

Delegated authority officer decision notice

Decision made by	Tim Oruye Head of Policy and Programmes
Lead officer contact details	Tom Gill Planning Policy Officer (Neighbourhood) Tel: 07510 921689 Email: thomas.gill@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 Beckley and Stowood Neighbourhood Plan, 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 an NDP; 3. To take all appropriate actions to progress the Beckley and Stowood Neighbourhood Development Plan to referendum.
Key decision?	No.
If key decision, has call-in been waived by the Scrutiny Committee chair(s)?	N/A.
Confidential decision, and if so under which exempt category?	No.
Delegated authority reference from the constitution	Head of Policy and Programmes ref 3.3.
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. Whilst the plan has had a significant level of community support, as detailed in the consultation statement, the parish council has expressed significant disappointment with the modifications recommended by the independent examiner. Notwithstanding this, the relevant regulations require the council to progress the plan to referendum if it meets the basic conditions.</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 Beckley and Stowood Neighbourhood Development Plan (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 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 December 2023. The revised NPPF replaces the previous NPPF published in March 2012 and revised in July 2018, February 2019, July 2021 and September 2023. The advice within National Planning Practice Guidance (“NPPG”) has also been borne in mind in reaching this conclusion.

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 polices. 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, quality and appearance of the neighbourhood area, as well as aims to enhance biodiversity and wildlife, as supported by National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 185. The Plan also contains policies which focus on the delivery of sustainable development, as supported by National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 29.
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 a policy for infill residential development (Policy VB1). In the social dimension, it includes policies on flood risk (Policy DS3) and on dark skies (Policy DG2). In the environmental dimension, the Plan positively seeks to protect its natural, built, and historic environment. It has policies on important views (Policy DS1) and on design (Policy DG1)

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. Beckley is identified as a 'smaller village' in the adopted Local Plan (Appendix 7). Policies H8 (Housing in the Smaller Villages) and H16 (Infill development and redevelopment) of the Local Plan set the context for the scale and nature of new development which would be supported in smaller villages in the district. Policy H8 advises that smaller villages have no defined requirement to contribute towards delivering additional housing, however where a Parish Council wishes to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan to support further growth, the Council will support this provided that the levels of growth supported are commensurate to the size of the village. The Neighbourhood Plan does not include any new housing allocations; however, it does introduce a settlement boundary for Beckley within which new housing through infilling or redevelopment will be supported in line with development plan policies. The Beckley and Stowood Neighbourhood Area also includes the Land North of Bayswater Brook Strategic Allocation (STRAT13). The Neighbourhood Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommended modifications, does not undermine the delivery of this strategic policy.
8. The Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendation, would not breach, and otherwise be compatible with, the assimilated obligations of EU legislation as consolidated in the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 (Consequential Amendment) Regulations 2023.
9. In order to comply with the basic condition on the European Union legislation, South Oxfordshire District Council undertook a screening exercise (dated May 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 was likely to have significant effects

on the environment and accordingly would require an SEA. As a result of this conclusion, the Qualifying Body commissioned a Strategic Environmental Assessment dated June 2022. The Strategic Environmental Assessment set out the introductions and background in sections 1, 2, 3 and 4. Section 5 sets out the scope of the SEA. Section 6 is an appraisal of the plan vision and objectives and section 7 is an appraisal of reasonable alternatives. Section 8 assesses the environmental impact of the Neighbourhood Plan policies, and sections 9 and 10 sets out the monitoring and next steps of the Plan. The Environmental Report was well considered and detailed. It assessed the environmental conditions in the neighbourhood area and appraised the policies (and reasonable alternatives) against the framework developed through the Scoping Report. As part of the examination on the Plan, the examiner advised the council to run a consultation on the examiner's proposed significant changes to the Plan. As a result of this consultation, the Council undertook a further screening assessment (dated March 2024) which concluded that the Plan, as modified by the significant changes, is not likely to have any significant effects on the environment and accordingly would not require SEA. This updated screening opinion was also subject to consultation.


