3PH | Outline planning application | Shiplake | P19/S0038/O | 01 May 2019 | N/A | N/A | 2 | 2 | Not started |
| 2111 | Minor | Fairwinds New Road Lower Shiplake Oxfordshire RG9 3LH | Proposed replacement dwel | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P19/S0722/FUL | 01 August 2019 | 1 | 0 | Complete |
| 2146 | Minor | Mulleins, New Road, Lower Shiplake RG9 3LH | Demolition of existing bunge | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P19/S1861/FUL | 06 September 2019 | 1 | 0 | Under construction |
| 2159 | Minor | Shiplake House Farm, Mill Lane, Shiplake RG9 4BJ | Prior Notification under Clas | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P19/S2649/N4B | 14 October 2019 | 5 | 5 | Under construction |
| 2187 | Minor | 2 Orchard Close, Shiplake Cross RG9 4BU | Demolition of existing bunge | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P19/S2953/FUL | 20 December 2019 | 1 | 0 | Under construction |
| 2228 | Minor | Land adjacent to The Tower House, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake RG9 3JN | Erection of 2 new detached | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P18/S4323/FUL | 27 March 2020 | 2 | 2 | Complete |
| 2244 | Major | Land to the east of Reading Road Lower Shiplake RG9 4BG | Outline application for the d | Shiplake | P18/S3210/O | 14/10/2019 | N/A | N/A | 65 | 65 | Not started |
| 2271 | Minor | Salthouse, Mill Road, Lower Shiplake, RG9 3LW | Proposed new dwelling to re | Shiplake | N/A | N/A | P18/S3026/FUL | 19 June 2020 | 1 | 0 | Under construction |
| 2359 | Minor | Mount Ida, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake, RG9 3PH | Reserved Matters following | Shiplake | P16/S2861/O | 26 June 2019 | P20/S1990/RM | 09 October 2020 | 8 | 7 | Under construction |