

Delegated authority officer decision notice

Decision made by	Adrianna Partridge Deputy Chief Executive – Transformation and Operations
Lead officer contact details	Robyn Tobutt Senior Planning Policy Officer (Neighbourhood) Tel: 07917 088349 Email: Robyn.Tobutt@southandvale.gov.uk
Decision (Keep this succinct)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To accept all modifications recommended by the Examiner; 2. To determine that the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan Review, as modified, meets the basic conditions, is compatible with the Convention rights, complies with the definition of a neighbourhood development plan (NDP) and the provisions that can be made by a NDP; and 3. To take all appropriate actions to progress the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan Review to referendum.
Key decision? (see notes below)	Yes, the designated neighbourhood area includes the whole Parish of Sonning Common, as well as small areas of Kidmore End Parish and Rotherfield Peppard Parish, and this decision affects three wards (Sonning Common, Woodcote and Rotherfield, and Kidmore End and Whitchurch).
If key decision, has call-in been waived by the Scrutiny Committee chair(s)?	Yes
Confidential decision, and if so under which exempt category?	No
Delegated authority reference from the constitution	Deputy Chief Executive – Transformation and Operations Ref 3.1 (Page 136). Head of Policy and Programmes ref 3.3 (Page 178)
Risks	<p>The local community will have the opportunity to vote on the neighbourhood plan at referendum; there is a risk that the local community will vote against the plan. This risk is low given the level of support shown for the plan and detailed in the consultation statement.</p> <p>The legislation makes provision for the council's decision at this stage to be challenged via a judicial review. The process undertaken and proposed accords with planning legislation.</p>
Reasons for decision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan Review (the plan) as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, has had regard to policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State. A requirement to have regard to policies and advice does not

	<p>require that such policy and advice must necessarily be followed, but it is intended to have and does have to a significant effect. A neighbourhood plan must not constrain the delivery of important national policy objectives. The principal document in which national planning policy is contained is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and this conclusion is reached bearing this in mind. It should be noted that the NPPF was revised on 20 July 2021. The revised NPPF replaces the previous NPPF published in March 2012, revised in July 2018 and updated in February 2019. The advice within National Planning Practice Guidance (“NPPG”) has also been borne in mind in reaching this conclusion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Paragraph 13 of the NPPF is clear that neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans and spatial development strategies. Qualifying bodies should plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside these strategic policies. More specifically paragraph 29 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies. 3. Beyond this, the content of a draft neighbourhood plan will determine which other aspects of national policy are or are not a relevant consideration to take into account. The basic condition allows qualifying bodies, the independent examiner and local planning authority to reach a view in those cases where different parts of national policy need to be balanced. 4. Having considered all relevant information, including representations submitted in response to the Plan, the Examiner’s considerations and recommendations, the council has come to the view that the Plan recognises and respects relevant constraints. The Plan has developed a positive suite of policies that seek to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. There is a clear focus on maintaining the character and appearance of the neighbourhood area and ensuring that it can deliver housing development as required by the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035. 5. The plan, as modified by the Examiner’s recommendations, contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. This condition relates to the making of the plan as a whole. It does not require that each policy in it must contribute to sustainable development. Sustainable development has three principal dimensions – economic, social and environmental. It is clear that the submitted Plan has set out to achieve sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. In the economic dimension, the plan includes policies for the village centre (RVC1 & 2) and for employment uses (RE1a/b). In the
--	---


