

SONNING COMMON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Consultation Statement

January 2016

Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	5
Chapter Two: Consultations 2012 to 2015.....	5
Chapter Three: Pre-submission consultations	12
Chapter Four: Overview of feedback and changes	16
Appendix 1: Sonning Common Magazine NDP articles	16
Appendix 2: Publicity examples	21
Appendix 3: Henley Standard NDP articles.....	22
Appendix 4: Pre-submission consultation publicity (1)	23
Appendix 4a: Pre-submission consultation publicity (2)	27
Appendix 5: Residents' Representation and Feedback Form (1)	29
Appendix 5a: Residents' Representation and Feedback Form (2)	31
Appendix 6: Comments - residents	33
Appendix 6a: Public consultation (1).....	34
Appendix 6b: Public consultation (2).....	67
Appendix 7: Comments - statutory and other	76
Appendix 7a: Public consultation (1).....	77
Appendix 7b: Public consultation (2).....	96

Tables

Table 3.1	Pre-submission calendar of events - consultation (1).....	13
Table 3.2	Pre-submission calendar of events - consultation (2).....	14

Figures

Figure 2.1:	Publicity flyer	21
Figure 2.2:	Sonning Common Magazine cover	21
Figure 4.2:	Poster	23
Figure 4.3:	Email to residents	24
Figure 4.4:	Sonning Common Magazine article	25
Figure 4.5:	Email to residents.....	26
Figure 4.6:	Henley Standard	26
Figure 4.7:	Henley Standard article	27
Figure 4.8:	Email to residents	27
Figure 4.9:	Poster	28
Figure 4.10:	Sonning Common Magazine article	28

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

Chapter One: Introduction

Purpose

This Consultation Statement supports the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan (SCNDP) and has been prepared to fulfil the legal requirements defined in Part 5, paragraphs 14 and 15 (2) of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

A Consultation Statement is defined in paragraph 15 (2) as a document which:

- contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan
- explains how they were consulted
- summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted
- describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan

In December 2011, Sonning Common Parish Council (SCPC) notified South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) of its intention to launch a neighbourhood development plan. Formal discussions with SODC about the process began once the Localism Act 2011 became operational in April 2012. The application for a designated plan area, which includes parts of Kidmore End and Rotherfield Peppard parishes, was approved by the Cabinet of SODC on 25 October 2013.

Structure

Chapter Two details the engagement and consultation undertaken by the SCNDP Working Party, from the beginning of 2012 through to the end of 2015.

Chapter Three records how the pre-submission consultations were publicised to ensure that residents in particular were aware of the draft Plan and the importance of completing the Residents' Representation and Feedback Form.

Chapter Four, in essence the backbone of the Consultation Statement, gives an overview of the feedback submitted by residents and summarises Plan responses to the key issues raised. It also highlights the principal changes to policies following consideration of comments received from statutory consultees, landowners and developers of the SHLAA sites, and other interested parties.

Chapter Two: Consultations 2012 to 2015

Introduction

From the outset, the priority for the SCNDP Working Party comprising residents, who volunteered, and parish councillors was to focus on the involvement of residents, including those from neighbouring parishes.

How to reach out effectively and efficiently to the 1,595 households in the parish of Sonning Common alone, capture and sustain their interest and ultimately garner their support for the development proposals was and remains a challenge.

During the first year, in the absence of a website or email contact details, publicity of events relied heavily on door to door leaflet drops, a banner across the frontage of the Village Hall and posters in the windows of local businesses and on parish notice boards.

Fortunately, Sonning Common boasts an excellent local magazine and six issues of some 30 pages each are delivered annually to every home in the village. Securing the agreement of its committee to use the magazine as the main vehicle to inform on the progress of our neighbourhood plan was a major benefit for the village. See Appendix 1.

The Henley Standard provides a further avenue for updates on our plan. There are regular reports on the progress of all neighbourhood development plans in the district and we have listed articles in which the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan (SCNDP) has featured, hard copies of which are available in the SCNDP evidence file in the parish office. See Appendix 3.

Autumn 2012 saw the emergence of an email directory created with the permission of attendees of various public gatherings about the neighbourhood plan which meant that events and news could start to be sent electronically in 2013.

In June 2013 the SCNDP website ¹ was launched and is now a valuable tool to inform both in terms of events and supporting evidence in respect of plan proposals.

The next part of this chapter sets out details of the public events the SCNDP Working Party has hosted and also lists meetings it has held with landowners and developers.

¹ Source: www.scpc-ndp.co.uk

Public events 2012 to 2015

28 April 2012 – Village Hall		174 attendees
Publicity	Letterbox leaflet delivery to all households in Sonning Common; posters – shop fronts & notice boards; Sonning Common Magazine; banner outside the Village Hall; Henley Standard;	
Presentations	Neighbourhood plans vest powers in communities to have meaningful say in planning policies affecting the future of their villages and towns; SODC's Core Strategy	
Activities	Attendees identify likes and dislikes about the village; memory maps reveal amenities most used by community; maps & photographs of 14 SHLAA sites; children engage in skate park designs; outline of structured surveys to be completed by residents; interim results fed back to audience; next steps outlined	
Consultation evidence	Website: Publicity - Sonning Common Magazine Jun/Jul 2012 – 'Community spirit...people who smile' follow-up article Website: Community evidence – report filed on 'Design Day' events	

2 June 2012 am – Village Hall 7 July 2012 am		144 attendees
Publicity	Letterbox leaflet delivery to all households in Sonning Common; posters – shop fronts & notice boards; Sonning Common Magazine;	
Purpose	'Drop-in' meetings to recruit volunteers to complete structured surveys designed by external consultants including Site Assessment, Village Character, Landscape Setting	
Activities	Guidance as to completion – illustrative examples on display boards; 80 volunteer surveyors signed up	
Consultation evidence	Website: Publicity - Sonning Common Magazine Aug/Sep 2012 – follow-up article - 'Neighbourhood planning is moving forward' Website: Site selection criteria – Templates of surveys	

15 September 2012 – Village Hall		79 attendees
Publicity	Letterbox leaflet delivery to all households in Sonning Common; posters – shop fronts & notice boards; banner outside the Village Hall;	
Purpose	Update on surveys completed by residents; display boards on each of 14 SHLAA sites to further engage with local community; publicise housing needs survey to be delivered to households in Sonning Common;	
Activities	Small group discussions on village centre; 21 volunteers signed up for NDP support tasks;	
Consultation evidence	Website: Publicity - Sonning Common Magazine Oct/Nov 2012 – follow-up article - 'Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) marches on!'	

During 2012 and 2013 all SHLAA sites were surveyed:

- by residents who volunteered for the task and by members of the SCNDP Working Party ²
- results were analysed and collated into 'traffic light' grid ³ and audited ⁴ by a small group of residents
- residents were then consulted at public meetings and individual site meetings on the various site options available for development and views taken into consideration

An officer from The Chilterns Conservation Board gave his advice that SONs 10, 11, 12 and 14 should not be developed as they are either in or border very sensitive AONB.

² Source: Completed Site Assessment Surveys and summaries available in parish office

³ Source: www.scpc-ndp.co.uk - Site selection criteria

⁴ Source: www.scpc-ndp.co.uk - Evidence base

7 February 2013 pm – Village Hall		174 attendees
9 February 2013 am		
Publicity	Email invitation; posters – shop fronts & notice boards; Sonning Common Magazine; banner outside the Village Hall; Henley Standard;	
Presentations	14 SHLAA sites including photographs and analyses of site assessment surveys completed by residents; evaluation of each site relating to landscape, environment, location, access and sustainability criteria in the format of a 'traffic light grid'; development proposals for each site put forward for comment by attendees	
Activities	Attendees completed questionnaires covering development proposals put forward for each SHLAA site; two groups of residents overseen by independent consultants audited NDP working party conclusions presented as 'traffic light grids' for each SHLAA site	
Consultation/evidence	Website: Evidence - Site surveys auditing report Website: Publicity - Sonning Common Magazine Apr/May 2013 – follow-up article - 'Decision time for consideration of sites' Website: Evidence: Site selection summary report	

45 attendees submitted a total of 416 comments in respect of the 14 SHLAA sites put forward for development. 88% of responses agreed with the proposals, which were largely based on the site assessment surveys completed by residents. The website reports referred to above contain the detail but in summary it was agreed that SON sites 2, 6 (part), 7, 9 and 11 (part) should go forward to the next stage for appraisal as housing sites, with SON 1 to be retained as open green space, SON 3 to be considered for recreational facilities and SON 8 to be retained as a gymnastics centre. It should be noted that three other sites had already been withdrawn by their owners.

19 July 2013 pm – Village Hall		49 attendees
Publicity	Email invitation; poster on notice boards; banner outside the Village Hall;	
Presentations	Additional SHLAA site, increasing total to 15. Analysis of site assessment surveys and summary of 'traffic light grid'; options put forward for possible uses of available SHLAA sites	
Activities	Attendees completed questionnaires covering development proposals put forward for SON 15 and considered an options matrix covering all available SHLAA sites	
Consultation/evidence	Website: Publicity - Sonning Common Magazine Oct/Nov 2013 – follow-up article – 'Neighbourhood Development Plan'	

SON 15, belonging to Chiltern Edge School, was put forward in May 2013 as a registered SHLAA site for consideration as part of the neighbourhood plan. The proposal by the SCNDP Working Party suggested that only part of the site should be considered for housing (SON 15a) and the remainder (SON 15b) set aside, and this was supported by the meeting. However, it has proved to be one of the more contentious sites primarily because near neighbours were not aware of the school's intentions and some residents believe that school playing fields should not be developed.

11 October 2013 pm – Village Hall		53 attendees
Publicity	Email invitation; poster on notice boards; banner outside the Village Hall;	
Presentations	Sonning Common Character and Design Statement (external consultant report); Traffic and parking in Sonning Common (internal report); update on site development options	
Activities	Attendees completed questionnaires covering traffic and parking and development options for consideration in the next phases	
Consultation/evidence	Website: Publicity - Sonning Common Magazine Dec/Jan 2013/14 – follow-up article – 'Neighbourhood Development Plan' - 7 th public meeting in consultation series'	

Attendees welcomed the updates from the three speakers but it became apparent from comments after the meeting that residents would value a review of progress and a timetable setting out the next stages in the development of the plan

16 November 2013 – Village Hall		146 attendees
Publicity	Email invitation; poster on notice boards; banner outside the Village Hall;	
Purpose	Prompted by comments from supporters of the Plan that they felt out of touch with progress, an extensive display board exhibition was organised 'The Story So Far' setting out the SCNDP in ten distinct phases since its inception in early 2012	
Activities	Publicity emphasised the need to spread the word about the NDP to attract new attendees to meetings	
Consultation/evidence	Sonning Common Magazine Feb/Mar 2014 – comprehensive five page follow-up article – 'The Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for Sonning Common'	

The phase by phase approach to explain the journey of the neighbourhood plan was appreciated and also helped to attract newcomers. Sites selected for housing received the most questions and many mentioned the need for smaller and therefore more affordable homes to attract young people to revitalise the village. Infrastructure dominated the general issues for concern with congestion in the village centre the most frequently mentioned.

15 & 16 November 2014 – Village Hall		256 attendees
Publicity	Sonning Common Magazine; email invitation; poster on notice boards; banner outside the Village Hall;	
Purpose	'Drop-in' meetings. First draft of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (not pre-submission consultation version) available on series of display boards for residents' views and comments	
Activities	Attendees completed a short questionnaire giving feedback on content and layout	
Consultation/evidence	196 completed questionnaires returned.	

Attendees were asked to complete a questionnaire, the focus of which was the principles and policies within the Plan, as they walked around the exhibition. The highest level of support (96.3%) was for the principle to protect Sonning Common's sense of community as it grows in size and the lowest support (60.6%) was for the policy concerning preferential access to housing.

6 & 7 February and 5 March 2015 – Village Hall		377 attendees
Publicity	Henley Standard; email invitation; SCNDP website; Sonning Common Magazine; poster on notice boards and retail premises; kerbside notices; banner outside the Village Hall;	
Purpose	'Drop-in' meetings. Draft of the Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-submission version on series of display boards for residents' views and comments	
Activities	Emphasising the importance of completing Residents' Representation and Feedback Form	
Consultation/evidence	See below	

Appendix 6a in this Consultation Statement shows the detail contained in all the residents' feedback forms submitted, while Chapter Four summarises the key messages and the Plan responses.

10 September 2015 – Village Hall		114 attendees
Publicity	Letterbox leaflet delivery to all households in Sonning Common; Henley Standard;	
Presentation	CH SCNDP Working Party explained why the draft Pre-submission Plan had to be rewritten and reasons for increasing the overall number of new homes to 195	
Activities	Attendees were asked to complete a short questionnaire covering the proposals to include SONs 5 and 15a as allocated sites and SON 8 as a reserve site	
Consultation/evidence	Of the 52 completed questionnaires, three objected to SON 15a	

While there was overwhelming support for the Plan and recognition of the need to anticipate the potential impact of the SHMA there were questions as to why outlying villages could not take some share of the increasing number of homes. Attendees acknowledged that many of the infrastructure concerns they have expressed from the outset remain outside the remit of a neighbourhood plan but nevertheless a sense of frustration prevailed that policy imposes numbers of new homes without consideration of even the current challenges facing communities.

Additional meetings were held in the Village Hall with small groups of 'near' residents most directly affected by proposed development on allocated sites	
04 Jun 2014 – SON 6 07 Jun 2014 – SON 15a 07 Jun 2014 – SON 9 18 Jun 2014 – SONs 7 & 7a 06 Nov 2014 – SON 1 07 Nov 2014 – SONs 2 & 3 29 Jan 2015 – SONs 7 & 9 30 Jan 2015 – SON 5 14 Sep 2015 – SON 8	Written invitations to meet with the SCNDP Working Party were delivered to homes most directly affected by potential site development
Purpose	Discuss with residents the draft policy proposals in respect of individual sites
Activities	Attendees considered proposals and illustrative material and discussed with the SCNDP Working Party
Consultation/evidence	Where possible, individual site policies took account of residents' concerns and suggestions. However, several of the issues raised cannot be considered until submission of a planning application

Meetings with landowners, agents, developers

Date	Site – landowner/agents/developers
21 March 2012	SON 7 - Mr & Mrs R Colbeck
09 August 2012	SON 9 - S Lilly
25 March 2013	SON 5 - TA Fisher
20 May 2013	Chiltern Edge School (now SON15A) - D Sadler
24 May 2013	SON 5 - TA Fisher
24 June 2013	SON 9 - S Lilly and K Djiksman
25 June 2013	SONs 1, 2 & 3 - R Pelly
09 July 2013	SON 7 - Mr & Mrs R Colbeck
01 August 2013	SON 7 - Mr & Mrs R Colbeck
27 August 2013	SON 8 - Mr & Mrs R Newton
04 September 2013	SON 6 - M Woods
12 November 2013	SON 9 - S Lilly and S Trenwith (Bewley Homes)
27 November 2013	SON 9 - Bewley Homes
08 January 2014	SON 5 - TA Fisher
04 February 2014	SON 7 - Mr & Mrs R Colbeck
06 February 2014	SONs 1, 2 & 3 - R Pelly
12 February 2014	SON 6 - M Woods
14 May 2014	SON 9 - Bewley Homes
23 May 2014	SON 7 - Mr & Mrs R Colbeck
02 April 2014	SON 15A - D Sadler
13 June 2014	SON 7 - Mr & Mrs R Colbeck
04 July 2014	SONs 2&3 - Linden Homes
25 July 2014	SON 15A - D Sadler
07 August 2014	Kidby's Yard - F Williams
20 August 2014	SONs 2&3 - Linden Homes
28 August 2014	SONs 2&3 - Linden Homes
03 October 2014	SONs 2&3 - Linden Homes
31 October 2014	SON 5 - TA Fisher
12 December 2014	SON 9 - Bewley Homes
13 January 2015	SON 5 - TA Fisher
11 February 2015	Kidby's Yard - F Williams
02 March 2015 – Conference call	SONs 2&3 - Linden Homes
23 March 2015	SON 15A - D Sadler
24 April 2015	SON 9 - Bewley Homes
19 June 2015	SON 6 – Gallagher Estates
24 June 2015	SON 15A - D Sadler
10 July 2015	SON 5 - TA Fisher
30 July 2015	SON 8 - Mr & Mrs R Newton

Chapter Three: Pre-submission consultations

Requirements

Part 5, Pre-submission consultation and publicity, paragraph 14 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 states that before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must:

- publicise in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area
 - details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan
 - details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected
 - details of how to make representations and
 - the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised
- consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood plan and
- send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority

Process

The pre-submission consultation commenced Friday 6 February 2015 (6:00pm to 9:00pm) in the village hall with a public exhibition of the Plan displayed on boards. The exhibition was also available on Saturday 7 February between 10:00am and 3:00pm and again on Thursday 5 March (7:00pm to 9:30pm).

The SCNDP Working Party was present throughout to answer questions and to emphasise the importance of completing the Residents' Representation and Feedback Form. Although the events were attended primarily by residents, some landowners and developers also attended.

By Friday 13 February the due process of advising all interested parties, including residents, other stakeholders and statutory consultees, was completed, with Friday 27 March set as the closing date for the 6 week consultation period. However, the consultation period was extended for a further 6 weeks from 28 April to 12 June 2015 to allow the Sustainability Appraisal Environmental Report to be considered in tandem with the draft Pre-submission Plan.

In June 2015, SODC advised Sonning Common Parish Council that both documents would require redrafting and that a second 6-week public consultation would need to be launched so that residents, other stakeholders and statutory consultees could consider and comment on the revised documents.

The second public consultation commenced on Friday 23 October with a closing date of Friday 4 December. Residents were advised that comments submitted on the first draft Pre-submission Plan (February 2015) had been collated and considered in preparation for submitting to the Examiner.

This table summarises the actions taken to publicise the first Pre-submission draft Plan.

Date	Method	Publicity	Detail
19 Dec 2014	Henley Standard	Dates, times, venue of exhibitions in February 2015 to launch formal 6 week consultation of Plan	Appendix 4 Figure 4.1
19 Jan 2015	Parish Council meeting	Formal adoption of draft Pre-submission Plan	
26 Jan 2015	Posters on notice boards, retail premises	Dates and times, venue of February & March exhibitions to launch formal 6 week consultation of Plan	Appendix 4 Figure 4.2
27 Jan 2015	Email to all addressees in SCNDP Directory	In addition to the above, emphasis on importance of residents' involvement	Appendix 4 Figure 4.3
1 Feb 2015	Sonning Common Magazine Feb/Mar issue	Front cover and two page spread providing detail about the formal consultation and viewing of Plan	Appendix 4 Figure 4.4
2 Feb 2015	Banner outside village hall and kerbside notices	Abbreviated version of poster publicity	
6 Feb 2015	Exhibition in village hall	A1/A3 displays of Plan; feedback form with unique identification number given to attendees; SCNDP Working Party available throughout	
7 Feb 2015	Exhibition in village hall	A1/A3 displays of Plan; feedback form with unique identification number given to attendees; SCNDP Working Party available throughout	
11 Feb 2015	SCNDP website www.scpnc-ndp.co.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation details • Pre-submission Plan • Electronic feedback form • Supporting evidence 	
11 Feb 2015	Parish Office and Sonning Common Library	Reference copies of the Plan made available together with feedback forms for completion	
12 Feb 2015	Email to Statutory Consultees, landowners, developers and other stakeholders	Link to the Plan and supporting evidence via the SCNDP website inviting comments by 27 March 2015	
12 Feb 2015	Email to all addressees in SCNDP Directory	Consultation information Details of additional public exhibition on 5 March (pm)	Appendix 4 Figure 4.5
27 Feb 2015	Email, posters on notice boards & retail premises, banner outside village hall and kerbside notices	Public exhibition on 5 March (pm) Importance of feedback by 27 March	
5 Mar 2015	Exhibition in village hall	A1/A3 displays of Plan; feedback form with unique identification number given to attendees; SCNDP Working Party available throughout	

Table 3.1 Pre-submission calendar of events - consultation (1)

This table summarises the actions taken to publicise the revised Pre-submission draft Plan.

Date	Method	Publicity	Detail
4,5 & 6 Sep 2015	Leaflet drop to every household in Sonning Common	10 September 2015 at 7:30pm. Meeting in village hall to explain the reasons for the redrafting of the Pre-submission Plan and the need for a new public consultation period when completed	
1 Oct 2015	Sonning Common Magazine Oct/Nov issue	Two page spread covering the aspects of redrafting the February 2015 Pre-submission Plan	
23 Oct 2015	SCNDP website www.scpnc-ndp.co.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public consultation details • Second Pre-submission Plan • Electronic feedback form • Supporting evidence 	
23 Oct 2015	Henley Standard	Commencement of public consultation on the second draft of the Sonning Common Neighbourhood	Appendix 4a Figure 4.7
23 Oct 2015	Email to Statutory Consultees, landowners, developers and other stakeholders	Links to the Plan and supporting evidence via the SCNDP website inviting comments by 4 December 2015	
23 Oct 2015	Email to all addressees in SCNDP Directory	Details relating to the revised draft Plan and the 6-week public consultation period	Appendix 4a Figure 4.8
23 Oct 2015	Posters on notice boards around the village	Abbreviated detail relating to the revised draft Plan and the 6-week public consultation period	Appendix 4a Figure 4.9
23 Oct 2015	Parish Office and Sonning Common Library	Reference copies of the Plan made available together with feedback forms for completion	
1 Dec 2015	Sonning Common Magazine Dec/Jan issue	Reminder that the public consultation period due to close 4 December 2015	Appendix 4a Figure 4.10

Table 3.2 Pre-submission calendar of events - consultation (2)

In accordance with The Neighbourhood Planning (General Regulations 2012) the following bodies were invited to submit their comments on the first and subsequently revised Pre-submission versions of the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Statutory consultees

South Oxfordshire District Council	Homes and Communities Agency
West Oxfordshire District Council	MONO Consultants Ltd for Mobile Operators Association (MOA)
Oxford City Council	The Coal Authority
Vale of White Horse District Council	NHS Property Services
Cherwell District Council	British Gas
Reading Borough Council	UK Power Networks
West Berkshire Council, Planning and Transport Policy	National Grid Plant Protection
Wokingham Borough Council	Marine Management Organisation
Buckinghamshire County Council	Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OLEP)
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead District Council	Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (Acute and Community Services)
Ayelsbury Vale District Council	British Telecom
Wycombe District Council	Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE) (Reading)
Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council	Oxfordshire Local Nature Partnership
Kidmore End Parish Council	Homes and Communities Agency
Harpsden Parish Council	Oxford NHS Foundation Trust
Binfield Heath Parish Council	Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce
Eye and Dunsden Parish Council	Churches Together in Oxfordshire
Environment Agency	Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)
Natural England	Thames Valley Police (Design)
Historic England	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD)
Chilterns Conservation Board	Thames Valley Police
North Wessex Downs AONB	The Office for Nuclear Regulation
Highways England	Health and Safety Executive
Southern Gas Networks	Sonning Common Library
Entec on behalf of National Grid UK Transmission Network Rail	MP (Henley Constituency)
Thames Water Property Services	MP (Wantage and Didcot Constituency)
NHS England – Primary Healthcare Oxfordshire, Bucks and Berks	District Councillors
Homes and Communities Agency	

Chapter Four: Overview of feedback and changes

Residents' comments

Appendices 6a and 6b include the information collated from the Residents' Representation and Feedback Forms completed in respect of the two public consultations held to consider the first and subsequently revised drafts of the Pre-submission Plan.