10. The Council screened the Plan's potential impact on EU Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), and this was completed in May 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. As a result of the consultation on proposed significant modifications to the Plan, the Council rescreened the Plan's potential impact on EU SACs, completed in March 2024. The updated HRA screening report again 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.

11. 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 known.

12. 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

	<p>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>13. 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>14. 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 at Appendix 2.</p> <p>15. The Examiner noted in his report, paragraph 7.109, that it will be appropriate to make any necessary changes to the general text insofar as they are necessary to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions. To ensure that the plan reads as a coherent document, the council has identified factual, consequential, and typographical updates. These are set out in Appendix 3.</p> <p>16. The modifications set out in Appendix 1 and Appendix 3, both separately and combined, produce no likely significant environmental effects and are unlikely to have any significant effects on the integrity of European Designated Sites.</p> <p>17. The council has taken account of all the representations received.</p> <p>18. The Counting Officer is responsible for determining the date of the referendum. The Electoral Service team advises that the referendum is planned for 5 September 2024.</p>
<p>Alternative options rejected</p>	<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 weeks, 2. Refer the issue to a further independent examination if appropriate. <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</p>

	<p>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> 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>
Legal implications	The process undertaken and proposed accords with planning legislation.
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. 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 plan can be met from with existing neighbourhood planning budget.</p>
Climate 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 climate and ecological implications, the Plan seeks to have a positive impact. The plan also contains a Biodiversity policy (E1) with the purpose of supporting development which conserves and enhances biodiversity and which delivers a biodiversity net gain.</p>
Equalities implications	No implications.
Other implications	There are no other implications.
Background papers considered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beckley and Stowood Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents 2. National Planning Policy Framework (2023) 3. National Planning Policy Guidance (July 2014 and subsequent updates) 4. South Oxfordshire Local Plan 5. Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Beckley and

	Stowood Neighbourhood Plan 6. South Oxfordshire District Council SEA/HRA Screening Statement March 2024 7. Representations submitted in response to the Beckley and Stowood Neighbourhood Plan 8. Relevant Ministerial Statements			
Declarations/ conflict of interest?	None			
Consultees		Name	Outcome	Date
	Legal legal@southandvale.gov.uk		No comments	28/06/24
	Finance Finance@southandvale.gov.uk		No comments	28/06/24
	Climate and biodiversity climateaction@southandvale.gov.uk	Jessie Fieth	Agree to proceed	27/06/24
	Equality and diversity equalities@southandvale.gov.uk	Lorne Grove	Agree to proceed	28/06/24
	Strategic property property@southandvale.gov.uk	Christopher Mobbs	No comments	26/06/24
	Communications communications@southandvale.gov.uk	Victoria Nickless	Noted for comms	25/06/24
	Relevant Cabinet member	Councillor Anne-Marie Simpson	Happy to proceed	24/06/24
	Ward councillors	Councillor Tim Bearder	No comments	28/06/24
Decision maker's signature To confirm the decision as set out in this notice.	Signature:  Date: 04/07/2024			

Appendix 1: Examiner's recommendations

Policy/ Section	Examiner's recommendations	Council's Decision	Justification/Reason
<p>POLICY VB1. SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY & POLICY VB2. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY</p>	<p>Replace Policies VB1 and VB2 with:</p> <p>'The Neighbourhood Plan defines the settlement boundary as set out in Figure VB1 on the Policies Map.</p> <p>Proposals for limited infill and the redevelopment of previously-developed land within the defined settlement boundary will be supported provided they accord with development plan policies.</p> <p>Development proposals outside the settlement boundary and outside the land north of Bayswater Brook strategic allocation will only be supported where they are appropriate for a Green Belt location as identified in Section 13 of the NPPF and have regard to the principles of sustainable development. Proposals for inappropriate development will not be supported except in very special circumstances.'</p> <p>Delete the supporting text in the Plan associated with the submitted Policy VB2. Thereafter add the following supporting text at the end of the text associated with Policy VB1:</p> <p>'The policy also deals with situations where residential proposals affect areas outside the settlement boundary, but where Green Belt policy,</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The council consider the modifications to the policy and supporting text necessary to bring the clarity required by the NPPF; the modifications to the policy amalgamate two policies relating to the settlement boundary to ensure that the effect of the identified settlement boundary is clear and unambiguous. The modifications to the policy also ensure that it is clear that the land north of Bayswater Brook strategic allocation is excluded from the policy to avoid the policy undermining the delivery of the strategic policy, as required by the NPPF. The council supports the consequential modifications to the supporting text and the removal of unnecessary elements of the NPPF to avoid duplication with national policy.</p>