	<p>social role, it includes policies on new housing development and housing mix (RH1-3). In the environmental dimension, the plan positively seeks to protect its natural, built, and historic environment. It includes policies on design (RD1) and climate change (RENV5).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. As a whole, the council is satisfied that the policies in the plan pursue net gain across each of the different dimensions of sustainability in a mutually supportive way. 7. The plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the current Development Plan for the area. The Plan delivers a local dimension to the strategic context and supplements the detail already included in the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035. The Neighbourhood Plan Review is allocating a total of 183 homes, which includes 37 units carried forward from the 'made' Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan. 8. Sonning Common is identified as a larger village in the adopted Local Plan (Appendix 7) and the overall strategy supports and enhances the roles of the larger villages, including Sonning Common. Policy H4 in the Local Plan sets out the housing requirement figures to be delivered in larger villages. It identifies that in Sonning Common the requirement is 96 new homes. Part 2 of the policy contains a contingency mechanism addressing circumstances where the Neighbourhood Plan has not been submitted in time or does not allocate sufficient housing sites. 9. The housing requirement for larger villages in the Local Plan was arrived at using a proportional mathematical formula (15% growth on the number of dwellings in that village as per Census 2011 plus any Core Strategy allocations where these existed). Completions and commitments as of 1 April 2020 were taken into account when determining the outstanding requirement figure for Neighbourhood Plans identified in Policy H4, with a breakdown provided in table 4f. 10. The Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan Review includes two allocations, allocating a total of 183 homes. This is across two sites, one carried forward from the 'made' Neighbourhood Plan (SON15) with an increased capacity of 50 from 37, and one new site (SON24) which has planning permission for a continuing care retirement community of 133 units. Combined, the package of housing allocations proposed in the neighbourhood plan will deliver an additional 146 homes and exceed the minimum outstanding requirement set out in H4. 11. The Plan progressed in line with the timetable envisaged in Policy H4 of the local Plan. The Plan is supported by
--	---

	<p>proportionate evidence and therefore is considered to deliver sufficient housing allocations as required by Policy H4.</p> <p>12. The site (SON15) being carried forward from the 'made' Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan is currently the subject of a planning application for 50 homes which was submitted on 13 June 2022. The new allocation already has planning permission for 133 units which was allowed at appeal on 25 June 2021.</p> <p>13. The delivery of the development proposed in the plan will contribute towards supporting the overall spatial strategy for the district, which is to support and enhance the roles of the larger villages.</p> <p>14. The Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendation, would not breach, and be otherwise incompatible with EU obligations, retained in UK law, including the following Directives: the strategic Environmental Assessment (2001/42/EC); the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (2011/92/EU); the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC); the Wild Birds Directive (2009/147/EC); the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC); the Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC); and the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC). In addition, no issue arises in respect of equality under general principles of EU law or any EU equality directive.</p> <p>15. In order to comply with the basic condition on the European Union legislation South Oxfordshire District Council undertook a screening exercise (dated December 2021) on the need or otherwise for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be prepared for the Plan. As a result of this process, it concluded that the Plan is not likely to have any significant effects on the environment and accordingly would not require SEA.</p> <p>16. The plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, would not give rise to significant environmental effects on European sites. The Council screened the Plan potential impact on EU Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and this was completed in December 2021. The HRA screening report concluded that the Plan would not have any likely significant effects on the integrity of European sites in or around South Oxfordshire, either alone or in combination with other plans or programmes and that an Appropriate Assessment is therefore not required.</p> <p>17. The Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, is in all respects fully compatible with Convention rights contained in the Human Rights Act 1988. There has been full and adequate opportunity for all interested parties to take part in the preparation of the Plan and to make their comments</p>
--	---