253 completed feedback forms were received in respect of Public consultation (1) and 23 in response to Public consultation (2). The publicity relating to the second consultation was similar to that of the first except that there were no meetings showing displays of the revised Plan.

Residents were advised that comments submitted in respect of the first draft Plan had been collated and analysed and would be relevant going forward to examination. This goes some way to explaining the low return of responses relating to the second draft. Changes relating to the distribution of sites included SON 8 – Kennyland Gymnastics as a reserve site and the reclassification of SON 5 – Kennylands Paddock and SON 15a – Chiltern Edge Top from reserve to allocated sites.

Key messages

Consultation during the planning process

98% of 242 responses agreed that residents had been consulted well

Support for the Plan

94 % of 235 responses indicated broad support for the first draft Plan

70% of 23 responses indicated satisfaction with the revised Plan

Overall proposed policies

93% of 227 responses believed that the proposed policies were right for Sonning Common

87% of 23 responses thought the revised policies were about right

Recurring topics

Of the 650 written comments received, the following topics were covered most frequently:

- Housing mix
- Parking in the village centre
- Infrastructure (roads, traffic, health and education facilities)
- Housing sites
- Park and ride
- Minimum 138 new homes for Sonning Common

Plan responses

Housing mix

This was the topic raised most frequently by residents. The emphasis was on the need to provide smaller-sized properties (1/2 beds) and homes affordable for young families, which might also allow those residents wishing to downsize to stay within Sonning Common. We should be redressing the balance of the ageing population by providing more starter homes. More bungalows including those to cater for wheelchairs and also sheltered accommodation for the elderly were other suggestions.

Plan response

Policy H2, although modified in the light of comments from SODC, continues to focus on the need to provide smaller-sized homes.

Policy H2b encourages development proposals which provide for extra care/senior living accommodation.

Policy HS5 (SON 7 Hagpits House), extra-care housing is being considered for this site.

Policy HS6 (SON 8 Kennylands Gymnastics), single-storey homes are proposed, which would be in keeping with nearby Essex Way.

Parking in the village centre

Of all the observations about traffic, parking and congestion in the village centre were the most common complaints with insufficient parking bays, inconsiderate parking and long stay users of the public car park behind the village hall cited as some of the causes. Vehicular traffic from the new homes would create further pressures and there were concerns about the future of the bus route through the village.

Plan response

The SCNDP Working Party explained at public meetings that this issue as with others involving infrastructure cannot be addressed directly by a neighbourhood plan. That said the Plan includes a section entitled **Actions for parish council**, which covers aspects such as the bus service and traffic measures. Once the Plan passes referendum, residents will be approached to join a task group to work with the parish council to seek solutions.

Infrastructure

Concerns about infrastructure perceived by some as being already fragile ranged from the pressure on medical and education facilities to the poor maintenance of roads.

Plan response

See Plan response above.

Housing sites

While most of the specific remarks were from residents living close to allocated/reserve sites, others commented that the sizes of one or two of the proposed housing developments were not what villagers wanted in Sonning Common.

Plan response

The SCNDP Working Party held meetings with neighbours close to each potential development site to discuss proposals. Many of the issues raised can only be dealt with once a planning application is received. All non-AONB sites are now included within the Plan and individual densities are cognisant of AONB sensitivities and the minimum 25dph required by SODC.

Park and Ride

This proposal was vigorously opposed by many residents on the grounds that far from alleviating traffic problems it would attract even more vehicles. Furthermore, it had not been discussed with the community.

Plan response

Policy VC2b relating to a village 'park and ride' facility was removed from the Plan.

Minimum 138 new homes for Sonning Common

The majority of residents accepted the need for new homes but many expressed concerns that with no upper limit, ever greater numbers could be imposed on Sonning Common. Allied to this, many asked why infill development could not be counted as part of the minimum 138 homes allocation.

Plan response

The Plan allows for flexibility in the overall number of new homes and residents are informed of the potential impact of evidence from Oxfordshire's Strategic Housing Market Assessment. To this end, the Plan provides for 195 new homes on allocated sites, 41% higher than the minimum 138. Individual site numbers have been discussed and agreed with residents and most landowners/developers. National policy says that infill development does not count towards the numbers allocated to villages.

Statutory and other feedback

21 consultees, including statutory, landowners, developers and planning consultants, commented on the two Pre-submission drafts of the Plan. Appendices 7a and 7b show that the majority of remarks relate to specific policies and the Plan response column details any subsequent amendments. The key changes to policies are summarised in the following section.

Changes to policies

In consideration of the comments received from the two pre-submission public consultations, changes have been made to the following policies.

Development strategy

Policy DS1: As South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) does not support a 'settlement boundary' this was changed to 'gaps between villages' in line with their advice.

Housing

Policy H1: Housing distribution is amended to include numbers of new homes for allocated SHLAA sites, incorporating a minimum 138 homes and also a potential allocation as a result of the evidence presented in respect of Oxfordshire's Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Plan thus makes provision for 195 new homes.

Policy H2: Housing mix is modified in consultation with SODC but continues to accommodate the housing needs of Sonning Common as reflected in the ORCC report commissioned by the parish council and has regard also to Census 2011 data and comments made by residents.

Movement, road safety and parking

Policy MRP3: Parking standards in respect of parking provision on development sites were modified in the light of advice from Oxfordshire County Council.

Also related to parking, Policy VC2b, which included a proposal for a village 'park and ride' facility, was removed following strong opposition from residents.

Environmental

Policy ENV1: Wording was amended as proposed by The Chilterns Conservation Board and SODC to ensure compliance with the NPPF and other national policies.

Elsewhere in the Plan, text relating to the protection of the AONB was strengthened with the referencing of the Position Statement – Development affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB- Adopted June 2011' with regard to non-AONB SHLAA sites which lie in the setting of the AONB.

Policy ENV3a: This policy was deleted but the content relating to the designation of Local Green Space on SON 1 was expanded and included within Part 4 of the Plan – Site allocations and designations.

Non-land use

Policies CSH3, MRP1, MRP2b and ENV2d: Following SODC's advice these are no longer policies but are retained in the Plan as 'Actions for parish council.' They encompass education facilities, the bus service, traffic calming and wider 'green' planting.

Site allocations and designations

Policies HS1 to HS7 now include:

- SONs 5 (Kennylands Paddock and SON 8 Kennylands Gymnastics) to ensure that all non-AONB sites are now included in the Plan
- a requirement for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to accompany applications to help in determining the final capacity of each site
- references where appropriate to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2014-2019

Heritage

Policy HER1: This policy was revised to include Historic England's preferred wording.

Appendix 1: Sonning Common Magazine NDP articles

The Sonning Common magazine, which is published on a bi-monthly basis, is distributed free to every household in Sonning Common. Elsewhere in the village, some 70 copies are delivered to schools, the library, health centre, dentistry, estate agents, public houses, veterinary practice and other local businesses. It provides valuable publicity space for news on the progress of our Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and as can be seen, updates have been regular. All articles can be accessed on the SCNDP website (www.scp-ndp.co.uk) under the publicity section.

2012	Page(s)
February/March	7
April/May	2, 3
June/July	2
August/September	7
October/November	7

2013	Page(s)
December/January	6
February/March	Cover, 6, 7
April/May	6, 7
June/July	6, 14, 15
August/September	2,
October/November	6, 7

2014	Page(s)
December/January	5
February/March	13, 14, 15, 16
April/May	4,
June/July	4, 5
August/September	5,
October/November	16, 17

2015	Page(s)
February/March	Cover, 14, 15, 16
April/May	2
June/July	2
August/September	5
October/November	16, 17
December/January 2016	2

Appendix 2: Publicity examples

Flyer to homes, library, schools & retail

Sonning Common Magazine Feb/Mar 2013



Figure 2.1: Publicity flyer



Figure 2.2: Sonning Common Magazine cover

Appendix 3: Henley Standard NDP articles

The Henley Standard newspaper is published weekly and can be purchased in Sonning Common. Neighbourhoods around Henley have dedicated news pages carrying articles specifically about their villages. Sonning Common shares its page with Kidmore End and Peppard. The tables below show the frequency of and the dates the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan featured in the Henley Standard. Hard copies of the articles are available in the parish office.

[illegible]

2013 (23 articles)	Page
25 January	18
1 February	17
8 February	18
1 March	16, 17
15 March	17
5 April	19
19 April	19
17 May	15
31 May	19
14 June	15
28 June	18
5 July	19
12 July	16
19 July	19
2 Aug	17
16 August	16
20 September	19
11 October	17
1 November	18
8 November	14
22 November	23
29 November	21

2014 (18 articles)	Page
10 January	15
17 January	19
24 January	16
31 January	16
28 February	17
2 May	15
30 May	19
6 June	22
20 June	14
8 August	16
5 September	16
19 September	18
26 September	17
31 October	15
14 November	16
21 November	19
5 December	15
19 December	18

2015 (19 articles)	Page
13 February	17
20 February	19
13 March	17
10 April	14
1 May	17
5 June	17
19 June	16
24 July	16
7 August	13
21 August	17
4 September (2)	16
25 September	19
9 October	14
23 October	17
30 October	16
4 December	17
11 December	17
18 December	15

Appendix 4: Pre-submission consultation publicity (1)

Henley Standard – 19 December 2014

Poster circulated around Sonning Common



Figure 4.1: Henley Standard article



Figure 4.2: Poster

Copy of email to residents 27 January 2015

Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan

A six-week public consultation on the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan (SCNDP) will begin on Friday 6 February and run until Friday 20 March. The consultation will begin with public exhibitions in Sonning Common Village Hall on:

- **Friday 6 February between 6pm and 9pm**
- **Saturday 7 February between 10am and 3pm**

We strongly urge residents to attend the village hall on either date to view the latest plans for proposed development within Sonning Common, to ask questions and to complete comment and feedback forms. Your views are important in helping to shape the emerging neighbourhood development plan.

The story so far

- Government policy has resulted in South Oxfordshire District Council allocating a quota of a minimum of 138 new homes to be built in Sonning Common.
- SC Parish Council initiated the NDP in 2012 to enable residents to be involved in the development of their village.
- Since the last public NDP event on 15 & 16 November 2014, the Working Party has refined Sonning Common's NDP in the light of feedback from those who attended. Revisions were also included following discussions with landowners, South Oxfordshire District Council, Chilterns Conservation Board and residents who live closest to the proposed development sites.
- The February meetings will display the draft Plan as it currently stands.

Why is it important that you attend

- The meetings on 6 & 7 February are very important because they mark the beginning of a formal six weeks of consultation when our Sonning Common NDP is sent to a list of 'statutory' organisations for their comments.
- **Your feedback** will be every bit as important as the 'statutory' comments but **your presence** at the above meetings is crucial because a government-recognised independent examiner will be interested also in attendance numbers when the Plan is submitted for inspection.
- This stage in the preparation of our Plan is therefore a vital step in the 'countdown' to referendum in September

Whatever happens affects us all

- The minimum of 138 new homes affects all of us wherever we live in the village.
- There is no legal requirement to have a Plan, but without one residents lose the opportunity to reflect the needs of the local community in any development which takes place.
- The next edition of the SC Magazine (1 Feb) highlights what happened to the village of Buntingford in Hertfordshire, which **did not** have the protection of a neighbourhood plan.

Help to spread the message

- The February SC Magazine, delivered to every home in the parish, will provide detail on the proposed development sites and how residents can give their views on the Plan at this important stage. Encourage friends and family to read the article.
- Also visit www.scp-ndp.co.uk
- On 6 & 7 February, the Plan will be presented on display boards and the Working Party will be there to answer questions. Please spread the word.

We look forward to seeing you and thank you for your support.

Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Party

Figure 4.3: Email to residents

Sonning Common Magazine – Feb/Mar 2015

IN FOCUS

THE FINAL COUNTDOWN

FORMAL CONSULTATION ON THE PLAN COMMENCES

SCNDP SONNING COMMON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

KEY:

- Village Centre
- 150m radius
- Allocations A Designations
- ADNR Boundary
- Sonning Common Parish Boundary

Old Copse Field SON 1
Designated as Local green space

North Hadden SON 2
Homes: 50
Status: Allocated site, subject to approval by Chilterns Conservation Board and contract to be signed by Linden Homes for SON 3 to transfer to Parish Council for recreation
Phase one build

Chilham Edge Top SON 15a
Homes: 37
Status: Reserve site, subject to DFC approval for sale of land
Phase: First reserve (if additional number of homes required by SHMA)

Kennylands Inlet SON 6
Homes: 26
Status: Allocated site
Agreement to be signed with Land agents
Phase one build

Kennylands Paddock SON 5
Homes: 20
Status: Possible reserve site
Developer: T. A. Fisher
Current application for 30 homes with SODC
NDP negotiating to remove part of the site in order to retain the settlement line and to prevent further development towards Reading.

Hagbita Orchard SON 2a
Homes: 5 (some self-build)
Status: Reserve site
Phase two build if required by SHMA numbers

Hagbita House SON 7
Homes: 25
Status: Reserve site
Phase two build if required by SHMA numbers

Kennylands Gm SON 8
Covered for sports and leisure use

Los Meslows SON 9
Homes: 60
Status: Allocated and deliverable site
Developer: Bosley Homes
Current application for 83 homes with SODC
NDP negotiating to reduce numbers - outcome unresolved
Phase one build

After many, many hours of work and consultation, the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Working Party has completed the plan. Sonning Common's plan will be on display at the village hall on the following days and times.

FRIDAY 6 FEBRUARY 2015
6 – 9pm

SATURDAY 7 FEBRUARY 2015
10 – 3pm

THURSDAY 5 MARCH 2015
6 – 8pm

If you are unable to view the plan at the above times and need to see a hard copy then it will be available in the NDP office on any Monday morning from 9 February 10.15 to 12 noon. Please phone the Parish Clerk to make an appointment - 0118 972 3611.

The plan will also be available on the website www.scnp-ndp.co.uk

Whether you view it at the hall or on the website, feedback (representations) forms will be available for you to complete and email, or post through the door at the village hall. Most importantly, on the website there

will be copies of all the back ground evidence and documentation compiled by the working party, residents and consultants that have informed the whole process. And the write up of the final plan.

If you wish to examine the background evidence and do not have a computer then you can do so at the Parish Office.

The formal consultation process will last for six weeks until **FRIDAY 30 MARCH 2015**.

After the six week consultation with residents the feedback (representations) forms from residents, neighbouring parish councils, landowners, SODC and statutory consultees will be examined and amendments made.

When this process is completed the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan will be presented to the Examiners.

Finally it will go to a referendum, possibly in September 2015. If more than 50% of the people who live in the Neighbourhood area vote YES then it will become a legal document.

The PLAN will change before it goes to referendum due to:

- Consultation feedback from residents
- SODC requirements
- Examiner amendments

15

Figure 4.4: Sonning Common Magazine article

Copy of email to residents 12 February 2015

Henley Standard – 20 February 2015

Public Consultation on the Pre-submission draft Plan

If you found time to visit the public exhibitions of the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan (SCNDP) in the village hall last weekend (6 & 7 February) we hope you found them interesting and informative.

If you were unable to attend there will be an additional exhibition of the draft Plan in the village hall on **Thursday 5 March from 1900 until 2130** when the SCNDP Working Party will be available to discuss the proposed Plan and answer questions.

The exhibitions on 6 & 7 February were attended by 319 residents and included many who hadn't previously attended an SCNDP meeting. The events were publicised in an email to residents, the Sonning Common Magazine, the Henley Standard, the NDP website, the village hall and on posters throughout the village.

Barrie Greenwood, Chairman of the SCNDP Working Party, said: "We thought the exhibitions went extremely well and attendance was high which was very rewarding. Thank you to all those residents who attended and who provided their feedback on the draft proposals."

"The reaction from residents was very positive and many commented on the quality of the display material. There was also clear appreciation for the effort which the Working Party had put into the draft Plan, and, indeed for all the effort during the past three years."

Please note: The public consultation on the draft Plan, which began on Friday 6 February, has been extended until **Friday 27 March 2015**.

The full document is on the website together with the Residents' Representation and Feedback Form (www.scpc-ndp.co.uk)

Hard copies of the draft Plan are available for reference at Sonning Common Library and the Parish Office in the village hall together with the feedback form. Phone the Parish Office on 0118 972 3616 or Email: ndp@sonningcommonparishcouncil.org.uk. See also parish notice boards for further information.

The SCNDP Working Party

Another plan day

A **THIRD** exhibition about the draft Sonning Common neighbourhood development plan will be held next month.

The document will be on display at the village hall on **March 5, from 6pm to 9pm.**

More than 300 people attended two exhibitions at the hall earlier this month.

A public consultation that began on February 6 has been extended and will now run until March 27.

Residents unable to attend the exhibition can still give their views. Copies of the plan are available at the village hall and library and at www.scpc-ndp.co.uk

Figure 4.6: Henley Standard

Figure 4.5: Email to residents

Appendix 4a: Pre-submission consultation publicity (2)

Henley Standard – 23 October 2015

Copy of email to residents 23 October 2015



Figure 4.7: Henley Standard article

Public Consultation on the revised Pre-submission Draft Plan

Thank you for your on-going interest in the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan (SCNDP).

Following comments made by residents and other interested parties in response to our first public consultation earlier this year the Draft Plan has been revised. This and all supporting documentation can be found on the website: www.scpc-ndp.co.uk

A new 6-week public consultation on the revised Draft Plan is now underway and we would welcome your feedback via the Residents' Representation and Feedback Form by **4 December 2015**.

To view the revised Draft Plan and to complete the form, please follow the links below:

[Draft Plan: parts 1-3](#)

[Draft Plan: parts 4-5](#)

Feedback form: [NDP FEEDBACK FORM](#)

Hard copies of the revised Draft Plan and the Residents' Representation and Feedback Form are also available in the Parish Office in the Village Hall, Wood Lane, Sonning Common 0118 972 3616 and Sonning Common Library, Grove Road, during normal opening hours.

Please note that any comments you submitted previously on the original Draft Plan (February 2015) have been collated in preparation for sending to the Independent Examiner.

Barrie Greenwood
Chairman, Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan

Figure 4.8: Email to residents

Poster circulated around village

Sonning Common Magazine – Dec/Jan 2016



**New Public Consultation on the draft
Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan**

The draft Plan has been rewritten in light of comments made by residents, consultees and stakeholders in response to our first public consultation earlier this year. It is supported by the Scoping Report, Environmental Report and Basic Conditions Report.

This new public consultation on the revised Draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan (SCNDP) closes

Friday 4 December 2015

View the revised draft Plan and supporting documents

- www.scpc-ndp.co.uk
- The Parish Office in the village hall. Phone: 0118 972 3616
Email: ndp@sonningcommonparishcouncil.org.uk
- Sonning Common Library, Grove Road

Copies of the Residents' Representation and Feedback form are available at each of these locations.

Please take this opportunity to respond to this new consultation on the revised Draft Plan. If agreed, The Plan will direct the future development of our village from 2017 until 2027.

SCNDP Working Party
23 October 2015

Figure 4.9: Poster

THIS HAS TO BE THE FINAL STAGE OF THE NDP!

Our written Draft Plan and its supporting documents is nearing the end of its pre-submission consultation period. The closing date is Friday 4 December. There is still time to send us your comments either online at www.scpc-ndp.co.uk or on a feedback form available both of the Parish Office and the Library.

During November we have been adding the comments received about the Draft Plan to our Consultation Statement. This is a record of all the consultations we have had from start to finish of the Plan and any action which has resulted from them. In addition replies have gone to statutory consultees, landowners/developers and other stakeholders and are recorded on our Consultation Statement. Any relevant 'tweaks' to the Plan resulting from these comments will be made prior to presenting it to SODC for submission consultation with them, a further period of 6 weeks which will take us into January 2016.

The last stage of the process will be to present the Plan to an independent Examiner selected by us from a short list of three potential examiners given to us by SODC. The examination will happen sometime in late February or early March 2016.

We expect that we will be taking the Plan forward for Examination more or less in its current form. We have

worked very hard on the Plan and its supporting documents and will not be deflected from our timetable. It will go forward come what may.

There have been a series of successful appeals for housing developments in various areas of South Oxon, despite having been strongly opposed by residents, Parish and District Councils. It is evident that the only vehicle for local opinion and views about development in our Parishes to be upheld is by an active NDP. SODC's Core Strategy has not been able to defend unwanted or unallocated development of 150 homes in Benson, 100 and 80 homes on two sites in Chinnor or the 120 homes at Thomas Farm. None of these areas were protected by an NDP, which was pointed out by the Inspector who upheld the appeal by developers in Chinnor. **No Plan no protection.**

When our Plan goes to Examination it will have 'strength' to resist an appeal for unwanted development. Once it has been voted in by you at Referendum it will give Localism teeth and you through the Plan control over what happens in our village.