	<p>and the location, sustainability and accessibility of those areas does not support such development other than in exceptional circumstances as set out in paragraph 149 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Development proposals outside the settlement boundary which meet one of the Green Belt exceptions should be designed to ensure that they respond as appropriate to other policies in the wider development plan. Particular attention should be given to the prevailing character of the area in terms of the impact of new development on built form, density, and landscape quality, and that the location, sustainability and accessibility of the site is acceptable having regard to the principles of sustainable development.'</p>		
<p>POLICY E1. BIODIVERSITY</p>	<p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>'Development proposals which show a biodiversity net gain and conserve and enhance the environmental and landscape assets, including areas of designated Ancient Woodland, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, RSPB reserves, Conservation Target Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and Local Wildlife Sites (including BBOWT reserves) will be supported.</p> <p>Development proposals should demonstrate how they will conserve local assets such as mature trees, hedgerows, grass verges along the roads and woodland edges, and where appropriate secure the provision of additional habitat areas for wildlife.</p> <p>Proposals which encourage and promote additions</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The council consider the modification to the policy necessary to ensure the policy is not overly onerous by modifying the final paragraph of the policy so that it no longer places blanket restrictions on large areas of land but instead offers support for development which encourage additions to wildlife corridors and air quality improvements as identified within the treescape project map.</p>

	and enhancements to wildlife corridors and air quality improvements as identified within the treescape project map will be supported'		
POLICY H1. PRESERVATION OF HERITAGE	<p>Replace the second part of the policy with:</p> <p>'The effect of a development proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the planning application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect nondesignated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be taken having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'</p>	Agree	The council support the modification to this policy to ensure that it has regard to the NPPF's approach to non-designated heritage assets whereby a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
POLICY DS1. IMPORTANT VIEWS	<p>Replace the first part of the policy with:</p> <p>'The Neighbourhood Plan identifies the following Important Views as shown on Figure 2.11.1.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View 1. From the High Street Across Otmoor. • View 2. Across Otmoor from Church Street. • View 3. Across Otmoor from Woodperry Road. • View 4. Beckley from Shotover showing Beckley Transmitter. • View 5. From Woodperry Road to Brill. • View 6. From Stowood to Stokenchurch Cutting. • View 7. Across Otmoor from Common Road. • View 8. High Street Beckley.' <p>In the second part of the policy replace 'significant adverse' with 'unacceptable'</p>	Agree	The council considers the modification to delete view 6 is necessary as this views were positioned within or looking into the strategic allocation Land North of Bayswater Brook (Policy STRAT13 in the Local Plan), including covering areas shown on the indicative concept plan as high density development, medium density development, lower density development and green infrastructure. Policy DS1, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, states that "development proposals should preserve or enhance the local character of the landscape and through their design, height and massing should recognise and respond positively to the various Important Views." There will be significant changes to the landscape of the area related to the strategic allocation.