	<p>known.</p> <p>18. The Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, complies with the definition of an NDP and the provisions that can be made by an NDP. The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in the whole of the neighbourhood area; it specifies the period for which it is to have effect and it does not include provision about development that is 'excluded development'.</p> <p>19. The council is satisfied that it is not necessary to extend the referendum area beyond the boundaries of the designated neighbourhood area as they are currently defined.</p> <p>20. The individual modifications proposed by the Examiner are set out in Appendix 1 alongside the council's decision in response to each recommendation and the reason for them. The Examiner's Report is available in Appendix 2.</p> <p>21. The Examiner noted in his report, paragraph 7.127, that it will be appropriate to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text. To ensure that the plan reads as a coherent document the qualifying body and the council have agreed factual and consequential updates. These are set out in Appendix 3.</p> <p>22. The modifications set out in Appendix 1 and Appendix 3, both separately and combined, produce no likely significant environmental affects and are unlikely to have any significant effects on the integrity of European Designated Sites.</p> <p>23. The council has taken account of all the representations received.</p> <p>24. This decision follows the recently made delegated authority officer decision regarding the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan Review on 12 December 2022. This decision enables the council to make additional consequential changes as set out in rows 3, 5, 8, 10, 11 and 15 of Appendix 3. The additional modifications relate to typographical, grammatical, or factual corrections only.</p> <p>25. The Counting Officer is responsible for determining the date of the referendum. The Electoral Service team advises that the referendum is planned for Thursday 23 February 2023.</p>
Alternative options rejected	<p>Make a decision that differs from the Examiner's recommendation</p> <p>If the council deviates from the Examiner's recommendations, the council is required to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notify all those identified on the consultation statement of the parish council and invite representation, during a period of six

	<p>weeks,</p> <p>2. Refer the issue to a further independent examination if appropriate.</p> <p>Refusing to progress the Plan</p> <p>The council can decide that it is not satisfied with the plan proposal with respect to meeting basic conditions, compatibility with Convention rights, definition and provisions of the NDP even if modified. Without robust grounds, which are not considered to be present in this case, refusing to take the Plan to a referendum could leave the Council vulnerable to a legal challenge.</p> <p><u>Reason for rejecting alternative options</u></p> <p>These options were rejected because the district council is minded to agree with all of the Examiner's modifications and his conclusion that the Plan, as modified, meets the basic conditions and relevant legal requirements</p>
Climate and ecological implications	<p>The Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.</p> <p>In terms of the climate and ecological implications, the Plan seeks to have a positive impact, containing an objective concerned with the village's ecosystems and biodiversity and also an objective concerned with the delivery of high quality design which mitigates the effects of climate change as far as possible. The plan contains a suit of environment policies, covering green infrastructure (Policy RENV1), landscape (Policy RENV2), trees and hedgerows (Policy RENV3) and climate change (Policy RENV5).</p>
Legal implications	<p>The process undertaken and proposed accords with planning legislation.</p>
Financial implications	<p>The Government makes funding available to local authorities to help them meet the cost of their responsibilities around neighbourhood planning. A total of £20,000 can be claimed for each neighbourhood planning area. In the case of neighbourhood plan reviews, a local planning authority may make only one claim for substantive modifications to a specific neighbourhood plan in their area within each 5-year window from the date that plan was first made. The council becomes eligible to apply for this additional grant once the council issue a decision statement detailing the intention to send the plan to referendum.</p> <p>The Government grant funds the process of progressing neighbourhood plans through the formal stages, including the referendum. Any costs incurred in the formal stages in excess of Government grants is borne by the council. Staffing costs associated with supporting community groups and progressing neighbourhood plans through the formal stages are funded by the council. It is expected that costs associated with progressing this neighbourhood</p>

	plan can be met from with existing neighbourhood planning budget.			
Other implications	There are no other implications.			
Background papers considered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan Review and supporting documents 2. National Planning Policy Framework (2021) 3. National Planning Policy Guidance (July 2014 and subsequent updates) 4. South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 5. South Oxfordshire District Council SEA/HRA Screening Statement 6. Representations submitted in response to the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan Review 7. Relevant Ministerial Statements 			
Declarations/ conflict of interest?	None			
Consultees		Name	Outcome	Date
	Legal legal@southandvale.gov.uk	Vivien Williams	Approved	12/12/2022
	Finance Finance@southandvale.gov.uk	Nicole Tyreman	No comments	07/12/2022
	HR hadminandpayroll@southandvale.gov.uk	Trina Mayling	No comments	08/12/2022
	Climate and biodiversity climateaction@southandvale.gov.uk	Jessie Fieth	Agreement, no comments	06/12/2022
	Equality and diversity equalities@southandvale.gov.uk	Lynne Mitchell	No further comments	07/12/2022
	Risk and insurance risk@southandvale.gov.uk	Yvonne Cutler Greaves	No comments	12/12/2022
	Property property@southandvale.gov.uk	Chris Mobbs	Agree	07/12/2022
	Communications communications@southandvale.gov.uk			Consulted 02/02/2022 – 09/02/2022
	Relevant	Cllr Anne-		Consulted