We need your support more than ever to set the development agenda for Sonning Common. 🗳️

Boris Greenwood
bgreenwood@hotmail.com

Figure 4.10: Sonning Common Magazine article

Appendix 5: Residents' Representation and Feedback Form (1)



SCNDP SONNING COMMON
NEIGHBOURHOOD
DEVELOPMENT PLAN

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT PLAN
Residents' Representation and Feedback Form

Name:

Postcode:

Email address:

(Sonning Common Parish Council is aware of under the Data Protection Act. Your data will be used only for consultation on the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan.)

The public exhibitions of the plan in the village hall, Sonning Common, on Friday 6 and Saturday 7 February 2015 start a six-week consultation with residents who live in and around our designated plan area.

Please complete this form to ensure that your views can be taken into account in helping to shape Sonning Common's Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is very important that you return your full or partial comments to us **by Friday 27 March**.

Guidance on completing the form:

- Please tick boxes and make your comments in the spaces provided
- A comments box is provided at the end of the form for your general/overall view of the draft plan
- Please remember to record your personal details on the front of the form

The form should be returned:

- At the public exhibitions
- To the Parish Office, Village Hall, Wood Lane
- To the Parish Office letter box (Village Hall front door, right-hand side)
- Electronically via our website: www.scndp.co.uk
- Email to: info@sonningcommonparishcouncil.org.uk

G.B. Greenwood

Barris Greenwood, Chairman, SCNDP Working Party

It is very important that you return your full or partial comments by Friday 27 March

Residents' Representation and Feedback Form

Please tick the appropriate responses to the following questions:

PART ONE: Setting the Scene

Q1. Do you broadly agree with the Setting the Scene proposals?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

PART TWO: Overall Process

Q2. Do you broadly agree with the overall process that has been followed?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

PART THREE: Policies

Q3. Do you think the proposed Policies are about right for Sonning Common?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Q4. PART FOUR: Sites and Allocations

In considering this section it is important to understand that at least 138 new homes have been allocated to Sonning Common. The SCNDP is proposing development of the following sites.

Allocated Sites	Decision	Do you support these allocations?				
		Strongly agree	Agree	No strong views	Disagree	Strongly disagree
SON 2/3	a. Housing					
Bishopswood Middle Field	b. 52 homes					
Memorial Hall Field	c. Recreation					
SON 6	d. Housing					
Kennylands Infill	e. 26 homes					
SON 9	f. Housing					
Lea Meadow	g. 60 homes					

It is very important that you return your full or partial comments by Friday 27 March

Residents' Representation and Feedback Form (1)

The following are Reserve Sites. This means that if an allocated site (above) within the Plan drops out then one or more of the reserve sites will replace it.

Reserve Sites	Decision	Do you support these decisions?				
		Strongly agree	Agree	No strong views	Disagree	Strongly disagree
SON15a Chiltern Edge Top	a. Housing					
	i. 37 homes					
SON7/7a Haglets House and Haglets Orchard	j. Housing					
	k. 25 homes					
	l. Housing					
	m. 5 homes					

SON5 (Kennylands Faddock) is a possible Reserve Site.

Possible Reserve Site	Decision	Do you support this decision?				
		Strongly agree	Agree	No strong views	Disagree	Strongly disagree
SON5 Kennylands Faddock	n. Housing					
	o. 30 homes					

PART FIVE: Delivery
Q5 Do you think the proposed delivery strategy is appropriate for Sonning Common?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Public Consultation
Q6 Do you agree that residents have been consulted well during the NDP-planning process?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

It is very important that you return your full or partial comments by Friday 27 March

Meeting Needs
Q7 Given Sonning Common's legal requirement to accept new housing, do you think the draft plan meets our obligations and reflects our needs?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Distribution of Housing
Q8 Are you in favour of the overall distribution of new homes?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Overall view
Q9 Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Thank you for your time


Signature: _____ Date: _____

The public consultation will run until **Friday 27 March**. During this period copies of Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan (SCNDP) plus the residents' representation and feedback form will be available for inspection at:

- The SCNDP website: www.scs-ndp.co.uk
Email: ndp@sonningcommonparishcouncil.org.uk
- The Parish Office, Village Hall, Wood Lane, Phone: 0128 972 3616. (The office is open to the public on Mondays from 1030 – 1230 and at other times by previous appointment). Sonning Common Library, in Grove Road, during normal opening times.

It is very important that you return your full or partial comments by Friday 27 March

Appendix 5a: Residents' Representation and Feedback Form (2)



PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT PLAN
Residents' Representation and Feedback Form

Name:

Postcode:

Email address:
(Sonning Common Parish Council is registered under the Data Protection Act. Your data will be used only for consultation on the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan).

The Draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan (SCNDP) has been revised to reflect the comments made by consultees, stakeholders and residents, who live in and around our designated plan area, during the first round of consultation earlier this year.

We are now entering a second six-week long period of consultation.

Please complete this form so that we can assess how well we have responded to your comments. The questions we ask are related to the significant changes we have made to the Plan.

Guidance on completing the form:

- Please tick boxes and make your comments in the spaces provided
- A comments box is provided at the end of the form for your general/overall view of the draft plan
- Please remember to record your personal details on the front of the form.

The form should be returned by **04 December 2015** to the Parish Office letter box (Village Hall front door, right-hand side) Alternatively, you can download a copy from our website: www.scp-c-ndp.co.uk and return it by email to: ndp@sonningcommonparishcouncil.org.uk

Barrie Greenwood

Barrie Greenwood, Chairman, SCNDP Working Party

RESIDENTS' REPRESENTATION AND FEEDBACK FORM

Please tick the appropriate responses to the following questions about the revised Plan and make your comments in the boxes below:

POLICIES:
 There have been some changes in wording to many of the policies. For example, policies DS1, H1 and H3. Some policies have been removed.

Q1. Do you think the revised Policies are now about right for Sonning Common?
 Yes ☐ No ☐

Q2. What are your views on the changes? Do they now meet the community's requirements?
 Comments:

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DESIGNATIONS:
 In considering this section it is important to understand that although a minimum of 138 new homes have been allocated to Sonning Common the Plan is making provision for up to 195 new homes. This is to accommodate the extra homes to come from the SHMA (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) recommendation – an expected 50 to 60 new homes. Therefore, the Draft SCNDP is proposing the development of the following sites. **The changes and additions to our sites and homes' allocations are marked with an asterisk*.**

Q3. Do you support these allocations?

Allocated Sites	Decision	Strongly agree	Agree	No strong views	Disagree	Strongly disagree
SON 2/3	Housing					
Bishopswood						
Middle Field	50 homes					
Memorial Hall Field	Recreation					
SON 15a	Housing					
*Chiltern Edge Top	37 homes					
SON 5	Housing					
*Kennylands Paddock	Up to 22 homes					
SON 6	Housing					
Kennylands Infill	26 homes					
SON 9	Housing					
Lea Meadow	60 homes					

Residents' Representation and Feedback Form (2)

The following are **Reserve Sites**. This means that if an allocated site (above) within the Plan drops out then one or more of the reserve sites will replace it.

Reserve Sites	Decision	Do you support these decisions?				
		Strongly agree	Agree	No strong views	Disagree	Strongly disagree
SON 7	Housing					
Hagpits House	25 homes					
SON7a	Housing					
Hagpits Orchard	5 homes					
SON 8	Housing					
*Gymnasium Phase 1	4 homes					
Phase 2	10 homes					

Comments:

DELIVERY:
Q4. Do you think the proposed delivery strategy and planning policies are what is required for Sonning Common?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

OVERALL VIEW:

We would like to measure your level of satisfaction with the revised Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Overall satisfaction with the Plan

Very satisfied	Satisfied	No strong view	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied

Comments:

Thank you for your time

Signature: Date:

Copies of the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan (SCNDP) plus the residents' representation and feedback form will be available for inspection at:

- The SCNDP website: www.scpnc-ndp.co.uk
Email: ndp@sonningcommonparishcouncil.org.uk
- The Parish Office, Village Hall, Wood Lane. Phone: 0118 972 3616. (The office is open to the public on Mondays from 1030 – 1230 and at other times by previous appointment); Sonning Common Library, in Grove Road, during normal opening times.

Appendix 6: Comments - residents

Collation

Each completed Residents' Representation and Feedback Form (Appendix 5) was given a unique number and logged. Where family members completed forms individually these were treated as separate submissions even if the comments were identical.

Following substantial revisions to the February 2015 Pre-submission draft Plan, a 6 week public consultation period commenced 23 October 2015 for consideration of the rewritten Plan.

A second Residents' Representation and Feedback Form was therefore required to reflect the changes (Appendix 5a). The registering and recording of responses mirrored that adopted in respect of the first draft Plan.

To differentiate the responses to the two draft Pre-submission Plans, Appendix 6a includes comments received with regard to the first draft and Appendix 6b in respect of the second draft.

Plan response

NAN No amendment necessary

- Many comments indicate agreement with Plan proposals or statements, while some reflect upon its progress. As such no amendment is needed to the Plan and these are marked NAN

NAN/OSP No amendment necessary and outside scope of Plan

- Comments falling outside the remit of a neighbourhood plan such as dealing with the poor maintenance of the roads or the increase in backland/infill development, are marked NAN/OSP

AN Amendment necessary

- Where comments relate to potential changes in the Plan or changes already implemented, these are marked AN

Appendix 6a: Public consultation (1)

Question 1 – Do you broadly agree with the Setting the Scene proposals?

Yes	No
236	6
98%	2%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
839	However, you/we have lost the opportunity to create a better village centre by allowing back fill - the centre will become increasingly congested - it is badly so now, the bus has trouble getting through many times.	NAN/OSP – backland/infill development is outside the remit of NDP.
674	Peppard Common and Rotherfield Peppard should share the load.	NAN
753	But if things change would like to discuss.	NAN
376	Very grateful for what has obviously been a mammoth effort.	NAN
468	I particularly agree with the strengths/issues as shown in Table 1.6 - a very good summary. 78% response to the original community survey is huge and the top priorities derived <u>must</u> be addressed.	NAN
455	Only comment is to iterate my view that Sonning Common needs to have a NDP.	NAN
676	We do not need any more houses built.	NAN
437	But it is noteworthy that no detailed traffic studies have been done so potential impact on Reade's Lane/Kennylands Rd and rat runs between not sufficiently considered.	NAN/OSP – funding not available. OCC makes final decision.
436	<u>No detailed information on traffic</u> through Reade's Lane; Kennylands Road and Baskerville Road. This will impact an already over used traffic system; particularly village centre and local schools.	NAN/OSP – part mitigation proposed in SON 2/3 site Policy HS1.
424	A lot of hard work done by the Parish Council.	NAN
397	Excellent preparatory work and comprehensive basis of the whole Development Plan.	NAN
483	Very detailed and well explained.	NAN
513	I don't think the consultation process gave enough voice to residents. Housing stock design was based on comparing local area to the UK average which is a misguided comparison. SON 15 should not be considered as the owners do not have permission to sell it, unlike every other area.	NAN – incorrect. The housing mix closely referenced South Oxfordshire and the ORCC survey conclusions. SON 15 included as allocated site on SODC advice.
681	Not all.	NAN
569	We have to have new housing. This seems to be the way to have the greatest amount of control over the process.	NAN
685	A very detailed proposal with a lot of information. It would be helpful for all Parts (1-5) to be distributed to households.	NAN
762	I thought this was very thorough. No view of services that residents need to get from outside the Parish e.g. recreation, cemetery.	NAN

Question 1 - Do you broadly agree with the Setting the Scene proposals?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
76	Sonning Common needs and will have to have new housing this plan seems to accept this.	NAN
287	Seems well thought through. Has taken views of locals on board.	NAN
722	Fight every development and only accept the minimum.	NAN
149	Essential that all new housing has ample parking space.	NAN
675	Very well set.	NAN
224	An immense amount of effort and work. Very coherent proposals.	NAN
301	About right. Small housing development should be the aim. Ecological (AONB etc.), recreational, transport and business all need to be taken into consideration.	NAN
688	Very comprehensive and I agree with all.	NAN
19	Clear and good objectives.	NAN
772	Can't recall what the 'scene' is.	NAN
803	Mention is made of Kidmore End and Rotherfield Peppard Parishes being consulted but it is not clear how that authority is confirmed (i.e. statements from each to support the plan).	NAN – statement from KEPC; Memorandum of Understanding from RPPC.
5	1) The rural area is dominated by commercial farming. 2) Typing error on page 21. Sonning Common Garage has 3 sites not sires. 3) Insufficient emphasis on excellent services within the village, schools, health centre, dentist, shops and garage. 4) No mention of Crossrail and new Heathrow rail link coming to Reading within the period covered by the plan. These will have an impact on demand for housing.	AN – typing error corrected.
802	I think the NDP team have done a good job and I am very grateful for their hard work.	NAN
29	The development of SONs 2, 3 & 15a would be overkill for the residents of Reade's Lane. The top half of Reade's Lane would have development to the front and rear of their properties. A truly cramped situation completely ruling out the rural setting which in all honesty is the reason incomers have decided to make their homes here. In addition the increase in traffic from the development combined with the existing traffic particularly during rush hours and Chiltern Edge School traffic would turn Reade's Lane into a very busy thoroughfare. I would also remind you that two of the areas are Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	NAN
659	Whilst I broadly agree with the proposals the most urgent building work should be the village infrastructure. Parking outside the village hall which will now be made worse by the ATM being sited in the village hall.	NAN
425	More bungalows for elderly would release bigger houses for families.	NAN
523	This was an interesting overview. I had provided feedback earlier in the process and I recognise in your report how local people feel about the village. It is good to see how many jobs there are. I guess one thing that I am concerned about is the government's lack of investment in education facilities in South Oxfordshire and Reading and our schools are already under pressure, which more homes may make worse.	NAN
634	A very informative and well balanced review of the village. The content could be used to enhance our Wikipedia entry.	NAN

Question 1 - Do you broadly agree with the Setting the Scene proposals?

Response	Comment	Plan response
737	I agree that parking is a major issue in Sonning Common. The 32 spaces in the public car park behind the village hall are insufficient for the present population and visitors from surrounding villages. A Pay and Display system would be fairer to prevent persons parking and catching the bus. Shoppers could be given 30 minutes free parking. The Health Centre and Dentist's car park is often full at peak times and cars have to park in residential roads. More house building will only make the problem worse. I hope that this issue will be confronted soon and SODC asked for financial assistance.	NAN – all the SHLAA sites are 'greenfield' sites; no 'brownfield' sites put forward by owners.
64	The document sets the scene very clearly. Although I personally do not agree with building new homes on 'greenfield' sites, when there are many brownfield sites in need of renewal. I accept it is inevitable and commend the team on the job they have done on explaining the options. I note that the reference to the 'considerable number of trees...' and associated image on page 22 has recently been impacted by the destruction (to make way for large homes) of the wild area behind the Occasions Precinct.	NAN – all the SHLAA sites are 'greenfield' sites; no 'brownfield' sites put forward by owners to SODC.
423	Yes although I am surprised that lack of good public transport links to Reading and Henley is not highlighted as a weakness. Sonning Common could attract more families and be more 'green' if there was a more realistic ability to leave the car at home and commute to work and leisure activities nearby by bus. This means more transport options later in the evenings and at weekends.	NAN
430	A good overview of the village situation.	NAN

Question 2 - Do you broadly agree with the overall process that has been followed?

Yes	No
237	4
98%	2%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
839	Not sure about offices etc - we have competition from Reading.	NAN
303	Excellent.	NAN
674	Yes, though the dialogue between Parish Councils has taken too long to develop.	NAN
753	Sympathetically built in keeping with the village.	NAN
311	The bus service should be improved. There is no need for traffic calming on Kennylands Road, just enforcement of the 30mph speed limit.	NAN
455	Credit should go to the NDP team/working party who have put so much time, effort and good work into this process.	NAN
436	Overall agree; there should be more consideration for schools to be improved NOT by selling for housing but to develop existing buildings and encouraging local amenities.	NAN – decisions to sell rest with owners, not the NDP.
397	Extremely well researched - involving the community on all levels - communications at all stages have been clear and comprehensive. It seems the working group have dealt in great detail with overall clarity of purpose and objectives.	NAN
384	But great attention needs to be taken regarding parking, health facilities and schools. Parking at the moment is the main priority as the village is 'gridlocked' by inconsiderate parking.	NAN

Question 2 - Do you broadly agree with the overall process that has been followed?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
659	As above (Question 1).	NAN
488	Commendable and thorough.	NAN
513	I think the aims are correct but there has been a total lack of consistency in their execution. Areas have been ruled out based on certain criteria that hold true for other areas that remain included for example SON 5 =out SON 2/3 =In.	AN – SON 5 now an allocated site, previously reserve.
514	I think it is important to have an NDP in order to prevent over-zealous building companies from over-developing sites.	NAN
569	Very sensible proposals followed.	NAN
590	Ensure Southern boundary is adequately protected.	NAN
591	Please do not allow <u>any</u> development in the direction of Reading!	NAN
644	Not sure about the need for business development.	NAN
762	Should have incorporated adjacent Parishes more.	NAN – homes allocated to Sonning Common parish only by SODC.
764	Amazing. Such a lot of work and total commitment to detail and needs and is absolutely Sonning Common - centric.	NAN
264	I do not agree with an extension of the provision for business.	NAN
807	I do not think Sonning Common needs more business outlets.	NAN
722	It will go to appeal though and houses will be built unfortunately.	NAN
675	Yes all good.	NAN
224	Long term development and sustainability are carefully considered. Pleased to see thought given to jobs and business development in keeping with size and needs to community.	NAN
88	Houses should be shared over more areas in Sonning Common.	NAN
207	Very comprehensive and inclusive.	NAN
208	Process very thorough and inclusive.	NAN
778	Lea Meadow = too many houses for the size of the area. Parking= Not enough parking in the village for doc-dentist-shops.	NAN
326	Such amazing attention to detail. Nothing has been overlooked.	NAN
499	I strongly agree that our village should have a more even mix of housing, and that the village centre should suffer less from congestion. The appropriate landscaping and tree planting to maintain the woodland character and rural feel should apply to business developments as well as to housing developments.	NAN
500	I strongly agree that our village should have a more even mix of housing, and that the village centre should suffer less from congestion. The appropriate landscaping and tree planting to maintain the woodland character and rural feel should apply to business developments as well as to housing developments.	NAN
560	Lots of public consultation - clear exhibitions.	
561	Views from individual residents have been pooled to reflect the community view in most areas and issues.	NAN
754	See comments below (As the 'Policy' (i.e.) you must build x number of houses is enforceable those who have drawn up the plan have done more than could have been asked of them.)	NAN

Question 2 - Do you broadly agree with the overall process that has been followed?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
15	It would be beneficial to construct a dedicated cycle way - with physical separation - on the road through the village and into Emmer Green.	NAN/OSP – responsibility of OCC (and possibly Reading).
19	Excellent.	NAN
23	Generally, I agree - in particular I strongly support the Environmental objectives SCENV1 - SCENV3. However, I have concerns about increasing car parking in the village centre SCMRP3. This seems to me to conflict with a desire to support retaining the bus route (village centre already packed with cars.) Many of us already drive to Emmer Green to shop because our village is <u>too</u> busy.	NAN
803	Why is SON 5 not included in list other than as a possible reserve? In encouraging preferential access to new homes for those with strong local connections whilst this is superficially a reasonable aim it is only thus if the definition of 'strong' in this context is defined (as policy H5) and enforceable.	AN – SON 5 now an allocated site, previously reserve.
5	The vision should include the continuation of commercial agriculture in the surrounding area as essential to the rural feel. SON 5 should be included for development not put on the reserve list. No mention made of increased provision of accommodation with care for the elderly.	AN – SON 5 now an allocated site, previously reserve. AN – Extra-care housing being considered for SON 7 (reserve), see also Policy H2b.
802	The series of public consultations have been helpful to understand the potential impact of the scheme and what the options are. The various articles in the Sonning Common magazine have also been helpful in setting the scene.	NAN
29	As per my comments at Part one too much development in our area. The development should be shared/spread to other ends of the village. I would add however had Chiltern Edge School not jumped on our plan by the dubious transferring of Kidmore Parish land to Sonning Common Parish, we the residents of Reade's Lane would have taken a more sympathetic view over SONs 2 & 3.	NAN
359	I commend the SCNDP working party for their very professional and thorough approach to this huge endeavour. The government made it necessary for the NDP to be developed and the residents of Sonning Common have participated as fully as we could in the development of the SCNDP. It is therefore vital that the SODC and the developers/planners seriously consider and incorporate as much of the comments and suggestions made within it. It must not and cannot be simply brushed aside and ignored in favour of profit.	NAN
631	With the exception of Park & Ride being raised at this very late stage	AN – 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn.
181	I think that the plan has been very carefully and thoughtfully prepared.	NAN
634	It would be difficult to argue against any of the objectives, but there are linkages between the objectives, whereby the fulfilling of one might make the achievement of another difficult. For example, an over focus on village centre development could prevent a more dispersed approach to facilities which might be better suited to minimising central congestion.	NAN – Plan is not proposing additional village centre development but recognises importance of its continued sustainability.
737	Publicity has been good and the display of the Draft Plan in the Village Hall was effective. It was interesting to note that when I attended the display most of the attendees seemed to be Senior Citizens. I hope that young people and families will get involved with the process because they will benefit in the long run. If 40% of all the houses built are to be affordable it is the young families who will be able to get on the property ladder and stay in the area.	NAN

Question 2 - Do you broadly agree with the overall process that has been followed?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
64	I think an evidence based and transparent strategy has been followed.	NAN
423	The NDP team should be praised for the enormous amount of hard work that has gone into the process.	NAN
430	I am aware of the prodigious amount of time and effort which was required to produce the vision, objectives and development statement. However, it is my feeling that some compromise will be required and that not all of the guiding principles for land use will be fully achieved.	NAN

Question 3 – Do you think the proposed Policies are about right for Sonning Common?