	<p>Delete the (now) unnecessary list of views after the policy.</p> <p>Delete View 6 from Figure 2.11.1.2</p>		<p>The modifications also enhance the clarity of the policy by providing an identifying number to each view and by making minor changes to the language used.</p>
POLICY DS2. PARKING	<p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>‘Development proposals should make provision for parking within the overall site, in accordance with the provisions of the most up-to-date Oxfordshire County Council standards.</p> <p>As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should incorporate parking provision which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is provided off-road wherever practicable; • responds positively to the contents of the Design Guide and minimises the impact of the private car on the street scene; and • reflects the character and appearance of the immediate locality as set out in the Character Assessments at Appendices 12 and 13.’ <p>At the end of the first paragraph of supporting text on page 58 of the Plan add:</p> <p>‘For clarity Policy DS2 does not apply to the strategic development site of Land north of Bayswater Brook. The parking requirements for that site should meet the most up to date Oxfordshire County Council’s Parking Standards.’</p> 	Agree	<p>The council considers the modifications the policy and supporting text necessary to ensure that it brings the clarity required by the NPPF and so it can be applied consistently throughout the development management process; the policy is modified so that it refers to the most up-to-date County Council standards for car parking and also reworded to ensure that it recognises that different scales of development will require different approaches to parking. The modifications also remove an overly onerous requirement for parking to be sufficient t for the full life of the development as it may not be possible to predict what parking provision will be required for the future. The council also supports the relocation of the first part of the policy into the supporting text as it is explanatory in nature and therefore not suited for policy.</p>
POLICY DS3.	<p>Replace the policy with: ‘As appropriate to their</p>	Agree	<p>The council considers the modifications to</p>

FLOOD RISK AND DEVELOPMENT	scale, nature and location, development proposals should minimise the use of paved and hard-standing areas and utilise porous driveways and planting to reduce the risk of flooding and run off.'		the policy necessary to remove the first two paragraphs of the policy which replicated elements of the Local Plan in order to avoid unnecessary duplication, as required by the NPPF. The modifications also ensure that the policy sets out the requirements for development proposals rather than anticipating the outcome of planning applications, and sets out that the policy should be applied on a proportionate basis. These modifications recognise that other development plan policies will have a bearing on the determination of such proposals and that individual proposals will generate their own opportunities for the development of the achievement of sustainable drainage solutions
POLICY DS4. DWELLING SIZE	<p>Replace the policy with: 'Development proposals which deliver smaller homes (1-3 bedrooms) will be supported where they otherwise comply with the policies in the development plan.'</p> <p>Change title of policy to 'Smaller homes'</p>	Agree	The council considers the modifications to the policy necessary to avoid duplication with the Local Plan, as required by the NPPF, by removing those sections of the policy which duplicate Policy H20 in Local Plan 2035. The council also agrees with the modifications to enhance the clarity of the policy by defining the size of smaller homes.
POLICY DG1. DESIGN GUIDE	<p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>'As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals outside the strategic allocation at land north of Bayswater Brook should respond positively to the following design principles and the character and vernacular of the part of the</p>	Agree	The council considers the modifications to the policy necessary to bring the clarity required by the NPPF, to ensure it can be applied in a proportionate manner, and to ensure the relationship between the policy and the strategic site at Land North of Bayswater Brook is clear. The modifications

	<p>parish in which they are located as described in the character assessments at Appendices 12-15 and the Conservation Area appraisal for Beckley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• new buildings should be compatible with the size and character of existing buildings in the immediate locality;• power cables shall wherever possible be located underground and minimise the visual impacts associated with new development;• building heights should be in keeping with those of the surrounding buildings and should not extend beyond three storeys;• the design of new buildings should avoid appearing over-bearing by comparison with the neighbouring buildings, having regard to their height, massing, and general scale;• extensions to buildings should be subservient to the original building and should appear a natural evolution of the buildings which respects its character and appearance;• porches and canopies should be in keeping with the character, appearance, and design of the dwelling;• external landscaping proposals should respect the character of the village and the landscape of the immediate surroundings;• wherever practicable, development proposals should incorporate open fencing, railings and hedging that relate sensitively to the open countryside;• the design of new buildings or extensions should incorporate traditional pitched roofs;• TV Dishes and aerials should generally be kept away from the principal elevations and	<p>restructure the policy in a clear and structured manner by reconfiguring the policy so that it is free-standing and incorporates a series of development principles, bringing the clarity required by the NPPF. The modifications also ensure that the policy can be applied in a proportionate way by recognising that the design requirements applied to development proposals will differ as per their scale, nature and location. The modifications also ensure that the Land North of Bayswater Brook site is excluded from this policy. The council considers this modification necessary to ensure the policy does not undermine the delivery of the strategic allocation, as required by the NPPF. The council notes that the word “is” is erroneously included within the 5th bullet point. This matter is addressed in Appendix 3.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>should not be visible on any silhouette elevations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large box-type dormer windows should be avoided; • wherever practicable, solar panels should face the rear of the property, located in hidden valleys and away from principal elevations. Consideration should be given to the use of designs such as panels without frames, or those which that blend into the roofing colour and design of the host building. <p>The following additional design principles will apply in the Conservation Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the use of vernacular materials such as limestone rubble with quoins, well-modelled brickwork, wooden lintels and either wooden window casements or high-quality double-glazed units; • roofs pitches should be covered in tiles, slate, or thatch; and • solar panels should mimic roof tiles and/or have minimal visual impact. <p>Development proposals shall also demonstrate how they will maintain the nucleated pattern of settlements, and promote the use of building materials to maintain vernacular style and a scale of development which is in keeping with and appropriate to the Oxford Heights landscape character area.'</p>		
POLICY DG2. NIGHT	Replace the policy with:	Agree	The council considers the modifications to the policy necessary to bring the clarity