	Cabinet member	Marie Simpson		02/02/2022 – 09/02/2022
	Ward councillors	Cllr David Bartholomew	Agree	Consulted
		Cllr Leigh Rawlins		05/12/2022
		Cllr Lorraine Hillier		Consulted
		Cllr Jo Robb	Consulted	
		Cllr Peter Dragonetti	Agree	07/12/2022
Decision maker's signature To confirm the decision as set out in this notice.	<div>Signature: </div> <div>Date: 09/01/2023</div>			

Appendix 1: Examiner's recommendations

Policy/ Section	Examiner's recommendations	Council's Decision	Justification/Reason
The initial section of the Plan	<i>Add a free-standing paragraph of text after the existing paragraph on page 7 of the Plan and before Map 1.2: 'The Plan period is 2011-2035. This corresponds with that of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan'</i>	Agree	The council consider the proposed modification necessary to ensure the plan provides clarity over the plan period, which is a legal requirement.
The initial section of the Plan –	<i>At the end of the first paragraph of beginning with 'The Process begins' add: 'The review of the neighbourhood plan follows this same time span. As such the Plan period will be 2021 to 2035.'</i>	Agree	The council consider the proposed modification necessary to ensure the plan provides clarity over the plan period, which is a legal requirement.
Policy RSB1 – Settlement Boundary	<i>Extend the settlement boundary to incorporate the Little Sparrow housing allocation.</i> <i>Improve the clarity of the settlement boundary as shown on Map 4.1.</i>	Agree	<p>The council consider the extension of the settlement boundary to incorporate the Little Sparrows housing allocation necessary to ensure there is clarity and a consistent approach between the definition of the settlement boundary and the incorporation of the allocated housing sites within the boundary.</p> <p>The council agrees that the quality of the map showing the proposed settlement boundary needs improving to ensure the map, which is integral to Policy RSB1, has the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.</p>

Policy RH1 – Housing Allocations	In Policy RH1 delete the separate references to SON 23 and SON 8.	Agree	The council agrees with the examiner that there is no assurance around the deliverability of SON 23 and SON 8, and therefore their deletion from the plan is necessary to ensure has regard to national policy and guidance.
Policy RH1 – Housing Allocations	In Part Five of the Plan: Delete SON 23 <i>Delete the associated supporting text and maps</i>	Agree	<p>The council consider the proposed deletion of site SON 23 and the associated text and maps from the plan necessary to ensure the plan meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>Whilst the site is proposed as a reserve site, the potential effect on the AONB has not been assessed in detail, and there is no assurance around its eventual release or the extent to which its delivery would be necessary. National policy and guidance require that plans should be aspirational but deliverable. We consider that due to the uncertainties surrounding the site, it should be deleted from the plan, including any consequential modifications to the supporting text.</p>
Policy RH1 – Housing Allocations	In Part Five of the Plan: Delete SON 8 <i>Delete the associated supporting text and maps</i>	Agree	<p>The council consider the proposed deletion of site SON 8 and the associated text and maps from the plan necessary to ensure the plan meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>Whilst the site is proposed to be retained as</p>