Yes	No
211	17
93%	7%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
303	Completely right.	NAN
781	I was impressed and pleased to see an overall plan including transport, traffic, parking, business recreation and not just housing needs.	NAN
329	It is vital that the feel of the village is not destroyed. Sonning Common must not become a housing estate.	NAN
331	It is vital that developers 106 contributions come back to improve <u>our</u> village facilities and not to more general 'South Oxfordshire' improvements.	AN – see revised Policy DE2.
311	I'm not in favour of traffic calming on Kennylands Road or the B481 - just enforce the current speed limits.	NAN
468	Very pleased to see the emphasis on diverse housing mix, amenity green space and supporting our village centre.	NAN
437	Several residential roads are already restricted by parked cars. Far worse however is the parking of commercial vehicles on these roads. There should be a policy prohibiting the parking of commercial vehicles on residential streets.	NAN/OSP – responsibilities of OCC and the Police.
436	Too many commercial vehicles parked on main roads, Kennylands and residential roads; these have increased in the last 5 years. These need to be addressed as more will come with the increase in housing.	NAN
397	Smaller developments that meet our identified needs continue to support the historical character of the village. The attention paid to infrastructure services provision, access etc. is spot on.	NAN
659	The above should be carried out first to allow free movement of traffic through village high street.	NAN
843	In my view more land should be released for self build.	NAN
513	The policies are broadly correct but have been poorly and inconsistently executed. See above points. (Q2)	AN – see response to Q2 above.
533	Too many new homes planned.	NAN
569	We need to oppose larger dense builds.	NAN
590	See 2 above (Ensure Southern boundary is adequately protected.)	NAN
623	Proposals are excellent - they reflect the desire of residents for a community which retains its rural nature, but at the same time has a controlled coherent development strategy which aims to produce a sustainable vibrant community.	NAN

Question 3 – Do you think the proposed Policies are about right for Sonning Common?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
762	Good portfolio and policies.	NAN
58	See comments under overall view on traffic in Kennylands Road and overcrowding of village centre.	NAN
76	As above. Sonning Common needs and will have to have new housing this plan seems to accept this.	NAN
45	Stick to smaller developments.	NAN
128	Parking and transport to the village centre remain concerns that need careful attention.	NAN
125	Well informed.	NAN
287	It would give Sonning Common much needed housing, especially smaller properties for younger people. Also, the plans for sports facilities on SON 3 look great.	NAN
282	Very appropriate.	NAN
807	With reservations above the additional business proposals.	NAN
221	Given that we seem to have no choice about extra housing.	NAN
88	This is one of the last villages left in this area and should be protected as such.	NAN
208	I think that bearing in mind we have to accept we are obliged to provide more houses. The proposals are the best we can hope for.	NAN
210	But still strongly object to SON 15a as a reserve. Too many houses up Reade's Lane end. Too many cars will cause major congestion in and around the village, more road accidents putting Chiltern Edge school children at risk.	AN - SON 15a now an allocated site on advice from SODC.
211	My main concern is that there will be too much concentration of houses in and around Reade's Lane. This means that more traffic will have to pass through the village centre. Chiltern Edge school children will be put at extra risk too from vehicle pollution, road traffic accidents involving pupils, noise pollution et al.	NAN – site Policy HS1, SON 2/3, proposes parking facilities to be shared with Chiltern Edge School.
710	The policy for transport and traffic is totally inadequate. Sonning Common roads their condition and width will have to change. Can't see Oxford doing anything about it as they have totally ignored SC for years.	NAN/OSP – remains the responsibility of OCC.
171	Still feel 138 houses is too many!	NAN
182	A real emphasis should be placed on pedestrian and cycle movement in and around the village - footpaths are the communities' best amenity. The one via Burr Wood has been arbitrarily taken from us.	NAN
195	I strongly disagree with any type of 'park and ride' link to Reading. I believe it will promote perceived links to the town and increase likelihood of 3rd bridge. I am not convinced that it would alleviate parking problems in the village centre.	AN - 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn.
837	I do not believe that a park and ride would solve problems of people parking in the village. It will increase links to Reading and therefore I am strongly against it - whether it uses the 25 or a designated bus.	AN - 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn.
290	Not sure about this regards infrastructure.	NAN
326	OCC policies: I understand that the houses have to go somewhere but this number does seem high. NDP policies spot on.	NAN
499	Please see attached sheet (letter).	NAN
500	Please see attached sheet (letter).	NAN
560	Agree SC wishes to retain its ID as a VILLAGE.	NAN
561	Residents of Sonning Common want to keep their own identity by having green space between settlements but still welcome individuals to share our services.	NAN
754	As the 'Policy' (i.e.) you must build x number of houses is enforceable those who have drawn up the plan have done more than could have been asked of them.	NAN

Question 3 – Do you think the proposed Policies are about right for Sonning Common?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
755	Are the proposed policies that 138 new houses are forced on Sonning Common? Am obviously concerned about developing rural communities and altering them forever.	NAN
797f	See attached sheet (letter)	NAN
688	Park and ride would ease parking in the village centre. SON 1 acquisition very important. Traffic control/calming essential.	AN - 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn following strong opposition from residents.
15	I feel the addition of 'starter' homes will re-vitalise the village.	NAN
810	With even more houses - more cars - more children going to school, more shops - we must improve access roads for pedestrians and cycles - cycle paths needed between SC and Gallowstree Common and SC and Emmer Green - I think this should be integral to the plan and that any development should be contingent on this before agreed and funded by developers and/or SODC.	NAN/OSP – such prescriptive proposals/conditions are not permitted within the scope of an NDP.
19	Keep building density down (Lea Meadow) and quality up is a priority.	NAN
23	I reiterate my comments/concerns above. In addition we must have road surface improvement. Has the council decided to no longer adopt the roads in the village?	NAN/OSP – road surface improvement is ultimately the responsibility of OCC.
253	VC2b - proposal for park and ride into Reading? Is this justified? No site identified? Impact on the village will be very significant. Strongly disagree with SCH5 - you can't give priority to local buyers in a free market. SCEE1 - no mention of improved digital infrastructure - fibre optic broadband & mobile phone reception.	AN – 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn. AN – moved from policy to recommendation, see Policy H4. AN – see Policy EE2.
267	More than 138 – no.	NAN
772	The traffic is getting to be an increasing problem. The infrastructure needs to be higher up the agenda.	NAN
803	Refer to attached sheet for comments.	NAN
16	It is said that schools, health centre and dentist have contingency plans to deal with additional population. We have concerns re the Health Centre which is already at full stretch, has car parking problems on a site which is very restricted. They give us, as pensioners, excellent service.	NAN
5	1) Some houses should be permitted with 5 or more bedrooms. 2) Table 3.2 does not state the figures are % ages. 3) The wording in the green box re policy H2a on affordable housing is not clear. 4) Page 53. I agree more local employment is desirable. 5) Page 69. A better bus service to Henley on Thames should be added plus the feasibility of a direct service to Oxford should be investigated. 6) Does the designation of the central area mean there will be pressure to change the use of the residential dwellings located in the area?	1. NAN – priority is to satisfy need for smaller properties. 2. AN – table (s) amended. 3. NAN 4. NAN 5. NAN/OSP – post referendum, residents will be approached to form a special task group to investigate such matters with SCPC. 6. NAN – no.

Question 3 – Do you think the proposed Policies are about right for Sonning Common?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
802	While few people wish the village to change, it is better to have a managed approach. I agree with the majority of the policies. However, I feel the provision of a park and ride site is misguided. Even assuming we can persuade people to give up their cars it is likely to result in even more traffic chaos and further urbanisation of the village. The provision of additional sports facilities is long overdue and, in line with that at Gillotts, should not only benefit Chiltern Edge school but also the wider community. I do have a reservation as to the impact of an increasing population on the health services within the village and also the ability of the village to extract funding from the developers to make sure the potential benefits to the community are realised rather than just lining the pockets of the developers.	AN – 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn. AN – Policy DE2 covers s106 contributions.
29	Once again as per my comments at part one. I would like to state however that because there are less residents in Reade's Lane to defend their space, selection of sites should be made on the suitability of the location and not on how many voices are heard.	NAN
126	IT COULD BE WORSE. The car parking in the village is a big problem and losing the bus route would be also a cause for great concern. The cars that are parked in Wood Lane that appear at the beginning of the day and left until the owner returns later seem to be caused by people using the village as a car park for those on route to Reading. The number of 'Rat Runs' through Sonning Common is increasing along with the speed of vehicles. The policing of these problems is VERY POOR.	NAN
235	Policy D1d includes 'innovation to achieve low carbon sustainable design'. I hope that this consideration extends to the orientation of the proposed houses. 'South facing' houses use less energy. Also the species of any trees planted to the south side of the houses needs to be carefully selected to that they do not grow to a height that will shade the houses in later years.	NAN – see Design Brief guidelines within individual site policies.
659	No, unless the above is carried out i.e. (Whilst I broadly agree with the proposals the most urgent building work should be the village infrastructure. Parking outside the village hall which will now be made worse by the ATM being sited in the village hall.)	NAN
401	However, I remain very concerned about the impact on traffic flow through the village centre and furthermore I am doubtful that the parking issue will ever be resolved given the infill building taking place.	NAN
776	I am not convinced of the need to reduce the current 40mph limit (Herb Farm area).	NAN
181	They have tried hard to balance all the complex needs of the community.	NAN
206	However, I do not agree that Park and Ride facilities should be provided anywhere near the village.	AN – 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn.
634	In the light of the historical development of settlements, the 'settlement boundary' looks somewhat optimistic. The possibility of using land outside the SB for car parks or business use might have to be considered.	AN – settlement boundary removed and replaced with 'Gaps between villages', Policy DS1.
737	The suggested Park and Ride scheme is worthwhile but would need to be Pay and Display to avoid abuse of free parking. Again I feel the parking problems should be at the front of the agenda otherwise the businesses in the centre of the village could be badly affected when residents and visitors take their custom elsewhere. These concerns should be at the centre of any immediate solution.	AN – 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn.
64	I strongly support the vast majority of Policies.	NAN

Question 4 – Site Allocations and designations

In considering this section it is important to understand that at least 138 new homes have been allocated to Sonning Common. The draft SCNDP is proposing development of the following sites.

Q4: Site Allocation and designations											
Do you support these allocations?											
Number of responses: 220 – 236 of 253											
Allocated Sites	Decision	Strongly agree		Agree		No strong views		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
SON 2/3 Bishopswood Middle Field	a. Housing	70	32%	119	54%	17	8%	9	4%	7	3%
	b. 52 homes	62	27%	119	51%	29	13%	12	5%	10	4%
Memorial Hall Field	c. Recreation	115	49%	87	37%	27	11%	4	2%	3	1%
SON 6 Kennylands Infill	d. Housing	88	40%	97	44%	22	10%	7	3%	7	3%
	e. 26 homes	84	37%	105	46%	26	11%	6	3%	7	3%
SON 9 Lea Meadow	f. Housing	85	39%	109	50%	15	7%	8	4%	3	1%
	g. 60 homes	73	32%	100	44%	17	8%	28	12%	7	3%

Reserve Sites											
Do you support these decisions?											
No. of responses: 216-228 of 253											
Reserve Sites	Decision	Strongly agree		Agree		No strong views		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
SON 15a Chiltern Edge Top	h. Housing	52	24%	95	43%	32	14%	24	11%	18	8%
	i. 37 homes	50	22%	97	43%	41	18%	22	10%	18	8%
SON 7/7a Hagpits House and Hagpits Orchard	j. Housing	55	25%	102	46%	29	13%	22	10%	12	5%
	k. 25 homes	53	23%	96	42%	42	19%	22	10%	13	6%
Hagpits Orchard	l. Housing	50	23%	102	47%	30	14%	25	12%	9	4%
	m. 5 homes	52	23%	98	44%	42	19%	22	10%	10	4%

Possible reserve site											
Do you support this decision?											
No. of responses: 216-228 of 253											
Reserve Sites	Decision	Strongly agree		Agree		No strong views		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
SON 5 Kennylands Paddock	n. Housing	34	15%	63	28%	55	25%	37	17%	35	16%
	o. 20 homes	35	15%	63	28%	55	24%	38	17%	35	15%

Question 5 – Do you think the proposed delivery strategy is appropriate for Sonning Common?

Yes	No
203	18
92%	8%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
761	In general terms but without extra facilities (medical, commercial and schooling) have concerns.	NAN
312	Too many large estates planned. This will change the village. Smaller plots ought to be considered. 60 houses on one field is too many.	NAN
781	Concerning housing requirements, I feel there is a huge need for small 2 bed houses with a garage and garden for first time buyers or increasingly for mature residents to downsize to releasing existing family homes of 4/5 bedrooms.	NAN – see Table 3.5 on Housing mix.
674	A question, how much of the proposed housing will be suitable for those families with limited means? SCH2.	NAN – 40% affordable. See Policy H2a and Table 3.5.
437	Undecided.	NAN
436	Undecided.	NAN
683	138 houses will be another 200 cars. Viability of roads and Sonning Common parking is my only concern.	NAN
397	We recognise the nature of housing need and we must comply with government objectives. My personal opinion is that the strategy has been efficiently and effectively executed and no stone has been left unturned.	NAN
659	Not until the parking has been sorted out.	NAN
365	Prefer 15a to be second reserve and 7/7a first reserve.	AN – SON 15a now an allocated site on advice from SODC.
364	I would prefer SON 7/7a to be 1st reserve and SON 15a to be 2nd reserve.	AN – SON 15a now an allocated site on advice from SODC.
513	I agree with the distribution of 138 houses but if the allocation increases, which is likely, there will be far too much urbanisation of the north east of the village if SON 15a is used. It should also be excluded as the school does not have permission to sell the site.	NAN – 108 out of 195 homes on allocated sites, including potential SHMA, are to the south of the village.
514	Partly I think it is a mistake to urbanise the village in the planned proposals. The reasons for some sites being “favoured” over others are not true or consistent e.g. SON 5 versus SONs 3 and 15a.	AN – SON 5 now an allocated site, previously reserve
517	Let Down! I believe the local NDP committee have let the owners of Essex Way down if it is agreed that a footpath should border these properties. If you start from a position of 'not agreeing' you then can 'fight' from that position.	NAN
532	Apart from SONs 5 & 6.	NAN
681	Yes, but no planning to go through on delegated powers as a 48 bedroom extension to care home in Shiplake did.	NAN
812f	Much wider considerations need to be given to the village centre and the overall financing of the project as a whole.	NAN
569	These developments need to take place over a period of time.	NAN
623	It is <u>VERY</u> important that proposals from developers are <u>NOT</u> allowed to go forward until the Plan has been adopted formally. Once this has happened it is <u>critical</u> that approval for any development activity conforms with the Plan - or 4 years of residents' efforts will disappear down the drain.	NAN
762	In the period to 2026 SC will grow 10% (incl. infill) this is sufficient. Need to have high profile with developers on style/type of housing.	NAN

Question 5 – Do you think the proposed delivery strategy is appropriate for Sonning Common?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
58	Given the Government directive I do not think there is any alternative.	NAN
123	Much careful thought and consideration has been give to all aspects.	NAN
287	The proposed numbers seem reasonable, but I would object to a further increase of new homes.	NAN
807	It would be good to see houses being built.	NAN
664	Seems sensible.	NAN
177	If this site (SON 5) had to be used for building I would prefer bungalows - they would go like hotcakes (over 60's would probably leave - their 5 bed - bedroom homes and downsize!)	NAN
186	With regard to SON 15a. I strongly agree that this site be accommodated in the Plan if granted Dfe permission give the School's need for investment.	NAN
224	Yes, the strategy is very fair. I do hope SCPC will continue to consider new ways of tackling parking in the village and surrounds it is a growing problem for us all.	NAN
41	SON 9 and SON 5 would appear the most deliverable sites.	NAN
173	Too many houses planned overall.	NAN
174	Too many houses in SC as a total - it's a small town not a village but with <u>small village</u> amenities!	NAN
509	Far too much has been designated around Reade's Lane which is already a busy road even more so around school times.	NAN
665	It is very sad to have housing on AONB which is supposed to be protected.	NAN
88	I understand we need more houses but these plans are too many properties for a village.	NAN
208	Yes. We have to be realistic about what can be achieved.	NAN
440	I am not very clear that what the question means. My slight criticism (but it is also praise) is the depth and huge content of the consultation. I felt and heard other people voice the same opinion, that there was too much information to take in.	NAN
290	Yes, because we must accept extra homes, we have seen the knee jerk approval of new homes off Wood Lane. South Oxfordshire should be left in no doubt that they have made the acceptance of more homes more difficult by taking away the opportunity to revitalise the village centre to cope with additional homes and the traffic that will ensue, therefore no more than are proposed can be accepted. Where did the suggestion of the park and ride come from? ridiculous! I'm told it will not happen - let's hope some Whitehall Mandarin doesn't get hold of it - be careful what you wish for.	AN - 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn.
561	The seminars and display events have been well attended and extremely well run.	NAN
754	I am not sure if delivery strategy/policy is the same thing. Appropriate for Sonning Common? More housing on this scale will lead to more demands for example street lighting, traffic calming, traffic lights etc, all the trappings of urbanisation. If the residents of Sonning Common Village are happy with this scenario, then yes, the strategy is appropriate.	NAN
755	The SON 5 site is in the AONB and should definitely not be developed - it is the lung around the community; it should be retained at all costs for future generations. I understand this site and SON 4 site have been withdrawn??	NAN – incorrect. SON 5 is not in the AONB. Only SON 4 has been withdrawn by its owner.
15	The SON 2/3 site looks promising to develop. What form would the recreation area take? We should try very hard to preserve the space between SC and Emmer Green.	NAN
810	May I suggest that SON 9 has less houses and use SON 7 to spread out a little so less congestion.	NAN

Question 5 – Do you think the proposed delivery strategy is appropriate for Sonning Common?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
19	A vast amount of information given with a clear objective in sight.	NAN
267	138 houses? No its not its more but how many? The proposals should be based on Sonning Common/Peppard. Why is this not so? Infrastructure? Massive problems here Reade's Lane/Wood Lane/Parking/Bus routes etc.	NAN – the Plan allows for 195 homes on allocated sites which includes a 'guesstimate' for SHMA. SODC has ruled that the new homes allocation can only be provided by Sonning Common parish.
772	Sorry can't remember what this is. If it relates to the SON 2/3 type delineator, then yes. The order of execution seems fair.	NAN
663	Only if village centre traffic and parking sorted out.	NAN
16	The car parking situation needs to be dealt with early on - houses are already being built on sites which could have provided additional car parking. It will need MONEY!	NAN
5	In the previous section insufficient justification is given for the housing numbers. In general I believe more dense housing is desirable as a better use of land.	AN – explanation on densities provided in a grid in Part Two.
802	The delivery strategy appears to be the best in the current climate. With appropriate screening and thought to the layout of the roads and paths the visual impact to the village should be minimal. SON 5 should not be approved as it is a slippery slope towards becoming a suburb of Reading.	NAN
29	No please refer to my previous comments.	NAN
82	I will not support this overall plan because of the inclusion of the statement re park and ride. I cannot support the inclusion of the reserve sites at Hagpits because of the disruption during build of SON 6 and Hagpits and the impact of additional traffic to Kennylands Road.	AN - 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn. AN – see Policy HP1 covering traffic management.
401	However, I am very concerned about what has been going on with Lea Meadow and Bewley Homes. They almost seem to us residents to be running the show! It has been explained to us that SODC actually said that 47 was too few but PLEASE NO MORE THAN THE INCREASED 60. Otherwise it will mean that as residents we have wasted our time commenting on this site and supporting the work of the NDP.	NAN
634	The delivery strategy only relates to new homes. Even if there was no housing development, many of the objectives need activities to fulfil them. The delivery sections need a brief extension to cover non - housing development objectives.	NAN
737	Please see above comments regarding the parking problems which need to be addressed immediately.	NAN
64	Yes, but reluctantly, as I think the level of housing proposed is too high. I do not blame the SCNDP for this, but failed strategies of successive governments. Our objective should be to have a static population, in line with other Western countries, and to discourage the ownership of second homes.	NAN

Question 5 – Do you think the proposed delivery strategy is appropriate for Sonning Common?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
423	I think 60 homes on Lea Meadow is too many - 50 is a more sustainable and acceptable number for the site and surrounding area. The housing needs should be met by spreading the development out around the village and not try to put as much as possible in one place. It will create strain on infrastructure and be out of keeping with the residential areas nearby and the open countryside opposite.	NAN
202	Too many houses planned for village.	NAN
659	As previous comment (Whilst I broadly agree with the proposals the most urgent building work should be the village infrastructure. Parking outside the village hall which will now be made worse by the ATM being sited in the village hall.)	NAN

Question 6 – Do you agree that residents have been consulted well during the NDP planning process?