SKY/LIGHTING	<p>‘Insofar as planning permission is required, proposals for external lighting should incorporate design features and mitigating measures to ensure that the lighting is at the minimum level for its intended purpose.</p> <p>Lighting proposals which would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of residential properties in the immediate vicinity or on the wider rural character of the countryside and biodiversity will not be supported.’</p>		<p>required by the NPPF; the modifications ensure that the policy recognises that not all proposals for external lighting will require planning permission and reconfigures the final element of the policy so that it sets out the implications of proposals which do not take a sensitive approach to this matter rather than more generally commenting about the wider purpose of the policy</p>
POLICY CC1. NEW CONSTRUCTION AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY	<p>Replace ‘policy DES10’ with ‘Policy DES10 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan’</p> <p>Replace the final bullet point with: ‘the provision of electric vehicle charging points for all new dwellings.’</p>	Agree	<p>The council considers the modifications to the policy necessary to bring the clarity required by the NPPF; the modifications ensure that the reference to the Local Plan 2035 is clear and recasts the final bullet point so that it more properly relates to the context of the specific points made.</p>
Community Aspirations	<p>Replace the Action with: ‘The community will develop a list of non-designated assets.’</p> <p>Delete the Community Aspiration on the monitoring of the Plan.</p> <p>Delete the heading and Section 5.7</p>	Agree	<p>The council considers the modifications to the community aspirations necessary to bring the clarity required by the NPPF; the modifications restructure the aspiration relating to non-designated heritage assets so that it does not make judgements about how the assets would be safeguarded and removes the aspiration relating to monitoring as this does not accurately reflect the correct statutory position that the Parish Council (PC) is the qualifying body responsible for the preparation, monitoring and any future review of the neighbourhood plan.</p>

<p>Mitigation Policies (Section 6)</p>	<p>Delete the Mitigation policies and community actions in Section 6.</p> <p>Delete the supporting text in Section 6.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>We acknowledge that the Parish Council disagree with the Examiner's recommendation to delete Section 6 and have made a number of representations on this matter. We have considered this matter in detail, including representations submitted in response to the consultation on significant modifications to the plan. Having taken all the relevant information into account, we agree that the deletion of Section 6 is necessary for the following reasons:</p> <p>The council raised concerns on the mitigation policies at both the Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages of the Plan process, noting that Section 6 of the Plan either repeated requirements for the strategic site at Land North of Bayswater Brook as set out in the Local Plan 2035 (which is in conflict with the NPPF which states that plans should avoid duplication of policies that already apply to the specified area) or proposed additional requirements on the strategic allocation without providing evidence that these additional requirements had been assessed as to whether they impact the viability of the strategic allocation.</p> <p>The council noted in their comments that several of the policies in this section looked to address non-land use issues and therefore fell outside the scope of a</p>
--	---	--------------	--