			<p>a reserve site, there is no assurance around its eventual release or the extent to which its delivery would be necessary. National policy and guidance require that plans should be aspirational but deliverable. The plan provides very limited detail on the way in which its release would be triggered and its ability to be delivered within the plan period. We consider that due to the uncertainties surrounding the site, it should be deleted from the plan, including any consequential modifications to the supporting text.</p>
Policy RH1 – Housing Allocations	<p><i>In the supporting text on Little Sparrows (which runs from pages 13-14) replace the final three sentences with: ‘Planning permission was refused in June 2020. A subsequent appeal was allowed in June 2021. In these circumstances the Parish Council has reconsidered the matter. The granting of planning permission means that the site is deliverable and is considered to contribute to the overall housing requirement for Sonning Common.’</i></p> <p><i>Delete the wildlife corridor shown on Map 4.4. which bisects the Little Sparrows site.</i></p> <p><i>In the Environment Section delete the seventh paragraph of supporting text.</i></p>	Agree	<p>The council consider the proposed modifications to the supporting text and map necessary to ensure the text is consistent with the modifications proposed to Policy RH1 and to ensure that there is the clarity required by national policy and guidance.</p> <p>The council agrees that deletion of the wildlife corridor shown on Map 4.4 which bisects the Little Sparrows site is necessary. The site was subject to detailed ecological assessments as part of the planning application, whereas the neighbourhood plan was not supported by evidence, and therefore having regard to national policy and guidance, it is appropriate to amend this.</p>
Policy RH2 – House Sizes	Replace the policy with: ‘Development proposals for one-, two- and three- bedroom	Agree	<p>The council consider the proposed replacement policy text necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national</p>

	homes and proposals that meet a specialist need such as assisted living accommodation will be supported'		policy and guidance.
Policy RH3 – Infill Development	<p>Replace the opening element of the policy with:</p> <p>'Proposals for infill development will be supported where they meet the following criteria:'</p> <p>Replace criterion e) with: 'pollution, contamination or the use of/or storage of hazardous substances.'</p> <p>Add a further criterion to read: 'f) external lighting.'</p>	Agree	The council consider the proposed modifications to the policy text, including relocating elements of the text into the supporting text and splitting the fifth criterion into two separate criteria, necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.
Policy RH3 – Infill Development – Supporting text	<p><i>Immediately before the final paragraph in the support text (after the RH policies) add:</i></p> <p><i>'Policy RH3 sets out the Plan's approach to infill development. It follows the approach taken in the adopted Local Plan. Infill development is defined as the filling of a small gap in an otherwise continuous built-up frontage or on other sites within settlements where the site is closely surrounded by buildings. The scale of infill development should be appropriate to its location.'</i></p>	Agree	The council consider the proposed modification to expand the supporting text necessary to help Policy RH3 achieve the clarity required by national policy and guidance and to ensure the text is consistent with the modifications to Policy RH3.

Policy RH4 – Garden Spacing	Replace the policy with: ‘New developments with gardens backing on to or beside existing gardens should, wherever practicable, share boundaries with the adjacent gardens.’	Agree	The council consider the proposed change to the policy text necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance. The changes will remove elements of supporting text from the policy and ensure the language is clear and unambiguous.
Policy RD1 - Design	At the beginning of the policy insert ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location’ Insert ‘as set out in the development plan’ after ‘...standards of energy efficiency and water conservation’.	Agree	The council consider the proposed changes to the policy text necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance. The modifications will ensure the policy operates in a complementary way to the relevant policies in the adopted Local Plan.
Policy RVC1 – Village Centre - Uses	Replace the policy with: ‘Within the designated village centre (as shown on the policies map) proposals for new or extended premises for retail, leisure and ground floor offices will be supported.’	Agree	The council is in agreement with the examiner that the proposed modification to the policy text is necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.
Policy RVC2 – Village Centre - Traffic	At the beginning of the policy add: ‘Insofar as planning permission is required’	Agree	The council consider the proposed additional text at the beginning of the policy necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance. The modification means the policy acknowledges that some general improvement works within the public highway would benefit from permitted development rights.