Yes	No
237	6
98%	2%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
303	Excellent consultation throughout.	NAN
674	Yes, good consultation.	NAN
329	Very good and we are well informed.	NAN
331	An excellent consultative process.	NAN
468	There has been more than ample opportunity not just to be kept informed but to be involved with the development of the plan. The working party have been faultless in their efforts to involve the whole community and reflect the majority view in the plan.	NAN
456	The NDP committee have done a fantastic job over the years! They have also shown local democracy at its best.	NAN
455	A very thorough and collaborative process. Local democracy at its best.	NAN
437	But, inevitably, there is limited public resource which means 'so-called' local opinions really comes down to the interested minority. This needs to be sufficiently large enough to be meaningful.	NAN
436	Limited public interest; therefore the minority views will be accepted.	NAN
424	Parish Council have worked hard.	NAN
670	They have used many ways of informing us as to what is going on. It has been well publicised.	NAN
683	No complaints.	NAN
397	Opportunity at all times in different ways during the whole process has been presented to the residents and responses/comments/questions or observations have been incorporated throughout the process. I would like to thank each member of the working party for their skill and dedication in the interests of our village. We are lucky to have you !!	NAN

Question 6 – Do you agree that residents have been consulted well during the NDP planning process?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
392	Possibly more consultation with Kidmore End residents and other outlying villages.	NAN – the two key neighbouring parish councils (KEPC and RPPC) were invited to nominate a representative to attend NDP Working Party meetings.
365	Every opportunity seems to have been given to local residents to know what is going on and to comment.	NAN
364	Exceptional effort by all concerned.	NAN
355	Very much so and I would like to express here appreciation of all the SCNDP team's efforts on the village's behalf. Thank you.	NAN
488	Very well given the pressures on you.	NAN
513	There have been a few chances to voice concerns or debate proposals. We as residents have been spoken at on a number of occasions but rarely had an opportunity to speak ourselves.	NAN
514	I feel that we have not had opportunities to talk or discuss any options during planning meetings. We have been talked AT not to at almost all occasions/meetings. The inclusion of SON 15a is an option that should not have been available. Not without the agreement of the Dfe. People have been misled by the inclusion of SON 15a.	NAN
713	Residents have been consulted but I don't see where residents have changed any decisions. This whole thing feels like it was fait accompli from day 1.	NAN
621	Very well consulted.	NAN
623	Communication with residents has been EXCELLENT. This is probably one of the most difficult aspects of the study to achieve success in - however, the Working Group has surpassed itself in exploring and employing every avenue to clearly communicate the issues and proposals to residents - and to incorporate their concerns and suggestions in the Plan.	NAN
762	Looks to have been sufficient.	NAN
76	I have attended two events prior to this.	NAN
838	Good amount of meetings held.	NAN
128	The meetings in the village hall have provided a good way to learn and exchange views.	NAN
123	I think that all concerned have worked very hard to ensure proper consultation.	NAN
282	Strongly agree.	NAN
281	Very good and thorough at every stage.	NAN
807	It seems to have slowed things down.	NAN
722	It won't help though!	NAN
221	Very well. Thank you!	NAN
768	Yes we have been well consulted, however, I do not agree with certain developers being able to rush/push through their plans and ignoring the consultancy process and its decisions.	NAN
87	Highly organised and well explained campaign over many months.	NAN
118	Yes, it has been very thorough and residents have been given plenty of opportunities to be involved.	NAN

Question 6 – Do you agree that residents have been consulted well during the NDP planning process?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
119	Lots of meetings and displayed well. Team available to discuss questions.	NAN
664	Lots of opportunities.	NAN
700	Extremely competent consultation and an enormous amount of work! Well done.	NAN
179	There is no doubt a huge amount of effort has gone into producing the Draft Plan.	NAN
224	Well advertised and very high attendance at meetings.	NAN
41	The NDP has done a comprehensive job of informing and involving the residents.	NAN
301	There have been sufficient opportunities and advertising of the Plan to ensure residents know what is happening.	NAN
565	I agree that residents have been consulted well! Barrie and team have done a brilliant job. A big thank you.	NAN
665	Very impressive in attempting to involve the people of the village.	NAN
88	But I feel it will all be in vain.	NAN
152	Anyone who wants to comment has had plenty of opportunities to do so.	NAN
207	Residents have been well informed throughout.	NAN
208	First class consultation process. Congratulations to the NDP Working Party.	NAN
440	I think that the NDP team has gone to great lengths to involve residents with very visible advertising, banner, road signs and copy in the magazine.	NAN
756	I think SCNDP have done a fantastic job.	NAN
171	See enclosed letter.	NAN
182	An excellent process and a great amount of work by all.	NAN
326	They could not have been consulted more openly or professionally than they have been.	NAN
747	Comprehensive display.	NAN
721	Excellent display - far too much to absorb in one visit.	NAN
560	Extremely.	NAN
561	Every resident has had several opportunities to engage with the NDP team who have given a great deal of time gathering information.	NAN
754	Anyone ticking the NO box must have been away on a long vacation.	NAN
755	The Sonning Common Parish Council are to be commended for all the work they have put into developing the NDP Plan.	NAN
595	At the beginning of the process no, but the committee has made great improvements.	NAN
684	By the end of the consultation (this March/Feb) communication was much better - we didn't feel we knew what was going on to start with and SON 15 was added without much publicity which was disappointing.	NAN
694	YES in relation to SON 9 and SON 7. Can't answer for other sites.	NAN
19	Very communicative. Excellent visual and spoken.	NAN
52	Very much so.	NAN
253	Not in respect to the park and ride into Reading. I have been to every meeting and originally headed the traffic group for NDP and a park and ride into Reading has NEVER even been mooted as an idea and today it has appeared for the first time in the report. This is sly and underhand and in my view jeopardises the whole of the NDP.	AN – 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn.

Question 6 – Do you agree that residents have been consulted well during the NDP planning process?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
267	This is one proposal. Many property developers have other ideas which have nothing to do with this.	NAN
803	Consultation extent and detail have been fine.	NAN
663	Though health centre seems to have missed consultation process (probably because practice manager on leave).	NAN
5	A good number of well prepared events.	NAN
29	I realise the committee have put in long and arduous hours (unpaid) forming the plan. I am sure the majority of residents appreciate the effort they have put in.	NAN
235	The exhibitions and public consultations have been truly excellent.	NAN
401	Residents have been give lots of opportunities to comment and the Sonning Common magazine has provided lots of articles to update us.	NAN
425	This has been an impressive aspect of this process. Thank you to all concerned for all your hard work.	NAN
181	There have been frequent email communications and articles in the Parish Magazine, and several exhibitions which have been well publicised.	NAN
737	Are the young people being engaged in the process?	NAN
64	The SCNDP have done an extraordinary job and I believe all residents are aware of their efforts and have a good understanding of the plans.	NAN
430	A very effective and comprehensive consultation process judging on the number of residents involved.	NAN
483	We have been given every opportunity to voice our opinions.	NAN
569	The displays and meetings at the village hall have been well publicised and attended.	NAN
125	Adequate info given.	NAN
197	Excellent!	NAN
781	The numbers add up to what is required but I feel the number is too high considering the facilities within the village and the capacity of existing amenities.	NAN
329	We have been very proactive about meeting our obligations. Thank you to the SCNDP.	NAN
331	Given the amount of time and effort devoted by SCNDP w/party AND residents, it is vital that the plan receives active and considered thought by Oxfordshire.	NAN
753	Only objection is the additional houses being built but not coming out of the allocation.	NAN/OSP – backland/infill development is outside the remit of NDP.
452	Please include units for over 55's bungalows/flats as near to centre of village as possible and near Chiltern Edge school.	NAN
451	Please include units for over 55's bungalows/flats as near to centre of village as possible and near Chiltern Edge school.	NAN
437	Numerically, but not necessarily on the allocations.	NAN

Question 6 – Do you agree that residents have been consulted well during the NDP planning process?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
436	Traffic hazards need to be addressed <u>now</u> as more traffic with impact on the village which is already congested.	NAN
424	Do no not agree with the distribution of homes.	NAN
397	Absolutely.	NAN
483	It appears to be as good as it could possibly be for the area.	NAN
705	Bearing in mind the Government's decision I think the committee have done well.	NAN
488	Certainly.	NAN
513	Yes to the point of 138 houses but not if reserves are included.	NAN

Question 7 – Given Sonning Common's legal requirement to accept new housing, do you think the draft plan meets our obligations and reflects our needs?

Yes	No
220	15
94%	6%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
532	Broadly speaking.	NAN
569	The only things that I would like to see that are not covered are provision of studio flats at the lowest possible price to purchase for young people. Assisted housing to rent or buy for elderly people who need some assistance, but do not need a care home place.	NAN – see affordable housing, Policy H2a. AN – Extra-care housing being considered for SON 7 (reserve), see also Policy H2b.
591	It meets obligations but probably does not reflect our needs.	NAN
713	There is no upper limit on the number of houses to be built. It started at 138 but that is now quoted as a minimum number.	NAN – 138 new homes was always a minimum.
623	YES - the Plan suggests a good balance between the distribution of new homes between the North and South of the village. It also creates a similar balance for the recreational facilities offered by the village.	NAN
762	Legally tight. Identifies SC very well.	NAN
764	Absolutely. Commend the plan for a small 'industrial' site which should help alleviate traffic problems in the village centre.	NAN
45	Very well considered.	NAN
128	Generally - it's difficult to understand all the fine details.	NAN
722	Fight any development and accept the minimum.	NAN
768	Yes, but are the numbers accurate and will any infill building be taken into account and subtracted from the National Requirement?	NAN/OSP – backland/infill development is outside the remit of NDP.

Question 7 – Given Sonning Common’s legal requirement to accept new housing, do you think the draft plan meets our obligations and reflects our needs?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
664	Covered most issues bar health centre issues now numbers higher than initially thought. Need more public parking provision in village centre.	NAN
700	Absolutely.	NAN
94	The best of a bad job as we have little option to accept the number proposed by SODC.	NAN
301	Yes, but we must retain a 'village feel' and an independent identity. (No drift of development from Reading etc.) small housing developments are essential, so too is plenty of landscaping in line with AONB.	NAN
509	Meets legal requirements but in a very blinkered way.	NAN
665	The big concern will be traffic and parking along Wood Lane which is already a considerable problem.	NAN
88	Some sites could take larger numbers and some are being pushed to limit i.e. Lea Meadow.	NAN
208	Adequate recreational facilities most important, also affordable housing.	NAN
381	Well spread out around the edges of the village.	NAN
440	Yes, although I am not sure that the legal requirements are.	NAN
710	Broadly I think it does but one aspect – No - and it is transport and the state of the roads and pavements that really have not been addressed. The centre of the village, unless it changes, will be inundated with cars . Also Kennylands Road will be the main route for most of these new residents - it is a country lane and not looked after properly by Oxford.	NAN/OSP – the state of the roads is ultimately the responsibility of OCC.
171	Still think the amount of housing is too great for our size village - traffic, doctors etc.	NAN
561	Looking at the demographics of the area smaller properties are needed for an ageing population. The challenge will be in getting developers to meet our needs.	NAN
754	It meets Sonning Common obligations but does not reflect its needs.	NAN
755	The draft plan meets the obligation of the draft plan but does not reflect our needs as the majority of the residents do not want further development.	NAN
684	Yes, and having met our obligations we strongly ask that - no more obligations are summarily added. Proper consultation continues to be observed. All new developments in the village are subject to the NDP, no exceptions.	NAN
694	There is a need for affordable and social housing with the SCNDP.	NAN – see affordable housing, Policy H2a and also Table 3.5.
15	I believe it will - it has the best chance.	NAN
810	Because we have no safe cycleway to support the extra population. I would agree if this could be incorporated in the plan.	NAN
19	And flexible as well.	NAN
23	Although I have never been at all clear about whether this is a legal requirement rather than a politically driven strategy. Also not at all clear on the details of local need for new additional housing in the village. There are gaps for me in the proposal. I think it would be helpful to have real, tangible specifics on which to base these plans.	NAN
52	Very much so.	NAN
253	For housing yes. But many other areas are neglected - digital infrastructure, traffic, cycle ways, pedestrian access and safety (e.g. street lighting, parking on pavements).	NAN
267	Our needs are for low cost housing not executive type.	NAN – see Policy H2 on housing mix and also Table 3.5

Question 7 – Given Sonning Common’s legal requirement to accept new housing, do you think the draft plan meets our obligations and reflects our needs?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
772	As far as I can remember.	NAN
5	While in general I agree I do think SON 5 should be proposed for development and not included as a reserve. Its present designation smacks more of nimbyism than logic as it is quite close to the village.	AN – SON 5 now an allocated site, previously reserve.
802	I think the plan has the potential to expand the village without destroying the character. The current obsession with infilling needs to also be taken into account within the overall numbers of new homes.	NAN/OSP – backland/infill development is outside the remit of the NDP.
29	The obligations and needs, yes.	NAN
82	I will not support this overall plan because of the inclusion of the statement re park and ride. I cannot support the inclusion of the reserve sites at Hagpits because of the disruption during build of SON 6 and Hagpits and the impact of addition traffic to Kennylands Road.	AN – ‘Park & Ride’ proposal withdrawn.
126	The village is expanding and the amount of building has increased and new builds in excess of £1,000,000 has increased. The new builds are not included in the plan especially with the traffic issues.	NAN
719	Not entirely as I think that there should be a greater allocation of affordable housing.	NAN – 40% affordable housing is set by SODC.
235	See separate letter attached to feedback questionnaire.	NAN
359	However I do not understand the need for a pathway to be built on SON 7a behind the gardens of Essex Way bungalows. There is currently no path. Why is this a requirement for planning permission? The two roads of Kennylands and Peppard are already easily accessible. Once any housing is built on SON 9, residents can either use the existing paths aside the residential road of Westleigh Dr (connecting Peppard Rd and Kennylands Rd) or enter the Millennium Field via the Bird Wood Court entrance and use the western part of the Millennium Field (connecting Peppard Rd with Kennylands Rd). Perhaps a bus stop could also be agreed with Reading Buses for a stop near the Herb Garden.	NAN – ultimately pedestrian access will be decided by OCC and SODC.
401	This village needs to be able to attract young people so I agree that we need smaller properties - 1/2 and 3 bedrooms not 4/5.	NAN
181	Agree with numbers at particular locations and emphasis on balance of housing sizes and social housing.	NAN
737	If houses are built on the suggested sites, which are either in or abut the AONB, no doubt there should be conditions regarding design and landscaping so that any intrusion into the countryside is strictly limited.	NAN – see Design Brief within individual site policies.
430	I do understand that there are tensions between developers and the draft plan proposals over the housing mix with particular reference to the very skewed demography of Sonning Common. To be specific I am unaware of any attention being given to provision of bungalows, sheltered housing or any other accommodation to meet senior resident requirements.	AN – Extra-care housing being considered for SON 7 (reserve), see also Policy H2b.
468	Certainly meets our obligations. Our needs? Time will tell, subject to the success of plans for recreational facilities, AGS, transport and parking.	NAN
312	Too many large estates planned.	NAN
781	I strongly believe in infill within the village lines and not expanding out into larger estates to keep the village feel.	NAN
674	Except for SON 7 and SON 9	NAN

Question 7 – Given Sonning Common’s legal requirement to accept new housing, do you think the draft plan meets our obligations and reflects our needs?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
331	Important that SON 9 is <u>NOT</u> overdeveloped - strongly support <u>60</u> homes.	NAN
347	Providing proposed numbers at each site don't increase.	NAN
311	I don't agree with building on SON 6.	NAN
468	The maps presented show very clearly that the allocated sites fit well within the village, barely changing the overall shape of the village at all.	NAN
437	Generally yes, but not all the sites allocated.	NAN

Question 8 – Are you in favour of the overall distribution of new homes?

Yes	No
206	28
88%	12%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
436	SON 15b should be leisure. SON 6 should be removed. SON 1 housing; SON 2 housing; SON 3 housing.	NAN
424	Too many homes proposed south of the village.	NAN
397	Smaller developments are always favoured over larger ones.	NAN
659	As before too much traffic too little parking.	NAN
355	Yes, with the exception of SON 15a as a primary reserve site. I favour replacing it with SON 5 but will accept if the majority view is against this swap. My concern is the increased traffic pressure on Reade's Lane that 2 sites (SON 2 and 15a) virtually opposite each other will bring about if 15a, too, is used.	AN – SON 5 now an allocated site, previously reserve.
483	The sites chosen appear to have been kept to the edges of the village and should cause as little disruption to the residents as possible.	NAN
488	Yes - well distributed, with good consideration for environmental impact.	NAN
513	The overall distribution is OK but if reserve sites have to be used there will be far too much bias towards the west of the village.	NAN
514	The Reade's Lane end of the village will be hit with most amount of building work/sites. This is unfair.	NAN – 108 out of 195 homes on allocated sites, including potential SHMA, are to the south of the village.
531	Feel a need for attention being paid to an increasing ageing population in the village. Too many of retirees (like us) who are unable to move to smaller properties in old age and no longer have need of 2/3 bedroom homes.	NAN – see Policy H2 on Housing mix and also Table 3.5. AN – Extra-care housing being considered for SON 7 (reserve), see also Policy H2b.

Question 8 – Are you in favour of the overall distribution of new homes?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
532	Preference for less large (detached) houses and more bungalows and 1/2 bed apartments, thus enabling freeing up of semi's and 3+ beds already in the village.	NAN – see Policy H2 on Housing mix and also Table 3.5.
681	Mostly.	NAN
569	It would have been nice to have new sites for houses closer to the centre of the village, but that is clearly impossible. I oppose the infill building on Wood Lane.	NAN
590	Given the caveats regarding SON 7/7a.	NAN
599	On the whole.	NAN
612	Part of the development behind Essex Way could be taken away and put on SON 5 (reserve site). That would spread the houses in that area.	AN – SON 5 now an allocated site, previously reserve.
623	See comments above (YES - the Plan suggests a good balance between the distribution of new homes between the North and South of the village. It also creates a similar balance for the recreational facilities offered by the village.)	NAN
644	There is no provision for sheltered housing of any type which I feel is necessary.	NAN – SOHA said greater need for affordable housing in Sonning Common. See Policy H2b on Extra-care homes and supporting text.
264	Modestly sized houses are needed.	NAN
807	As long as there are affordable homes available.	NAN – 40% affordable. See Policy H2a.
722	Because any building will be a stepping stone to more development.	NAN
214	Some areas more suitable than others.	NAN
202	Should be more retirement size bungalows.	NAN
768	Too many units on too small plots. We must not allow SC to be 'joined' to Reading by infilling of green space.	NAN
87	Lea Meadow will be too concentrated and 60 homes are built in close proximity.	NAN
107	Most of the sites and reserve sites are around or near Kennylands Road. Other areas of the village are not affected so much. Not fair distribution.	NAN – SON 15a and SON 2/3 are near Reade's Lane and SON 8 and SON 9 are near Peppard Road.
118	I'd like to see more bungalows that are affordable with wheelchair or disability access. They currently go for a premium and then get developed.	NAN
119	Evenly spread across village, not clumped in one area.	NAN
664	Spreading out either end. Very sensible and balanced.	NAN
41	Whilst I agree with distributing the sites, the Herb Farm would appear to be the best place to put a large number of homes with the least impact to residents.	NAN
137	Think Kennylands Rd is a more suitable road for extra traffic than Reade's Lane, would avoid traffic travelling through village centre.	NAN
301	Generally, but developments should be kept small and housing design and layout made as individual and unique as possible. (i.e. mixed design and individuality). Ensure starter homes are sufficiently spacious with storage and a pleasing outdoor environment and surrounding landscape.	NAN

Question 8 – Are you in favour of the overall distribution of new homes?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
509	Building should be done to the southern side of Wood Lane to encourage people to use Emmer Green/Caversham facilities rather than the already too busy village centre.	NAN – 108 out of 195 homes on allocated sites, including potential SHMA, are to the south of the village which ultimately could pose a threat to the sustainability of the village centre.
665	SON 15a and SON 15b would be very useful.	NAN
88	Yes but not such a large number. This is a village NOT a town.	NAN
89	Should be spread across all sites now as the reserve sites could well be developed at a later date resulting in far more new homes than 138.	NAN
211	See Q3; Reade's Lane CANNOT cope with the dramatic increase in extra traffic all the new houses will bring. Development NEEDS to be on the Reading side of the village as this is the main route into Sonning Common.	NAN – 108 out of 195 homes on allocated sites, including potential SHMA, are to the south of the village.
647	Less homes for SON 9 and more distribution to SON 6 and SON 5.	NAN
470	I think smaller sites are better around the edge of the village, but not so big that we become part of Reading.	NAN
756	Less on Lea Meadow and more on SON 5.	NAN
710	I don't like the Kennylands infill and think the area around Chiltern Edge School will lose all its country character.	NAN
182	I still have reservations about the ability of the village infrastructure to cope. Traffic gets worse everyday. The recent development behind the pharmacy demonstrates the traffic problems in store.	NAN
290	But no more.	NAN
326	More opportunity for self-build would be nice - for those who want this in initial allocation and not just reserve sites.	NAN
561	SON 2 should see no development beyond the line of Orchard Ave in order to protect AONB.	NAN
754	You will always get differing views on distribution but on the whole you have done a first-class job.	NAN
755	Yes to the allocated sites, no to the reserve sites. Re section 7/7a - 15a if the allocated sites fulfil the requirements of the NDP there should be no need to develop the reserve sites. The allocated sites should fulfil the needs.	AN – additional allocated and reserve sites included on the advice of SODC to go towards the likely but as yet unknown SHMA impact. No guarantee that this will meet the final requirement.
810	I would like the houses behind Occasions /Chinese Takeaway to count as part of 138 as it seems to be a fait accompli which shouldn't have happened - as it has happened can 1 of other areas be less densely built on?	NAN/OSP – backland/infill development is outside the remit of the NDP.
19	Keep it a separate village. The best possible in circumstances.	NAN
23	I have concerns about the early consultation with developers for sites that may or may not be reserve sites (e.g. SON 5). Surely this is premature and can be used by developers to gain a short term advantage? To my mind if a site isn't even in reserve yet, then no discussions should be 'had' and SODC should support this!	AN – SON 5 now an allocated site, previously reserve.
52	Yes, but control still needed as to type, size, design etc.	NAN