			<p>neighbourhood plan. Additionally, comments were raised that, as neighbourhood plan policies are only applicable to development within the designated neighbourhood plan area and large parts of the strategic site allocation at Bayswater Brook fall outside of this area, it would be problematic for a specific policy approach to be identified in part of a wider strategic development site where no other equivalent complementary policies are being pursued in neighbouring parishes affected by the strategic site. In this context, section 6 detracts from the comprehensive and coherent approach set out in the Local Plan which has been through examination and found sound.</p> <p>The examiner's findings largely align with the above concerns raised by the council. The council also accepts the examiner's view that the mitigation policies were not prepared in collaboration with relevant stakeholders. The council has considered the examiner's recommendation that Section 6 should be removed due to the reasons set out above. On balance, the council agrees that Section 6 of the Plan should be removed.</p>
Other Matters – General	Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies and to accommodate any administrative and technical	Agree	Modifying the general text to ensure it is consistent with amended policies/supporting text is necessary to

	<p>changes.</p> <p>Removal of general text elsewhere in the Plan to take account of the deletion of Section 6 of the Plan.</p>		<p>provide the clarity required by national policy and guidance.</p>
Other Matters – Consequential Modification to the Objectives	<p>In Section 4 of the Plan delete Objective 7</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The council agrees with this consequential amendment.</p>
Other Matters – Specific	<p>Maps</p> <p>The maps currently used in the plan vary greatly in design and quality. It would improve the clarity and understanding of the plan if all the maps in the plan are standardised and enhanced, bringing them in line with the Basic Conditions which require a neighbourhood plan to be clear and unambiguous. Additionally, it is not clear if the appropriate licencing agreements are in place for maps from external organisations used throughout the plan. Any maps without the appropriate licencing agreement for their use in the plan should be replaced or removed.</p> <p>Figures and tables</p> <p>The figures, maps, and tables used within the Plan do not follow a structured labelling system. Each one should be given its own unique figure and title in a structured order, and ideally be referenced throughout the supporting text and the policies where applicable.</p> <p>Map of the neighbourhood area</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The council considers the modifications to the maps, figures and tables within the plan necessary to ensure that the plan has the clarity required by the NPPF. The council has standardised and enhanced the maps where relevant and provided a structured labelling system for the maps, figures, and tables used within the Plan.</p>

	This map should be enhanced by ensuring that the base map used is of a high quality. The current base map is difficult to read and understand which could lead to difficulties when considering planning applications. This will bring this map in line with the Basic Conditions which require a neighbourhood plan to be clear and unambiguous.		

Appendix 2 – Examiner’s Report

The Examiner’s Report is available here:

<https://www.southoxon.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2024/05/Beckley-and-Stowood-Neighbourhood-Development-Plan-Examiners-Report-March-2024.pdf>

Appendix 3 – Consequential and/or Factual Changes

Please note that new text is shown in bold and deleted text as strike through.

Section	Agreed change	Justification/Reason
Throughout Plan	Update references to NPPF to the latest version, updated December 2023.	Factual Correction.
Table of Contents	Update table, including updating page numbers and deleting references to those which have been removed, in response to Examiner’s modifications.	Consequential amendment.
List of Policies	Update list of policies, including updating page numbers and deleting references to those which have been removed, in response to Examiner’s modifications.	Consequential amendment.
Page 21	Remove the final bullet point relating to the mitigation policies which have been removed.	Consequential amendment.

Page 27	Delete bullet point 10 relating to the mitigation policies which have been removed.	Consequential amendment.
Page 53; Paragraph 5.4	Remove reference to Policy VB2	Consequential amendment.
Page 53; Paragraph 5.4.1	Delete: <i>“There are spectacular views from Beckley ridge north towards Otmoor from the Conservation Area and to Brill and towards Aylesbury from Woodperry Road and from Stowood to Didcot and the Stokenchurch cutting.”</i>	Consequential amendment
Page 65; Policy DG1. Beckley Design Guide	Remove word “is” from the following paragraph within the Examiner’s recommended modifications to this policy: <i>“extensions to buildings should be subservient to the original building and should appear a natural evolution of the buildings which is respects its character and appearance”</i>	Typographical correction.