Policy RE1a – Existing employment areas	Replace the policy with: ‘Proposals to retain and consolidate existing employment sites and to establish new employment sites will be supported where they conform with other policies in the development plan’	Agree	The council is in agreement with the examiner that the proposed modification to the policy text is necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.
Policy RE1b – Kidby’s Yard	In iii) delete the final sentence	Agree	The council consider the proposed change to the policy text necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance. The changes will remove elements of supporting text from the policy and ensure the language is clear and unambiguous.
Policy RE1b – Kidby’s Yard – Supporting text	<i>At the end of the second paragraph of supporting text add: ‘Policy RE1b comments about the way in which proposals for alternative uses on the site would be considered. The third criteria identifies that such proposal may have the ability to improve the living conditions of adjacent residential properties. As part of any such proposals the District Council will consider whether there is a realistic prospect of mitigating the detrimental effects of continuing employment use.’</i>	Agree	The council consider the proposed modification to expand the supporting text necessary to help Policy RE1b achieve the clarity required by national policy and guidance and to ensure the text is consistent with the modifications to Policy RE1b.
Policy RCSH3 – Memorial Park	Replace the policy with: ‘Development proposals for new or enhanced recreation and sports uses on the Memorial Park will be supported’	Agree	The council consider the proposed change to the policy text necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance. The modification will ensure the policy more clearly relates to proposals for new or enhanced recreation and sports

			uses on the Memorial Park.
Policy RTP1 - Parking	Replace the policy with: ‘Insofar as planning permission is required, proposals to improve and rationalise parking provisions will be supported where they otherwise conform with Oxfordshire County Council’s parking standards’	Agree	The council consider the change to the policy necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance. The modification means the policy acknowledges that some general improvement works within the public highway would benefit from permitted development rights.
Policy RTP3 – Road Safety	<p>Replace the opening part of the policy with: ‘New development proposal should not have an unacceptable impact on road safety including that of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. In particular, proposals should demonstrate the way in which they would address their impacts on:’</p> <p>Replace the final part of the policy with: ‘Any such development proposals should not result in an unacceptable impact on noise levels or the introduction of urban features which would not relate to the character and appearance of the village.’</p>	Agree	The council consider the proposed changes to the opening part and final part of the policy text necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.
Policy RENV1 – Green Infrastructure	Replace the policy with: ‘Development proposals which seek to improve the connectivity of green infrastructure and enhance biodiversity will be supported.’	Agree	The council consider the proposed modification to the policy to be necessary to ensure that there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance, and so that it is capable of being implemented through the development

			management process. This will mean that the policy reflects the overall intentions of the policy more closely.
Policy RENV2 – Locally valued landscapes	Insert ‘and nationally’ after ‘locally’	Agree	The council consider the proposed modification necessary to ensure the policy has regard to national policy, specifically relating to the setting of the AONB.
Policy RENV3 – Trees and hedgerows	Replace the second sentence of the policy with: ‘Proposals which promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of wildlife priority habitat and the protection and recovery of priority species will be supported.’ In the third sentence of the policy replace ‘possible’ with ‘practicable’	Agree	The council consider the proposed modifications necessary to ensure that there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance, so that it more clearly relates to site-specific circumstances.
Policy RENV4 - landscaping	Insert ‘which are in accordance with other development plan policies and’ between ‘development’ and ‘which’	Agree	The council consider the proposed change to the policy necessary to ensure that there is the clarity that is required by national policy, and to ensure that the policy does not have unintended consequences.
Policy RENV5 – Climate Change	Replace the policy with: ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, new developments should mitigate climate change through energy and water efficiency and the use of renewable energy and adoption of sustainable drainage systems’	Agree	The council consider the proposed change to the policy necessary to ensure that it can be applied on a proportionate basis and there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.