Question 8 – Are you in favour of the overall distribution of new homes?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
253	Distribution is fine. Density may be too low to be able create houses that are affordable.	NAN – 40% affordable set by SODC. See Policy H2a. AN – explanation on densities provided in a grid in Part Two.
267	Yes provided there are a no. of sites with lowish density.	NAN
772	Only if the infrastructure and public services take priority.	NAN
803	It will be difficult to ensure the housing balance is addressed but the aim is fine.	NAN
164	Vital to keep Sonning Common a separate village with green space surrounding on <u>all</u> sides.	NAN
5	While in general I agree I am not convinced that the number of dwellings on each site is right. In general, greater density is desirable to improve land use. I do think SON 5 should be proposed for development and not included as a reserve. Its present designation smacks more of nimbyism than logic as it is quite close to the village centre.	AN – explanation on densities provided in a grid in Part Two. AN – SON 5 now an allocated site, previously reserve.
126	Do we have a choice?	NAN
235	I tend to favour the northern sites because they are closer to the village centre than the southern sites. I fear that the new residents will drive to the village centre, adding to traffic congestion and pollution.	NAN
359	Yes, the rebalancing of housing stock looks quite adequate and any rooms NOT labelled as bedrooms in the plan but could in fact be used as bedrooms should be counted in the number of bedrooms in that structure. I agree strongly that the infill must reflect the character of the SC village. I agree that employment sites be limited. I feel strongly that wildlife corridors be retained suitably and that the density of housing is looked at thoroughly with a view to the overall beauty of the village and not just to suit profitability of the developers.	NAN
760	Agree with the strategy on this and keeping houses spread over a number of sites.	NAN
634	My only concern is that I would envisage an 'out of centre' car park being built at some time, perhaps free to use, with the village centre car park being charged and time limited. The proposed housing development fills in many gaps in the outline of the village, making it less practical to build a sizeable car park which is close enough to the village centre.	AN – 'Park & Ride' proposal withdrawn in the face of strong opposition from residents.
737	Apart from intrusion into AONB.	NAN
64	My only objection is the number of homes in Lea Meadow. Sixty is too many (40 is more acceptable) and I am gravely concerned that Road Traffic Accidents are inevitable due to congestion in our narrow roads and lanes, which are frequently lined with parked cars due to the absence of public parking. The plans should also take into account the growing number of new houses but outside of the objectives of the NDP; these should be subtracted from the target.	NAN/OSP – backland/infill development is outside the remit of the NDP.
423	See answer above - I think that there should not be too dense development in any one particular area. 60 homes for Lea Meadow is too high. I would find 50 more acceptable.	NAN
430	I do have some concern about so many houses being planned for the southern part of the village.	NAN
15	See previous comments (I believe it will - it has the best chance).	NAN

Question 9 – Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Yes	No
223	13
94%	6%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
293	Possibly increase the one and two bedroom homes. To lower prices a modern (factory) method of building should be considered.	NAN
303	A totally professional job done.	NAN
691	I had a very interesting conversation with Barrie Greenwood but I still feel that I don't know enough to give an informed opinion.	NAN
781	My main concern is that the housing developments will proceed before the infrastructure and amenities (traffic, parking etc) have been addressed. I would like to congratulate all concerned in drawing up this very thorough plan. Well done.	NAN
331	Thanks for all the excellent work.	NAN
347	I appreciate the hard work put in to get the plan this far. Lets hope we can remain a lively village with the bordering countryside our biggest asset.	NAN
753	SON 1 to stay as Green. The houses should be offered to local village people 1st.	NAN – see Policy H4 and supporting text.
468	The original community survey showed an overwhelming preference for smaller developments on multiple sites. The plan addresses this, and it is the only way we can absorb the housing allocation without dramatically altering the character of our village.	NAN
456	Ref SON 9 Plan. Strongly agree with the proposals that the housing should be well sited to minimise the visual impact from AONB. Also the development should be screened from the rear gardens of Bird Wood Court.	NAN
437	But not all the sites allocated. Proposed settlement boundary should be redrawn to include SON 5 exclude SON 6, exclude 15A, include SON 1. Son 15A would be a preferable recreation area to SON 1, which should be housing.	NAN
436	As above: SON 15b should be leisure. SON 6 should be removed. SON 1 housing; SON 2 housing; SON 3 housing.	NAN
424	Too many proposed homes Lea Meadow. Disagree with footpath strongly, health and safety risk for residents.	NAN
671	Need for social and recreational facilities, in particular youth (who may not be able to afford private sports clubs etc).	NAN – recreational facilities proposed for SON 2/3 – Policy HS1.
670	Sonning Common needs more /larger recreational facilities and sports facilities for ALL age groups	NAN – see 671 above.
408	Although I see the need for more housing in the village, I strongly feel that more thought needs to be give to the impact on the village. i.e. parking and the village centre, road conditions (surface etc).	NAN
397	I still have some concerns about service provision for new residents - schooling; health etc. However, the Plan as a whole is well prepared and working party to be congratulated on a job well done.	NAN
392	Thanks to all concerned for such a comprehensive Plan. Much appreciated.	NAN
408	Although I see the need for more housing in the village, I strongly feel that more thought needs to be give to the impact on the village. i.e. parking and the village centre, road conditions (surface etc).	NAN

Question 9 – Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
397	I still have some concerns about service provision for new residents - schooling; health etc. However, the Plan as a whole is well prepared and working party to be congratulated on a job well done.	NAN
392	Thanks to all concerned for such a comprehensive Plan. Much appreciated.	NAN
659	If the infrastructure is sorted out first.	NAN
471	On the basis of the requirements of SODC for 130+ houses I consider the draft NDP to be well researched and presented. It covers all the important aspects on the future of the village.	NAN
483	I feel the Sonning Common Parish Councillors have handled this very efficiently. Well done to all who have given their time and effort.	NAN
488	Well thought through.	NAN
843	Yes, I broadly agree as there not enough houses built in this area. I would also be interested in applying for self build area 7a. There should more land for self build in my view.	NAN
513	I support the need for an NDP but this has been poorly executed with a lack of consistency and limited community engagement. There also feels a lack of imagination and flexibility in the process and plan. Particularly worrying if more allocation is needed. The policy for reserving sites and reserve allocation is flawed.	NAN
514	I partially support the NDP. I certainly support having a plan, but I feel that it has not been very well thought out. I feel the inclusion of SON 15a was a mistake. The Dfe are still to agree to the selling of the field yet the SC Parish Council <u>continue</u> to include it in a plan. People of the village voted on an option that was not available or legal.	NAN – the landowner believes this site is deliverable.
532	Do not wish to extend the new building out toward Reading.	NAN
681	Proposed site 10 is spreading on to open countryside in unprecedented style. Site 8 how is it proposed to get access onto this site compulsory purchase?	NAN – incorrect. SON 10 is not going forward into the Plan and access to SON 8 will continue to be via Bird Wood Court.
569	The plan has been carefully put together and well publicised. We have to have new housing whether we like it or not, so this is the best way to go. Efforts should continue to be made to increase the availability of off road parking in Wood Lane. The former Natwest plot should be considered for housing if the site becomes available. I am concerned the access to SON 2/3 should be further away from Chiltern Edge, going towards Gallowstree Common.	NAN
575	I think there are enough people here. Anyhow it is difficult to cross the roads. The schools are full and people have difficulty parking.	NAN
590	Congratulations to the NDPWP for all their efforts. Please ensure a sympathetic mix of housing that fits the locality. Maintain our separation from Reading.	NAN
591	A lot of hard work has been done to produce this plan - thank you. Please ensure that S/Common remains separate from Reading as the borough would be delighted to envelop the village.	NAN
599	I am very concerned about the provision for parking. I do not see where it can go now houses have/are being built opposite the village hall.	NAN

Question 9 – Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
713	I don't support building housing estates on land designated AONB. Why aren't all the houses being limited to within the village limits?	NAN – locations for new homes are limited to SHLAA sites, some of which are outside the current built village.
685	The number of houses need to be reduced. <u>No plan</u> has been made for coping with increased traffic, demand for parking, pressure on the health centre, dental practice, school places. A copy of all sections of the plan should be sent to all households. This is a <u>very</u> important matter.	NAN/OSP – provision of such a plan is outside the remit of the NDP.
621	Concerned about lack of parking and non-use of current parking in Wood Lane. Police do not seem to check parking on yellow lines.	NAN
623	SPECIFIC TO SON 9 PROPOSAL. 1) Pedestrian link to Kennylands Road shown on 'concept statement'. If SON 7 does not go ahead, then path will have to pass close to Bird Wood Court and Essex Way residents. There should be a STRONG statement here that says that measures will be taken to minimise disturbance and maximise security for existing residents. In addition, if SON 7 is built on, then the aforementioned path will be abandoned, returned to nature and a new path put through the centre of SON 7 well away from Bird Wood Court/Essex Way boundary. 2) There should be a statement saying no roads near Bird Wood Court boundary. 3) There should be a statement which says no vehicular access between SON 9 and SON 8.	NAN/OSP – some of these points are covered within site Policy HS7 but the detail will be part of the formal planning application process. The owners of SON 7 will not allow pedestrian/cycle access through its centre.
626	But grave concerns about all the extra traffic set to come on to Reade's Lane from SON 2/3.	NAN
627	See comments on 626. Concerns about all the extra traffic set to come on to Reade's Lane from SON 2/3.	NAN
762	No detailing of historical/forecast of infill housing in SC. This could mean a 10% growth in SC by 2027. With SHMA could mean +15% growth - unsure that traffic impact sufficiently identified e.g more car parking in village centre. Need to identify build space.	NAN – infill/backland development is outside the remit of NDP.
654	Except SON 15a should be removed from the Plan. Playing fields adjacent to the school should be protected from housing development. The proposed area should be improved to provide better facilities for children, to promote health and well being and fitness. Promoting more sport on site would help and reduce obesity/crime. The Draft Plan highlights the fact that there is clearly a need for more sport/recreation facilities.	NAN
58	1) At times Kennylands Rd resembles a racetrack with a number of cars speeding along its entire length. With proposed Kennylands Infill and Hagpits developments it is essential that appropriate traffic calming traffic flow measures are introduced (sleeping policeman?). 2) with possibly up to 138 extra cars using (and parking in) the village centre, has sufficient thought and attention been given to the congestion and pedestrian hazards that will inevitably arise?	NAN
76	People need housing. Young people who have been educated in and are living in this area need housing that is affordable. The cost of housing here is 'unaffordable' according to 'Shelter.' I am very tired of people who have homes here saying they don't want other people to have that opportunity.	NAN
67	Very informative excellent presentation.	NAN
128	I strongly support the development plan and hope it has a real influence on the village development.	NAN
127	I worry about the old chalk pits in and around sites 7/7a - risk of subsidence. Parking and traffic - especially along Wood Lane will need to be better policed.	NAN

Question 9 – Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
282	Strongly support. Extensive research and consultation have produced an excellent, relevant plan	NAN
759	Seems rather excessive.	NAN
264	I shall judge when the houses are built.	NAN
757	Congratulations to the people who have worked so tirelessly to produce this plan. It has been well thought out and given lots of opportunity for community input. My chief concern is extra traffic. We are already in a mess with traffic and more cars, delivery vehicles etc. will place a great strain, especially Kennylands Rd and the village centre.	NAN
722	As mentioned above. (Because any building will be a stepping stone to more development).	NAN
221	It seems essential. Thank you.	NAN
205	My main concerns are: impact of the 3rd bridge should it ever emerge. The SON 5 and SON 9 current planning applications should they be approved would undermine the whole NDP process.	NAN
197	Excellent proposals. It should be accepted and adopted.	NAN
708	It is important that recreational facilities are included within the plan and that such facilities are protected against future developments. This is essential for future generations.	NAN
660	Despite broadly agreeing, I have real concerns over the centre of the village and how parking which is already an issue can be resolved. Also concerned that the increase of approx 500 people will affect the Health Centre negatively.	NAN
661	The plan covers development of the village (not only increase in housing) however, it is unclear how the village issues of lack of parking in the centre and the ability of the Health Centre to be able to cope are to be addressed. Long term the village will not cope if these issues are not addressed.	NAN
86	Since I am hoping this plan will help self builders to find land and have a chance to build in lovely surroundings, I would like to ask for more options for self builders, not just reserve sites. Maybe community right to build schemes or government incentives for the council to support self builders more would mean the council might consider buying land for such projects and make the option attractive for vendors as well. More diversity rather than identikit houses.	NAN
87	Have lived in Sonning Common for almost 25 years - it needs to meet its targets and is a suitable place for this type of expansion...with cycle paths to Reading and improved road surfaces.	NAN
118	Yes, well done! Only main concern is addressing traffic issues on Peppard Road and against intensive development around Reade's Lane which has appalling traffic problems and more housing will only make this worse.	NAN
119	Need for greater parking in village. Need for zebra/pelican crossings near shops/schools etc.	NAN
664	Concerns re health centre provision now numbers increased so much. Need to discuss this impact. Concerns re water pressure and internet facilities, any increase in these would be great.	NAN
145	A park - ride would be good idea - towards Abbey Rugby Club. This might also alleviate some street parking (at present).	AN – 'Park & Ride' proposal has been withdrawn due to strong opposition from residents.
168	I feel I would have to go along with the findings of the Working Party who have given so much time to the scheme. Problems such as parking in the village of course came to mind.	NAN

Question 9 – Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
179	I broadly disagree with the SCNDP advocating sites wholly within the AONB in preference to non AONB sites available to meet the housing need.	AN – all non-AONB sites are now either allocated or reserve.
224	This has been a very thorough process and has had a good level of consultation locally. The meetings have been well advertised. I hope the Plan has some clout and cannot be easily overturned by SODC.	NAN
94	I wish to point out that you have not mentioned Springwater church, attended by many people who live in the village. Has the land at the end of Lambourne Road/Close been considered?	NAN – this church is not in the SCNDP designated area.
41	I feel that the Herb Farm site offers the best opportunity with the least impact on the village.	NAN
669	Although I would like to see more emphasis on walking and cycling proposed routes to neighbouring communities such as Emmer Green and Kidmore End/Gallowstree Common.	NAN/OSP
124	Brilliant job done by all involved many thanks.	NAN
174	This is the same as Q5 (Too many houses in SC as a total - it's a small town not a village but with small village amenities!)	NAN
301	Broadly. We must consider open spaces, wildlife corridors, sustainable transport (walking, cycling etc) and maintain the peace and calm of the village. Any new businesses etc. should have appropriate car parking. Have we considered a balanced carbon footprint? Use of re-newable energy etc? Traffic calming essential as is traffic management/parking in village centre.	NAN
509	A 100 space car park on AONB and on a school rd? As above, we should be planning to keep traffic away from village centre rather than encouraging more.	AN – see Policy HS1. Carpark capacity reduced. Note it is intended to service recreational facility and to alleviate school traffic on Reade's Lane.
565	I think Hagpits and Kennylands Paddock are a step too far! If these sites are developed it will form a solid mass of housing between Millennium Field and Westleigh Drive. This is assuming the Herb Farm will be developed which is highly likely, once Lea Meadow is completed.	NAN
665	Yes, I do (given the legal requirements) but I am disappointed more study has not been done on traffic motion and parking issues which are considerable. I am not sure the scheme is sustainable with employment. Has any work been done on pollution on Wood Lane? Has any S106 agreement been agreed?	NAN/OSP – see interim traffic report on website. Post-referendum residents will be approached to work with SCPC on traffic issues. Policy DE2 covers S106.
88	It is too many houses in such surroundings of a village of natural beauty. New houses should be shared over all sites in reserve or in the planned sites.	AN – new homes proposed for all allocated/reserve sites.
89	Too many houses for existing facilities.	NAN
192	I am concerned that the houses will be built <u>before</u> the infrastructure is improved to cope. i.e. Health Centre, schools, parking in centre easier and more frequent public transport to Henley.	NAN/OSP
731	The proposed extra housing must increase the demand on local schools, doctors etc. The increase of traffic in and around the village must be in need of more consideration as at present time parking can be very difficult.	NAN

Question 9 – Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
732	Has consideration been given to the increased requirement for primary and secondary schooling? Are the existing primary school facilities adequate for the increased number of children? Parking is already difficult in the village centre. There appears to be no plans for additional car parking. The report makes reference to the inadequacy of the village hall. How will this be rectified? Additional demands on the Health Centre will be a problem.	NAN/OSP – advice from OCC on school places included within community, social and health policies. Policy DE2 covers village hall.
207	Yes except that OCC and SODC are not doing their bit and are starving this village of the facilities enjoyed by other communities of similar size - notably Eynsham (see D. Cameron's constituency)!	NAN
208	Excellent job.	NAN
211	The village centre will not cope with all the extra traffic that WILL have to pass through to get to the new developments off Reade's Lane. The majority of new residents will be travelling to and from Reading /M4 etc. Develop on the south side of the village to reduce traffic and pollution in the village centre.	NAN – 108 of 195 homes on allocated sites are to the south of the village. Reserve sites are also to the south.
647	The working party have done an excellent job over several years.	NAN
739	I think you have done a fantastic job! I have not filled in all the sections as I do not live in Sonning Common so do not feel qualified to comment.	NAN
470	Yes I do. I'm not in favour of lots of infill in back gardens. As residents of the village for over 30 years we have no plans to move. However, there is very little scope for us to downsize if we wanted to. We would like to know more too about the intended (?) park and ride bus scheme.	AN – 'Park & ride' proposal has been withdrawn.
530	Great job 'well done'	NAN
775	What an excellent piece of work - many congratulations to all involved.	NAN
43	The Working Party have done a tremendous job on behalf of the residents. Additionally I favour the prevention of speeding mentioned in the Plan.	NAN
171	See accompanying letter	NAN
180	Thank you for your time and hard work.	NAN
182	Not keen on SON 5 because it affects me, but also because this is valuable scrub land - the little owls tree has already been lopped.	NAN
195	I am very grateful to the NDP team who have given so much time and effort to produce this document and take residents' feedback during the process.	NAN
290	Please note comments overleaf. The work carried out by the council has been excellent. However I believe a much harder line should be taken with South Oxfordshire and all forms of media not just local should be used to make sure we are not overrun. This may have left us with land in the centre of the village for village use not developer profit.	NAN
774	A Reading park and ride facility in Sonning Common: I understand that Blounts Court Rd has been strongly considered and find this unbelievable. This is a very narrow road, not suitable for heavy traffic on buses and would not only be dangerous but would spoil the area. Please do not let this happen.	AN – 'Park & ride' proposal has been withdrawn. Furthermore, no site was ever identified.
747	Affordable homes for local people should be a priority.	NAN – Policy H2 and Policy H4 have always made this clear.
721	We definitely need more housing but of a sensible size - not these five bedroom places which are being built.	NAN
499	Yes, but with the provisos indicated in the attached sheet.	NAN
500	Yes, but with the provisos indicated in the attached sheet.	NAN

Question 9 - Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
560	Park and ride not a parish responsibility given that would only move the problem (if it exists) not solve it. Must do all we can to protect AONB.	AN – 'Park & ride' proposal has been withdrawn. NAN – Policy ENV1 covers protection of AONB.
561	My only complaint in the proposed parking for people travelling into Reading. This will be a cost for our residents and produce no benefit to the community or local trade. SON 1 needs to be kept as open space as a balance to the Millennium Field as the heart and lungs of the village.	AN – 'Park & ride' proposal has been withdrawn.
754	Under the circumstances YES.	NAN
755	I lived in Wood Lane from 1942-1964 and have seen many changes since. I live 1 mile away. Sonning Common centre for the Health Centre, dentist, post office, garage and the shops all of which we use regularly. My concerns re the effect of extra housing are possibly the destruction of a rural community, its effect on the infrastructure and particularly the traffic and parking in Wood Lane, Grove Road and the Peppard Road. Wood Lane is bad enough at present and would no doubt become considerably worse. There is a fine line when the community becomes over developed.	NAN
684	I love walking around the village with my children - please keep the village safe and pleasant for pedestrians of all ages.	NAN
694	I have some concerns about how the village centre will cope with the extra traffic the new housing will generate.	NAN
797f	It would appear we have NO OPTION.	NAN
688	Strongly agree.	NAN
15	If it were not for the hard work of Barrie Greenwood and his team, I feel that SODC and the developers would see the village as a 'soft touch' and carry out unwanted and inappropriate development.	NAN
810	Yes but see above re cycle paths.	NAN/OSP
19	A remarkable achievement.	NAN
23	Subject to comments above. A really good piece of work.	NAN
52	I don't think a much better Plan, if at all possible, could be drawn up. I think the work has been excellent.	NAN
253	Without the park and ride I would. This hasn't been consulted on and the need hasn't been identified nor have the potential sites.	AN – 'Park & ride' proposal has been withdrawn.
267	Sport and leisure facilities? SC has poor coverage of these. Bishopswood - terrible mistake??	NAN – Policy HS1 covers proposed recreational facilities on SON 2/3.
772	But I would like to see what the plan is for roads and traffic and reassurance that the Health Centre can cope.	NAN/OSP
803	I broadly support the SCNDP although I have personal preferences related to development sites which don't match those set out the document. Covering letter attached.	NAN
16	Thank you to all those who have given so much time and effort to carry this process through and arrive at a set of proposals to meet the legal requirement of this village.	NAN
5	The professional approach and the enormous effort of the volunteer working party is highly commended.	NAN

Question 9 - Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
26	The District Council and planning department should be made aware that their previous planning decisions have created a SPECIAL AREA in Sonning Common known as ESSEX WAY. Apart from the care home situated at the entrance of Essex Way, the covenanted restrictions on purchase of 26 bungalows and 16 apartments has resulted in many elderly residents living in these dwellings. The Equality Impact Assessment should identify the adverse impact on the elderly residents caused by any development on the boundaries of this community. Therefore prescriptive measures should be detailed for the planned footpath that links SON 9 development with Kennylands Road to ensure the privacy AND SECURITY of the residents is protected. The NDP statement relating to this footpath is TOO WEAK.	NAN/OSP – NDP not allowed to be too prescriptive in site allocation policies. NAN – SCNDP Working Party has made SODC aware of the covenant restrictions.
29	Not the distribution of the development.	NAN
798	I feel it is very important to prevent further development towards Reading to maintain Sonning Common as a village.	NAN
82	I will not support this overall plan because of the inclusion of the statement re park and ride. I cannot support the inclusion of the reserve sites at Hagpits because of the disruption during build of SON 6 and Hagpits and the impact of additional traffic to Kennylands Road.	AN – ‘Park & ride’ proposal has been withdrawn. AN – see Policy HP1 on traffic management.
126	The Government has put this as necessary to increase housing. The need for low cost housing should be at the top of this plan and new development of the village. The need for housing for Sonning Common people should also be considered. Those that have lived in the village for longer than 10-15 years should be a priority as those who have been born locally. The infilling of expensive houses should definitely be considered in the numbers. The amount of building in back gardens should be halted. I notice that the owners of the land that will be considered consist of Builders who have built Large Executive Expensive houses. HOW MUCH WILL BE PAID TO THEM. It looks as though with all these developments Sonning Common will lose that village feel. As a nurse I already know that hospitals are not large enough to take the increase in patient load. The Health Centre will get too big. As it has increased over the years it has still kept that local Doctor feel. If it gets too big with the increase in number of patients it will lose that personal feeling. It has an incredible service with appointment times. The large practices in Reading show what happens to appointment choices. Some have to wait over 2 weeks for an appointment it would be awful if our award winning practice goes the same way. Traffic is also a problem which will increase as most homes have 2 cars especially as young people cannot afford to move away from home. Housing for this group of people should be considered. The other consideration should be will Reading take over and Sonning Common becomes part of Berkshire.	NAN – affordable and smaller homes are key considerations in Policy H2. NAN – infill/backland development is outside the remit of NDP. NAN/OSP – medical considerations are beyond the remit of NDP.
154	As long as education, health, environment and other essential services are developed in proportion to the increase in the population of the village.	NAN/OSP
719	I do however think that to swing away from sites closer to the Reading boundary is a little paranoid. There is a good deal of land between Sonning Common and Reading and reducing that gap isn't really a big deal and might help allocation. The other comment to make is that there should be better public transport provided to the outlying towns i.e. Reading and Henley with a bigger spread of hours than at present.	NAN

Question 9 - Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
235	I would like to thank the NDP committee for all the thought and hard work they have put into developing the plan and the extensive consultation with the villagers. Thank you so much!	NAN
359	The cynical side of me feels our NDP might end up being an exercise in futility because commercial opinion seems to hold more weight in these situations than ethical or indeed the aesthetic. In addition to my comments above, I should also like to emphasise the need for implementation of high speed broadband, a need to retain/expand the current bus service to Reading and strongly express to OCC Highways Dept the irrefutable need for investment in the roads in Sonning Common.	NAN/OSP
401	The small group of volunteers on the working party rightly deserve our thanks and appreciation for what they are doing for the village. Where would we end up without an NDP? I dread to think. I've one question. How safe is it to think that the site of Kennylands Gymnastics can be maintained as a recreational facility, I've seen no mention of it.	AN – the wish of the SCNDP is to retain SON 8 as a recreational facility but it is a SHLAA site put forward for homes and the existing covenant is still to be tested.
799f	My family has always been in the village and my son is trying to get housing to stay but with the house prices in the village it is near impossible for him or me to get housing. If it wasn't for Mum and Dad we wouldn't be able to stay in the village. I hope this will help us to stay and get places of our own.	NAN
64	With the caveats outlined above.	NAN
430	Yes - but am concerned that the major objective of most developers is to maximise their profit margin with little concern for the overall built environment.	NAN
312	Need to review distribution.	NAN
800	Since our hands are tied by Government to the no. of houses needed, this Development Plan is the best proposal and congratulations to those who have worked so hard on it for so long.	NAN
376	I wonder whether a greater proportion could have been set aside for self builders.	NAN
364	I believe that the Development Plan is excellent in its concept.	NAN
551	The number of houses suggested for SON 9 is excessive and should be more like the suggested size put forward originally by the SCNDP.	NAN
811f	All accept the reduction in size of Chiltern Edge school playing fields to sell off for housing. I went to Chiltern Edge school and hope my children will do in the future. I think it is vital to keep the school grounds for the future generations and not create irreversible issues from the reduction in the school playing field size. I think it is vital children have enough space to play these days be it rugby, football, cross country. Its in the papers daily about child obesity etc... so why should we reduce the school field size just to meet a housing requirement. Surely with the increased number of houses in Sonning Common from this housing development plan we should be INCREASING the schools playing field size due to the increase of children expected?	NAN – SON 15a is a SHLAA site, outside the AONB, which the SCNDP is obliged to consider as part of the overall Plan.
812f	SON 2 should include some housing. SON 15a should have less housing but more community use. Village centre and traffic movements/calming need to be dealt with in more detail to give the retail more confidence that the final shape of the village is viable. Please see also my further comments attached.	NAN/OSP

Appendix 6b: Public consultation (2)

Question 1 – Do you think the revised policies are now about right for Sonning Common?

Yes	No	No response
20	1	2
87%	4%	9%

Question 2 – What are your views on the changes? Do they now meet the community's requirements?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
808	This village cannot sustain the amount of development. Traffic is a nightmare - too much and too fast. It is chaotic in the village centre - impossible to cross the road safely, vehicles parked all over the place etc. I suggest a review is made immediately. This once tranquil and pleasant village is being systematically ruined. This will be the legacy of SCNDP.	NAN/OSP – numbers of new homes are national/district policy requirements. Once the Plan has passed referendum, residents commenting on traffic issues will be approached to form a task group and work with the parish council on these challenges.
26	Please see my comment under Q3 and the comment under Overall View.	NAN
775	Yes	NAN
5	The changes are sensible and meet community requirements. More emphasis could be placed on an enhanced bus service to Henley on Thames and, ideally to Oxford. Consideration should be given to enlarging the primary school and to a traffic management system in Grove Road.	NAN/OSP – most of the suggestions are outside the scope of the Plan but after the referendum residents who have commented on transport issues will be approached to form a task group and work with the parish council on these areas.
197	Given the pressures on housing, particularly in The South East, the policy framework developed through the Parish Council is critical to preserving our environment whilst providing the additional housing required. The proposed NDP meets both of these objectives.	NAN
282	Yes.	NAN
281	Mostly meet the communities' requirements.	NAN
66	Yes. Very thorough consideration of all issues involved and appropriate solutions envisaged.	NAN

Question 2 – What are your views on the changes? Do they now meet the community's requirements?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
781	I think the plan has been very well thought through and is right for the village moving forward.	NAN
86	The previous recommendation on the number of homes on SON 9 (Lea Meadow) was 47 houses. Given that a planning application in 2013/2014 for 55 homes was rejected, I am surprised that the current recommendation has been increased to 60 homes. This is too many in my estimate, and I can only assume that the pressure from the current application forced this decision. Comparing the most recent application and the previous one, homes look smaller and more closely spaced with less open feel to them, which is only to be expected with another 10 homes in the planning. In any case, I would like to see the number reduced again, or a subsequent application for less homes approved over the maximum number in the recommendation.	NAN – the current density of 60 homes is cognisant of the important setting of the adjacent AONB within the context of SODC's requirement of a minimum 25dph.
325	All new developments must reflect the character of Sonning Common and yes, I think the changes reflect this.	NAN
108	Agreed.	NAN
4	Yes.	NAN
513	Most policy changes are sound although I disagree with the allocation and potential destruction of AONB land. See below.	NAN – see below
107	Agreed.	NAN
623	Yes. With respect to removal of policies, I am pleased to see that Park and Ride has been removed.	NAN
471	Overall the changes would seems to meet the objectives (Table 2.1). General development density at 20-25 per ha is satisfactory but there is a strong need to continue additional backland development elsewhere in the village (schedule 3). Community requirements also seems to have been well considered.	NAN

Question 3 – Do you support these allocations?

In considering this section, it is important to understand that although a minimum of 138 new homes have been allocated to Sonning Common the Plan is making provision for up to 195 new homes. This is to accommodate the potential extra homes to come from the SHMA (Strategic Housing Market Assessment). The changes and additions to our sites and homes' allocations are marked with an asterisk. *

Q3: Site Allocation and designations											
Do you support these allocations?											
Number of responses: 21 of 23											
Allocated Sites	Decision	Strongly agree		Agree		No strong views		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
SON 2/3	Housing	8	38%	11	52%	1	5%	0	0%	1	5%
Bishopswood Middle Field	50 homes	7	33%	10	48%	3	14%	1	5%	0	0%
Memorial Hall Field	Recreation	10	48%	9	43%	0	0%	1	5%	1	5%
SON 15a	Housing	7	33%	10	48%	0	0%	2	10%	2	10%
Chiltern Edge Top*	37 homes	7	33%	10	48%	0	0%	3	14%	1	5%
SON 5	Housing	7	33%	10	48%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%
Kennylands Paddock*	up to 22 homes	6	29%	10	48%	3	14%	1	5%	1	5%
SON 6	Housing	10	48%	9	43%	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%
Kennylands Infill	26 homes	9	43%	9	43%	1	5%	1	5%	1	5%
SON 9	Housing	9	43%	11	52%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%
Lea Meadow	60 homes	11	52%	8	38%	0	0%	1	5%	1	5%

Q3: Site Allocation and designations													
Do you support these decisions?		Number of responses: 21 of 23											
Reserve Sites	Decision	Strongly agree		Agree		No strong views		Disagree		Strongly disagree		No Response	
SON 7 Hagpits House	Housing	7	33%	8	38%	4	19%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%
	25 homes	7	33%	8	38%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%
SON 7a Hagpits Orchard	Housing	7	33%	7	33%	4	19%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%
	5 homes	7	33%	7	33%	5	24%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%
SON 8 Kennylands Gymnastics*	Housing	3	14%	7	33%	6	29%	3	14%	1	5%	1	5%
Phase 1	4 homes	3	14%	7	33%	6	29%	3	14%	1	5%	1	5%
Phase 2	10 homes	4	19%	7	33%	4	19%	4	19%	1	5%	1	5%

Question 3 – Do you support these allocations?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
808	This village cannot sustain such a huge increase in its population. A rethink about the whole housing problem is required. This may mean the creation of new villages, more building on brown sites in towns where office blocks lie empty, incentives for people to move away from these densely populated areas. I also think that housing should not be left to developers to plan but should be based on suitable housing NOT on profit for individual developers.	NAN – the SCNDP has to conform to the strategic policies of the (district's) Local Plan. The SCNDP working party did urge residents to respond to SODC's public consultation on its proposed Local Plan which looked at housing alternatives. Housing mix in the Plan is based on the needs of Sonning Common. If the Plan passes examination and referendum developers will need to respect the mix.
26	There is an identified deficit of recreational land in Sonning Common yet the draft plan is proposing the gymnasium land (SON 8), which is covenanted for 'use as open space for recreational and amenity purposes', is developed for housing. With regard to SON 8, it would appear from Page 116 of the Draft Plan that the plan is being used to support a private business. The validity of this should be questioned but if it is appropriate for a Development Plan to be used in this way then any development of SON 8 should result in a contribution to our community in recompense for the loss of the restrictive covenant and open space. As there are 26 bungalows and 16 apartments in Essex Way all designated for the over 50s, Phase 1 and Phase 2 should be more specific in detailing the type of dwellings (1 or 2 bedroom, cottage style bungalows for the over 50s) to maintain the ethos of Essex Way.	NAN – this is a registered non-AONB site and the Plan is required by SODC to include all such sites. Covenant restrictions will be considered by SODC at the time of any planning application. Single storey housing has been proposed – HS6 page 120.
775	An enormous amount of time and effort has been spent on this - congratulations.	NAN
5	House numbers, in general, are too low for the areas of land. Higher density would be much more efficient.	NAN – due regard given to the sensitivity of adjacent AONB on some sites as required by national policy.
197	Given the uncertainties regarding exactly how many houses will be required it is important that we view the reserve sites as likely to be developed. Hagpits House is favoured because it offers the largest share of the reserve and hopefully will meet this need. The Gymnasium already provides much needed recreational facilities for the village. Therefore, I would not support a change of use unless it is retained as part of the plans for Memorial Field.	NAN – policy HS6 takes into account that recreational facilities on SON 3 may impact on the sustainability of Kennylands Gymnastic.s.
282	Son 8 would ideally be bungalows to match the surrounding properties.	NAN – see Policy HS6 page 120.
281	Consider difficulties in accessing Son 8, as it is a narrow single track with potentially dangerous bend and needs to cross Millennium field. Cannot understand how the gym will function if there are contractor's vehicles on the car parking area. If the site must be used single storey housing would be most appropriate.	NAN - considerable traffic flow currently navigates this access road. Single storey homes are proposed – HS6 page 120.

Question 3 – Do you support these allocations?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
86	SON 8, if it does get planning permission and the current problems with the access lane can be resolved, may also be a good candidate for Self-building plots, which may in turn serve to prevent the occurrence of identikit houses and allow some diversity and variation in housing.	NAN – single storey homes are proposed. Policy HS6 page 120.
325	I agree with the NDP recommendations.	NAN
513	<p>My concerns are around the loss of the school field and the plans for the recreational area on SON3.</p> <p>Firstly SON15a: This proposed site is used on a daily basis by the children in the school. Not the AONB area but the field that is being included in this plan. Not only would it be a tragedy to lose forever the green playing area for the children of the school but the plan requires the loss of the tennis courts and therefore the building of more all-weather playing facilities/areas. The only land these areas could occupy are AONB. Therefore, the plans involve building on green space then tarmacing more green space to account for other losses. This seems ridiculous, short sighted and damaging for the village environment as well as the well being of the young people in the school.</p> <p>Regarding SON3 I completely agree that the village needs a recreational area and SON3 could fit the bill but the ideas put forward to build a 100 space car-park and large covered sports hall seem to be completely unnecessary and would destroy the look and feel of the AONB. Rarely have I seen an attractive car park and never a lovely looking sports hall. Can the plans not be simplified and made more realistic for the village and surroundings?</p>	NAN – SON 15a is a non-AONB SHLAA site and the Plan is required to include such sites. The school is in need of capital investment and development would provide the funds for refurbishment. Housing could provide homes for staff and future pupils thus helping to increase the viability of the school. The SON 3 car park is reduced to 60 spaces. Plans will need to be adapted within a realistic budget.
623	<p>SON 8</p> <p>This is a recreational site, which has a restrictive covenant in place (31 March 1983, Title No. ON89504). This says 'the site shall not at any time hereafter be used otherwise than as open space for recreational and amenity purposes.' On 10 Sep 2015, this position was challenged because we were informed in a public NDP meeting that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The owner wants to build on the site. 2. SODC and CCB have told NDP that all non-AONB SHLAA sites need to be considered in the plan before AONB sites are considered. 3. SODC was party to the covenant. A resident raised this with SODC and was told that it is the responsibility of the NDP to allocate sites - with the AONB/non-AONB issue in mind, this abrogation of responsibility by SODC puts the NDP in an impossible position. 4. So when is a covenant not a covenant? Residents are confused and angry by the apparent stance of SODC which leaves the NDP and residents between a rock and a hard place. <p>SON 9</p> <p>I have serious security and privacy/nuisance concerns about the proposed footpath and cycle route running from Peppard Road to Kennylands Road which will be open to ANY user - not just residents of SON 9. As proposed, this will seriously - and unnecessarily - impact residents in Bird Wood Court and Essex Way. I have raised this formally already.</p>	<p>NAN – SODC has advised that the restrictions of the covenant will be considered when a planning application is submitted. Meanwhile as a non-AONB SHLAA site the Plan is required to include SON 8.</p> <p>NAN – see policy HS7 page 125. Security/privacy concerns are recognised within the site policy.</p>
471	Clearly alternative areas need to be identified in the event that allocated sites were not available. The choice of the above sites is reasonable but 10 houses on SON 8 seems an over development when presumably it is expected that the gym will continue to function.	NAN – Phase 2 – 10 homes takes place in the event that recreational plans for SON 3 render Kennylands Gymnastics unsustainable.

Question 3 – Do you support these allocations?

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
814f	<p><u>Son7/7a or Son 6</u></p> <p>I propose that Son7/7a are allocated for development within the plan and Son 6 is held in reserve. The advantages of including Son7/7a in the current plan rather than Son 6 are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Son7/7a site is already used for residential purposes and is self-contained and surrounded by a natural border therefore its development will not materially adversely impact on the neighbor's adjoining this site unlike Son 6 2. The Son7/7a site is not adjacent to an area of outstanding natural beauty and will not be visible from the area of outstanding natural beauty. 3. The development of Son 6 will have an adverse impact on the prolific wildlife that inhabits this area. 4. The development of Son 6 will have an adverse impact on the enjoyment of this area by many local people who use the footpath through the field throughout the year on a daily basis for recreational purposes. 5. Development of Son 7/7a will not impact on the local look and feel of Sonning Common as it will be screened behind the existing hedgerow and will have minimal visual impact from Kennylands Road. <p><u>Son 6</u></p> <p>If Son 6 is developed, I would argue strongly in favour of a development that maintains the existing pattern of development i.e. infill housing with driveways exiting directly onto Kennylands Road. The advantages are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This would be in keeping with the current pattern of housing 2. Each of the new house would have more privacy and a larger garden 3. This would remove the need for a service road within the development resulting in a lower environmental impact by both increasing the ground surface area remaining available for natural drainage and reducing the construction materials used 4. This will also have aesthetic value by providing more space for off street parking and maintaining the traffic flow along Kennylands Road. 5. There will be easier access to the houses for emergency and council services. <p>I note that there will still be hedgerow on the opposite side of Kennylands Road as is the case currently with existing housing on Kennylands Road.</p>	<p>NAN – the owners of SON 7/7a have requested it be held as a reserve site.</p> <p>NAN – SON 6 is a non-AONB SHLAA site allocated for 26 homes and is deliverable now. The tree line alongside Kennylands Road forms an important part of the look and environment of the village. Plotland development is therefore not possible and the requisite density together with the housing mix, mean that more than 11 homes (eg 56-80) are required.</p>

Question 4 – Do you think the proposed delivery strategy and planning policies are what is required for Sonning Common?

Yes	No	No response
20	1	2
87%	4%	9%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
808	See previous comments	NAN
26	I fully support the introduction of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.	NAN
775	Yes.	NAN
5	House numbers, in general, are too low for the areas of land. Higher density would be much more efficient.	NAN – see response to Q3.
197	Yes emphatically.	NAN
282	Yes.	NAN
688	Yes.	NAN
281	Yes.	NAN
66	Yes.	NAN
781	Yes.	NAN
86	Yes.	NAN
325	Yes. I would hope that SODC Planning adheres to our recommendations.	NAN
108	Yes.	NAN
4	Yes.	NAN
513	Yes.	NAN
77	Yes.	NAN
311	Yes.	NAN
107	Yes.	NAN
623	I am pleased to see the proposals on traffic management during the construction phase given the current chaos in Wood Lane with just a few infill houses. I support both delivery strategy and planning policies for the village.	NAN
471	They appear to be comprehensive. Re cars and parking Policies the levels of car ownership, traffic management (especially in village centre) and public parking are a real cause for concern. There is a vital need for serious planning and subsequent enforcement. It is noted that liaison with service industries (water supplies, drainage and flooding are also included).	NAN – after the Plan passes referendum, residents who have expressed concern over traffic issues will be approached to work as a task group with the parish council.

Overall view on the revised Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	No Strong View	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No response
2	14	1	4	0	2
9%	61%	4%	17%	0%	9%

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
808	I feel we are being bullied into a disastrous deterioration of our village through overcrowding a small community. A proposed increase in the population of nearly 25% in an already densely populated village will impact very negatively on everyday life in terms of services traffic and tempers. A huge mistake!	NAN/OSP – national and district policies require the larger villages of South Oxfordshire, of which Sonning Common is one, to accommodate new homes. This has been the case since 2011 and is the starting point for the neighbourhood plan.
26	Although I support the Draft Plan in general, I am dissatisfied with the revised plan for two reasons: 1. The change in status of SON 8. 2. The SCNDP aspires to have a modern community sports hall but although Sonning Common has a significantly larger elderly population there is nothing outlined for any special recreational facility for the older residents.	NAN – nothing in the Plan suggests that the recreational facility proposed for SON 3 would not meet the needs of the older resident.
775	Satisfied.	NAN
5	Generally good but excessively verbose and repetitive. e.g the restrictions proposed in the box for SON 15a page 98 are repeated for SON 5 page 104, SON 6 page 108 and SON 7 page 114. The whole document should be edited down by about half. I fear that the assessor will be annoyed with the verbosity and therefore less likely to approve the plan. There should be a one or two page summary. However I do appreciate the enormous amount of work put in by the committee, all of whom are volunteers.	NAN
197	The NDP team at the Parish Council have put an extraordinary amount of effort into this plan. It is a complete and appropriate document and one the Government should implement in full. If they choose to carry out other ad hoc actions - because they are expedient, it will bring into high relief the need for Parish Councils. It must be supported in full as it will represent the wishes of the Community (the Big Society – who remembers that?). My concerns can clearly be seen in the general planning process where it appears that as long as no rules are actually broken you will be permitted to build against the wishes of the Parish Council and SODC.	NAN
282	Very satisfied.	NAN
688	Satisfied.	NAN
281	I would like to see this plan approved as soon as possible to prevent any more development outside the NDP.	NAN
66	A brilliant and all-encompassing study of the village and its needs with appropriate recommendations to preserve what is valued while meeting the requirements of its future expansion. Villagers are indebted to the team who have worked so productively over four years on their behalf.	NAN
781	Satisfied.	NAN
86	Satisfied.	NAN
325	Many hours of very hard work have been put into the publication of the Sonning Common NDP and the Team should be congratulated on their efforts.	NAN
108	Satisfied.	NAN

Overall view on the revised Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Respondent	Comment	Plan response
4	Satisfied.	NAN
513	<p>I understand both the need for a neighbourhood development plan and the significant effort involved in developing one. I also see that in Sonning Common there are not that many sites to choose from the develop the plan. However, I find the loss of green space and AONB land involved in the current plan difficult to support.</p> <p>Further, the plan continues to ask people to vote on a site that is not yet eligible to be included (15A) as the school has not been granted permission to sell the field by the DfE. Their application process has been underway for over 18 months and still not even submitted to the DfE. Not enough of this uncertainty has been made in the plan and I don't believe people understand the likelihood of the use of reserve sites</p>	<p>NAN</p> <p>NAN – the school submitted its application some time ago and is awaiting a decision from the DfE.</p>
77	Satisfied.	NAN
311	“No strong view” is strange term for what I assume is the middle ground. I’m neither Satisfied (there are some proposals that I do not agree with – building on SON 6; traffic calming on Grove Road), but there is enough that’s good to prevent me being Dissatisfied.	NAN
107	Satisfied.	NAN
623	I have attended almost every public NDP meeting. I consider this to be is a well thought through Plan which has tried to accommodate, as far as it is permitted to do, the comments and suggestions which I have heard residents raise at these meetings. My principal reservation is the allocation of SON 8 for housing.	NAN
67	Extra parking areas in the village centre should be a priority.	NAN
471	Very little other comment to make. The requirements under the Governments housing strategy/policy need to be met. Clearly much time and effort has been put into this NDP to provide a balanced future policy.	NAN

Appendix 7: Comments - statutory and other

Collation

Comments received and recorded include those from statutory consultees, also landowners, developers and planning consultants involved with individual SHLAA sites, and other interested parties.