Policy RDE1 – Pre-application services	Delete the policy	Agree	The council agrees that the deletion of this policy is necessary as it is an expression of intent about a process rather than a policy and lacks the clarity required by national policy and guidance. In addition, the issue is already addressed in national policy and local protocols and there is no need for the neighbourhood plan to repeat this.
Other Matters – general	<i>Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.</i>	Agree	The council agrees with the examiner that it may be necessary to amend the plan where consequential changes to the text are required directly as a result of the examiners recommended modifications.
Other Matters – Page 24	<i>Recommend that the relevant sentence in the second paragraph is replaced with:</i> <i>‘The settlement of Sonning Common is bounded on most sides by the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The village also is well provided with trees and has a distinctly rural character.’</i>	Agree	The council agrees that the proposed modification in this paragraph is necessary to be consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 177 of the NPPF. The modification will bring clarity, ensuring the supporting text accurately reflects the intent of national policy.
Other Matters – Page 27	<i>Replace the final two sentences on page 27 with:</i> <i>‘This has left an outstanding requirement of 96 homes to be considered in the revised Plan and is addressed in Policy RH1. The granting of planning permission on appeal for the 133 extra care apartments on the Little Sparrows site is</i>	Agree	The council agrees that the proposed modifications to the supporting text concerning the Little Sparrows site are necessary to help Policy RH1 achieve the clarity required by national policy and guidance and to ensure the text is consistent

	<i>considered in the wider Plan.'</i>		with the modifications to Policy RH1 and elsewhere in the plan.
Other matters – Page 41	<i>Correct the AONB boundaries on Map 4.4</i>	Agree	The council consider the correction of the AONB boundaries on Map 4.4 necessary to ensure the map correctly identifies a nationally significant landscape.
Other Matters – Site Specific	<p>Delete the reference to SON 1 in the 'Retained Allocations Section and Map 5.3</p> <p>Insert a new policy and supporting text in Environment section of the plan to read:</p> <p>Policy RENV6 – The plan designates land at Old Copse Field (as shown on Map insert number) as local green space. Development proposals on the site will only supported in very special circumstances.</p>	Agree	The council consider the proposed changes to the Local Green Space designation of SON 1 necessary to ensure there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.
Other Matters – Site Specific	<p><i>Reposition Map 5.3 into the Environment section (and renumber this map as required together with other maps elsewhere in the Plan which will arise as a consequence of this change in plan numbering)</i></p> <p><i>After the sixth paragraph of supporting text add an additional paragraph to read:</i></p> <p><i>'The review of the Plan continues to designate land at Old Copse Field as local green space. This</i></p>	Agree	<p>The council consider the proposed repositioning of Map 5.3, and consequential renumbering, necessary to provide the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance, and ensure it is consistent with the modifications proposed to the Local Green Space designation SON 1.</p> <p>The council also agrees that the additional paragraph is necessary to the new SON 1 policy achieve the clarity required by national</p>

	<i>approach carries forward the designation made in the 2016 NDP. The detailed case was set out there on pages 71-2 and in the view of the current working party remains compelling. In the context of the review of the Plan it is treated as a separate policy (RENV6) rather than as an outcome of a wider appraisal of a sites for other purposes.'</i>		policy and guidance.
Other Matters – Housing Delivery	<i>Modify the factual contents of Parts Two and Five of the Plan and Policy RH1 and the associated supporting text relating to the RH policies to reflect the recommended modifications to Policy RH1 (and the proposed allocations)</i>	Agree	The council agrees with the examiner that it may be necessary to amend the plan where factual updates to the text are required directly as a result of the examiners recommended modifications to Policy RH1.
Monitoring and Review	<p><i>Add a new section to the Plan to read as follows:</i></p> <p><i>‘Part Seven – Monitoring and Review</i></p> <p><i>The Sonning Common Plan will run concurrently with the current South Oxfordshire Local Plan and apply until March 2035. It is, however, acknowledged that the Plan is a response to the needs and aspirations of the local community at the time of making and will need monitoring and review to ensure continuing relevance and delivery.</i></p> <p><i>The Parish Council, will remain as the designated body responsible for maintaining and periodically reviewing the Plan should the needs and aspirations of the community require. Similarly, this requirement would arise following any significant changes to the Local Plan.</i></p>	Agree	The council agrees with the examiner that the insertion of a new section to take account of monitoring and reviewing in the plan is necessary to ensure any changes which may arise in national or local policy during the Plan period, and the way in which the housing allocations are delivered, are monitored. This inserted text provides clarity on the monitoring of the housing allocations in the Plan which is important given the way in which the Plan has sought to respond to the strategic requirements in the Local Plan 2035.

	<p><i>Housing delivery is a particularly important component of the Plan. In this context the Parish Council will monitor the delivery of the housing allocations in the Plan. If delivery is unlikely to proceed to meet the number of dwellings set out in Policy RH1, the Parish Council will consider a review of the Plan to identify the extent to which delivery is not proceeding and/or to explore the allocation of alternative sites to meet any shortfall.</i></p> <p><i>The Parish Council will assess the effectiveness of the Plan against national planning policy. It will also assess the ongoing effectiveness of the Plan against any changes which may arise in national planning policy. Where necessary it will consider undertaking either a full or a partial review of the Plan.'</i></p>		

Appendix 2 – Examiner's Report

The Examiner's Report is available here: <https://www.southoxon.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2022/11/Sonning-Common-Neighbourhood-Development-Plan-Review-Examiners-Report.pdf>

Appendix 3 – Consequential and/or Factual Changes

No.	Section	Agreed change	Justification/Reason
1	Front Cover	Change 'submission version' to 'referendum version'	Factual correction
2	Content Page and Maps	Updates to contents page and Map references	Factual corrections to be consistent with Examiner's recommendation.

3	Page 13 – Fourth paragraph	Change ‘Oxford’ to ‘Oxfordshire’	Factual correction to refer to Oxfordshire County Council.
4	Page 14	In the table showing the allocations delete the rows contains SON8 and SON23.	Consequential change to be consistent with Examiner’s recommendation concerned with the deletion of SON8 and SON23.
5	Page 17 – First paragraph	Change ‘Oxford’ to ‘Oxfordshire’	Factual correction to refer to Oxfordshire County Council.
6	Page 21 – First bullet point after third paragraph	Delete ‘The exception is the Johnson Matthey car park – the full case for allocating it as a reserve site for housing is present in part Five.’	Consequential change to be consistent with Examiner’s recommendation concerned with the deletion of SON23.
7	Page 24 – Fourth paragraph	In the final sentence delete duplicated ‘Policy H1’.	Typographical correction.
8	Page 24 – Sixth paragraph	In the first sentence replace ‘policies take account of the NPPF, para’ with ‘policy RSB1 takes account of the NPPF, paragraph’.	Consequential grammatical modification to provide clarity over which policy is being referred to.
9	Page 30 – Policy RVC2	Replace ‘provided’ with ‘providing’ and delete ‘with’ between ‘and’ and ‘Oxfordshire’.	Grammatical corrections.
10	Page 36 – Supporting text	In the first sentence delete ‘road’ between ‘main’ and ‘B481’. In the opening sentence and first bullet point replace ‘Rd’ with ‘Road’. Replace ‘traffiu-c’ with ‘traffic’	Consequential changes to provide clarity. Typographical correction.
11	Page 37 – First paragraph	Insert ‘Council’ between ‘Parish’ and ‘by’.	Typographical correction.

12	Page 39 – Supporting text	In the third paragraph on page 39 insert 'Development' between 'neighbourhood' and 'Plan'.	Consequential changes to provide clarity.
13	Page 39 – Supporting text	Delete fourth paragraph.	Consequential change to be consistent with Examiner's recommendation concerned with the deletion of SON23.
14	Page 46 – Supporting text	Delete 'it has been reallocated in this Revision NDP.'	Consequential change to be consistent with Examiner's recommendation concerned with the deletion of SON8.
15	Page 47 – First paragraph	Change 'Building work is in progress' to 'Building work is now complete'.	Factual correction to reflect the status of the site.
16	Page 54 – Supporting text	In the first sentence in the second paragraph replace 'will open' with 'opened'.	Factual correction as the Memorial Park is now open.