Following substantial revisions to the February 2015 Pre-submission draft Plan, a 6 week public consultation period commenced 23 October 2015 for consideration of the rewritten Plan.

To differentiate the responses to the two draft Pre-submission Plans, Appendix 7a includes comments received with regard to the first draft and Appendix 7b in respect of the second draft.

Plan response

The majority of consultee comments relate to specific policies and to this end the Plan response column indicates whether revisions have been made and where an amendment has been incorporated a brief description is provided. In all cases the relevant pages and/or policy numbers are referenced.

Appendix 7a: Public consultation (1)

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) – Part 1	Policy HER1 page 67	The requirement of Policy HER1 for all future development to conserve and enhance features of historic interest conflicts with national policy (Section 12 – NPPF).	page 67 Policy HER1 Submission version of the Plan will be amended.
SODC	Policy HS1 page 81	As identified, natural surveillance of the recreation land is important. However, this will only be provided by allowing houses on SON 2 to face onto the recreation space.	page 95 Policy HS1 revised to include: Layout and design Homes built on SON 2 that are adjacent to SON 3 along the south western boundary could provide natural surveillance of the recreation land.
SODC	Site Policy – Kidby's Yard page 102	You are unable to restrict the intensified use of the site to Class B1 (business) and SODC would be unable to resist a change of use to C3 (dwelling houses) or B8 use if the proposal met the criteria and passed prior approval.	Now Policy EMP1 page 126 – Policy EMP1 rewritten and takes account of advice on specific aspects, including: Proposed scope: Existing and new or intensified employment use on this site should be of Use Class B1 (business) unless permitted development allows otherwise. Planning applications made for a change of use to B2, B8 or C3 uses should not be permitted. Prior to any planning application for development of the extension area a Design Brief must be produced setting out the principles for development. This Brief must be discussed and agreed with Sonning Common Parish Council within a reasonable time prior to being submitted as part of any planning application.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Site Policy – Kidby's Yard page 102	A number of the requirements set out in the 'further considerations' and 'design brief' sections are over onerous, unreasonable and unenforceable.	Sections of the Design Brief and further considerations have been removed and replaced. Suggested reference to retail not included as additional retail requirement to be located at The Herb Farm which is currently a retail site.
SODC	Site Policy – Herb Farm	Remove section of policy regarding the 'proposed scope' for intensified use and replace with etc.	Landowner demanded that The Herb Farm employment site policy be removed from the Plan. This has been done.
SODC – Part 2	Objective SCDS4 page 29	This is a requirement of a neighbourhood plan rather than an objective. From the date the <u>Deregulation Bill 2015</u> is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. The neighbourhood plan can, therefore, no longer deliver this objective.	SCDS4: To be in general conformity with the strategic aspects of SODC's Core Strategy and to accept and provide for delivery of development allocations from it, whilst seeking to make good current and emerging deficits of community provision within the village. Above objective removed from the Plan in line with advice.
SODC	Development potential page 34	There is no explanation or justification set out in the plan or your evidence base for why the number of homes identified for the allocated sites are appropriate.	page 36 Table 2.2 sets out the detail.
SODC	Development potential – Tests page 35	This section sets out a summary of your more detailed explanation/justification for developing site SON 2/3 set out in your 'request to the Chilterns Conservation Board'. You need to ensure that the reader is aware that there is a more detailed explanation/justification that supports the plan.	page 37 Following explanation added: A submission has been made to The Chilterns Conservation Board to present the SCNDWP case for the development of SON 2/3. This background paper can be found on the website www.scpn-ndp.co.uk .

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Spatial strategy – paragraph 2 page 36	This text implies that the ‘settlement boundary’ already exists by making reference to the ‘partial move’ of the boundary etc. The ‘settlement boundary’ does not already exist and the spatial strategy needs to provide a stronger justification/explanation setting out why the specific ‘settlement boundary’ identified has been chosen.	page 38 First paragraph rewritten as below: The spatial strategy is our concept for coherent development, providing for a clear, natural boundary between the village and the AONB countryside. The key principle for the spatial strategy is to maintain the separate village of Sonning Common within the AONB landscape. In order to maintain its discrete nature and to preserve its setting, the ‘gaps between villages’ policy is fundamental to the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Detail appertaining to the individual site policies follows in Part Four.
SODC	Development Strategy Policies Policy DS1 pages 40, 41 & 42	SODC does not support a ‘settlement boundary’ approach to directing development. It is very inflexible and can stop sustainable development coming forward. Notwithstanding this, this approach, at present, does not conflict with National or District-wide strategic policy. There is reference to the Chilterns Conservation Board giving you guidance regarding the AONB and a landscape assessment but no explanation on how these have shaped your designated boundary.	page 38 First paragraph rewritten as above. pages 44 and 45 Policy DS1 and Map 3.1 revised to reflect ‘gaps between villages’ approach. page 37 Explanation added as noted previously.
SODC	Tables 3.1 & 3.2 & Policy H2 pages 43 and 44	The Development Management Officer has commented that the housing mix set out in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 and supported by Policy H2 is unrealistic, too prescriptive and will undermine housing delivery. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment requires 35% of housing to be 1 or 2 bedroom. Our current Housing Needs Assessment requires 50% of housing to be 1 or 2 bedroom and we rarely achieve this. This policy will raise the community’s expectations unnecessarily and will cause tension with the District Council when the policy cannot be achieved.	page 51 Policy H2 not removed but modified in consultation with SODC so as to reflect the findings of the ORCC report and have regard also to Census 2011 data.
SODC	Policy VC2b page 51	To ensure that Policy VC2b is effective you will need to ensure that any proposed ‘park and ride’ facilities are in an appropriate location to link to the existing bus service rather than simply being close to the existing route.	Policy subsequently removed following strong opposition to ‘park and ride’ from residents.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Policy EE2 - Employment sites page 53	'Employment use' generally includes only the 'B class uses' (B1 – Business, B2 – General industrial and B8 – Storage or distribution). However, the majority of the existing uses on the Herb Farm site are retail uses, which fall under the 'A class uses' of the Use Class Order. Define what is meant by 'employment use' in this policy in terms of acceptable uses on the Herb Farm site and the Kidby's Yard site.	<p>page 62 – recommended changes include:</p> <p>Rewording of Policy EE2:</p> <p>This plan designates the site identified in Map 3.4 as one which should remain in employment use. Applications to intensify and extend the use of this site will be permitted and supported. Proposals to change the use of this site to non-employment uses will not be permitted.</p> <p>However, landowner demanded that The Herb Farm employment site policy be removed from the Plan. This has been done.</p>
SODC	Policy CSH1a	In the supporting text on page 54 it is stated that any replacement library building should be on the primary school site.	<p>page 64 – policy revised</p> <p>Policy CSH1a</p> <p>The parish council by working with Oxfordshire County Council would welcome applications for a new library building and/or applications that would resource the provision of a new library building on the existing primary school site.</p>
SODC	Policy CSH2	The second part of this policy provides an explanation of why providing land for identified shortfalls in sports pitches and facilities is important. Include as part of supporting text rather than in the policy.	<p>Page 67</p> <p>Policy CSH2: Land for recreation duly revised.</p>
SODC	Sport and recreation – supporting text page 57	<p>A Local Needs Survey recently prepared by our leisure consultants, Nortoft, shows the following deficiencies in the ward of Sonning Common:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • amenity green space – 3.26ha • community sports hall – 30m x 30m without a full height roof • floodlit AGP – 60m x 40m • full sized floodlit MUGA/tennis facility • senior 9-strip cricket pitch (111.58m x 115.84) with exclusive use for cricket • a mix of youth and mini football pitches • space for other activities (e.g. fitness trail/outdoor gym) • sufficient parking for all necessary community use 	<p>page 67</p> <p>Supporting text to Policy CSH2 rewritten to include the list of deficiencies outlined in the Sonning Common Local Needs Report, June 2015 by Nortoft.</p>

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Policy MRP3: Shared-use scheme page 60	Policy VC2a already encourages shared-use schemes and more efficient use of parking around the village centre.	<p>page 59</p> <p>Policy VC2 rewritten and incorporates 'shared-use' schemes.</p> <p>page 71</p> <p>Policy MRP3 rewritten and excludes references to 'shared-use' schemes.</p>
SODC	Parking provision on development sites – Table 3.3 & Policy MRP4 page 60	Oxfordshire County Council have commented - "We consider that the parking standards in Appendix 3 are excessively high. While we acknowledge the reasons for the standards stated in the draft Plan, such standards may give rise to unviable development that is land intensive."	<p>Now Policy MRP3</p> <p>page 71 – Policy MRP3 modified in light of OCC advice.</p> <p>Applications for new residential developments should provide the parking provision per dwelling as detailed in Table 3.10 (page 72).</p> <p>The parking standards for 'sensitive areas' apply to the following highways within the designated neighbourhood area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peppard Road (B481) from Bird Wood Court to The Herb Farm. • Kennylands Road from Kidby's Yard to 80 Kennylands Road. • Reade's Lane from Kidmore End Memorial Hall to 26 Reade's Lane.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Policy ENV1a: Protecting the AONB page 63	The NPPF requires that protected landscapes, including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are conserved and enhanced. This requirement is affirmed in the Core Strategy. This need not be repeated in the neighbourhood plan. Also, the last paragraph of the policy needs to be clarified.	<p>page 75</p> <p>Policy ENV1 revised to exclude the opening sentence, “To conserve and enhance the land designated as AONB.”</p> <p>Last paragraph clarified as follows: Where developments are on the edge of the AONB, opportunities must be taken to improve degraded landscapes, access to the countryside and to lessen the impact on the setting of the new homes alongside the AONB.</p>
SODC	Policy ENV2: Environment – Landscape setting page 64	It will be difficult to define where a site borders the ‘landscape setting’. Policies need to be a clear enough to allow a single interpretation.	<p>page 76</p> <p>Policy ENV2 rewritten as advised.</p>
SODC	Policy ENV2c: Maintenance of common areas including buffers page 64	<p>It would be good to clarify that this requirement should happen as part of the application process, before permission is granted.</p> <p>The second part of the policy regarding the ownership being passed to the Parish Council and there being a levy on properties is not a requirement. This should be removed from the policy and replaced in the supporting text.</p>	<p>page 76</p> <p>Policy ENV2c rewritten as advised.</p>
SODC	ENV3a - Supporting text page 66	The justification for designating SON1 as a Local Green Space includes an explanation of how cherished and important Old Copse wood is to residents but less of an explanation as to why SON1 is special to the community and holds local significance.	<p>Policy ENV3a removed.</p> <p>pages 87 and 88 SON 1 – Old Copse Field - supporting text expanded.</p>
SODC	Policy HER1: Heritage page 67	You will only be able to seek developers’ contributions by Section 106 agreement for historic features where a development directly impacts on those historic features.	<p>page 79</p> <p>Submission version of the Plan will be amended.</p>
SODC	Policy CSH4: Lifetime Standards page 69	This policy does not belong in this section of the plan. Taking account of mobility access in the village centre would sit better in Policy VC2a.	<p>Policy CSH4 removed.</p> <p>page 59</p> <p>Policy VC2: rewritten and incorporates mobility access in the village centre.</p>

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Policy MRP1 page 69	For this policy to be taken forward it needs to be clear who will be responsible for working with the Reading Bus Company.	page 81 Policy MRP1 now reads: The parish council will work with Reading Bus Company to retain the bus service in its current form, both its regularity and route, and with Oxfordshire County Council to retain the Whites coach to Henley.
SODC	Policy MRP2b page 70	For this policy to be taken forward it needs to be clear who will be responsible for working with OCC and SODC.	page 82 Policy MRP2b now reads: The parish council by working with Oxfordshire County Council and South Oxfordshire District Council, would welcome the following measures which are considered necessary given developments in Sonning Common.
SODC	Policy DE2 page 71	This policy does not belong in this section of the plan. It would fit better in the Delivery section and would be far more effective if it included a list of projects and initiatives that the Parish Council were planning to spend CIL monies on.	page 135 Policy DE2 moved to Part 5: Delivery and rewritten as recommended to include a list of investment needs in the supporting text.
SODC	Policies HS1 to HS5 pages 81-101	To strengthen the site specific policies and ensure that they are as effective as possible you need to set out the mechanism for approving the Design Brief, e.g. agreed by Parish Council.	pages 94-126 Design Brief paragraph rewritten as advised in each of the following policies: Policies HS1-HS7 and EMP1 Prior to any planning application for development of the site a Design Brief must be produced setting out the principles for development. The Brief must be discussed and agreed with Sonning Common Parish Council within a reasonable time prior to being submitted as part of any planning application. More information about this protocol can be found at the end of Part Four. The Brief must include the requirements set out at Policy D1a/1b/1c and ENV 1/2/2a/2b/2c/and 3. The proposal set out in the planning application must be in accordance with the agreed Brief.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Policy HS1 Page 80	The Council's Landscape Capacity Assessment considers this site to have an overall medium landscape sensitivity and a medium to low landscape capacity. It recommends that only a reduced area (up to 50%) should be considered for development on landscape and visual grounds. Whereas the outline Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment undertaken by Potterton Associates Ltd concludes there to be no apparent reason why this site should not be developed.	Differing conclusions reached by SODC and Potterton Associates in their respective assessments are noted. pages 94 and 95 Policy HS1 revised and takes account of advice on specific aspects.
SODC	SON 15a Chiltern Edge Top – supporting text page 82 Policy HS2 page 84	There is no reason that this site cannot be fully allocated provided there are enough sites/reserve sites to meet the Core Strategy allocation (138 dwellings) if the school site did not come forward.	SON 15a is now included as an allocated site. pages 98 and 99 Policy HS2 rewritten and takes account of advice on specific aspects.
SODC	Policy HS4 page 92-97	The Council's Tree Officer has made the following comment "Significant trees on this site should be retained as dominant landscape features that will enhance the development. This could affect the density achieved on this site. Any proposals should be well integrated and sit within the existing landscape." Given the Tree Officer's comments, the Council is concerned that the number of homes allocated for the site (30 homes at 20dph) may be unrealistic.	Now Policy HS5 pages 114 and 115 Policy HS5 comments on density noted. Policy HS5 amended and takes account of advice on specific aspects.
SODC	Policy HS5 page 100 and 101	The fourth bullet point requires a lateral screening woodland belt midway up the rising site. For reasons of clarity this needs to be shown on a map. The fifth bullet requires publicly accessible green space and structured play areas to be provided in the western corner of the site adjacent to the Saxon Maze. The edge of residential developments are generally poor locations for green space as they are often less accessible and poorly overlooked compared to central green spaces. The sixth bullet point requires sustainable urban drainage (SUDs) to be installed in the lower part of the site adjacent to Bird Wood Court. What is the justification for locating the SUDs there? The final bullet point requires a 5m buffer zone to be provided to respect the privacy of existing properties in Bird Wood Court. Policy D4 of the Local Plan 2011 protects the privacy of neighbouring properties by not permitting development that would unacceptably harm the amenity of neighbouring properties	Now Policy HS7 pages 124 and 125 Policy HS7 rewritten and takes account of advice on specific aspects.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Site Policy – Kidby's Yard pages 102 and 103	<p>Throughout the policy you refer to the 'lower part of the site' and the 'upper part of the site'. Do these references relate as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower part of the site = existing yard • Upper part of the site = extension area <p>For reasons of clarity, if the above is correct, you should refer to these areas as the 'existing yard' and 'extension area'.</p>	<p>Now Policy EMP1</p> <p>page 126 – Policy EMP1 rewritten and takes account of advice on specific aspects.</p>
SODC	Site Policy – Herb Farm pages 104 and 105	For reasons of clarity and ease of use, this policy needs a reference number similar to your other sites.	Landowner demanded that The Herb Farm employment site policy be removed from the Plan. This has been done.
SODC	Part Five: Delivery – Priority/phasing policy for contingency sites page 106	There is reference to the Working Party wishing to set out a specified order for the contingency sites – what is the reasoning/justification for this?	<p>pages 133 and 134</p> <p>Part 5: Delivery rewritten.</p> <p>Robust justification has been provided for the phasing of all sites due to serious concerns about contractors' vehicles on key through roads.</p>
SODC	Policy H1a page 106	For reasons of clarity refer to your site allocation policy (HA1a) in this policy.	<p>page 132</p> <p>Policy H1 – replaces policy H1a and reads as follows:</p> <p>Planning permission will be granted for 138 homes to meet the Core Strategy allocation with a further number of houses for the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, to be distributed across the sites as shown in the tables below.</p>
SODC	Policies H1b, H1c and H1d pages 106 and 107	The NPPF requires policies to be clear on what will or will not be permitted and where etc.	All three policies have been revised.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Part Five: Delivery – supporting text pages 107 and 108	Reference is made to two live planning applications. This information is out of date and should be removed. The specifics of current planning applications are not relevant to the plan policy.	Three paragraphs referring to SON 5 and SON 9 removed from the Plan.
SODC	Policy HR1b - Housing additional SHMA page 107	The supporting table will need to be amended to reflect the changes made to Policy HS4.	Policy HS4 now Policy HS5 page 114 Policy HS5 has been rewritten and takes account of advice on specific aspects. page 134 Table 5.4 takes account of advice on Policy HS5 .
Oxfordshire County Council		We note the considerable work that has gone into preparing this draft Neighbourhood Plan.	
		Reserve sites Can these be relied upon as potential allocations given that neither is currently available?	SON 7 confirmed as being available as a reserve site wef April 2017. Clarification awaiting on the status of SON 15a. Plan now includes 195 (138) new homes from allocated sites to allow for potential SHMA impact.
Oxfordshire County Council		Settlement boundary The delineation of a settlement boundary may not be in accordance with the Core Strategy.	pages 44 and 45 Policy DS1 and Map 3.1 revised to reflect 'gaps between villages' approach.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Oxfordshire County Council		Parking standards - Appendix 3 The parking standards proposed in the Plan are excessively high. Such standards could give rise to unviable development that is land intensive.	<p>Now Policy MRP3</p> <p>page 71 – Policy MRP3 modified to reflect advice.</p> <p>Applications for new residential developments should provide the parking provision per dwelling as detailed in Table 3.10 (page 72).</p> <p>The parking standards for ‘sensitive areas’ apply to the following highways within the designated neighbourhood area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peppard Road (B481) from Bird Wood Court to The Herb Farm. • Kennylands Road from Kidby’s Yard to 80 Kennylands Road. • Reade’s Lane from Kidmore End Memorial Hall to 26 Reade’s Lane.
Oxfordshire County Council		Policy MRP2b - traffic measures This policy is very specific yet it may be that some of the traffic calming proposals are not possible. We welcome the reference to working with OCC; amendments to the policy may be necessary prior to submission.	<p>page 82</p> <p>Policy MRP2b revised.</p>
Oxfordshire County Council		Community, social and health policies – schools The referenced likely numbers of new school children arising from the building of new homes are approximations as school places are generally identified having regard to housing mix.	<p>page 63</p> <p>Text rewritten to reflect OCC as the source of the information on school places, these being approximations.</p>
Oxfordshire County Council		Community, social and health policies – libraries We note Sonning Common's public library is located currently on the (primary) school site. Its future development will be based on the Library Service delivery strategy with contributions from new housing development within the ward-based catchment going towards any library development.	<p>page 63</p> <p>Supporting text includes reference to Library Service delivery strategy. Furthermore, Sonning Common Parish Council and the school will engage in discussions with OCC regarding the replacement of the library.</p> <p>Due to its location the utilities costs are met by the school.</p>

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
The Chilterns Conservation Board		3. NPPF paragraph 116 page 35 - important precursor - "Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of" - should be added.	page 37 This will be added in the Submission version of the Plan. pages 75 & 76 Environmental policies ENV1 & ENV2 rewritten taking account of advice from CCB planning officer at 7 August 2015 meeting. page 90 South Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment (SPG) referenced in the consideration of SON 2/3 as allocated site.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		4. The Plan needs to have regard to national policy and be in conformity with SODC's Core Strategy (Local Plan).	Complied. Basic Conditions report on SCNDP website.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		5. Starting principle for housing distribution is no major development in the AONB especially given the availability of non-AONB sites to the south of the village. Currently SON 2 is allocated for major development in the AONB.	All non-AONB SHLAA sites now in Plan including: SON 15a - now allocated - 37 homes SON 5 - allocated - up to 22 homes SON 7/7a - reserve site - up to 30 homes SODC tree officer comments resulted in SODC Planning voicing concerns that the density "may be unrealistic" SON 8 - Kennylands Gymnastics - a reserve site – Phase 1: 4 homes Phase 2: 10 homes - although a covenant restricts its use to recreation and open space. However, landowner contests its validity. Following advice from SODC to allow for the potential SHMA impact, the Plan shows allocated sites now contributing 195 vs previous 138 homes. 108/195 homes are to the south of the village.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
The Chilterns Conservation Board		6. Densities on some sites appear low. Is land being used efficiently? Is land in the AONB being allocated needlessly?	page 36 provides rationale for densities on each SHLAA sites. The Plan has regard for the advice to provide for more than 138 homes to accommodate the SHMA impact.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		7. Draft Landscape Study of the Sonning SHLAA sites commissioned by SODC recommends a reduced area for development for SON 2. The Board recommends that if SON 2 is taken forward, the reduced area should be in the submission plan.	pages 33, 37, 90 and 91 develop the case for using the larger SON 2 area.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		8. SON 6 and SON 9 which form part of the "setting of the Chilterns AONB" have a reduced capacity for development. The Board recommends adding reference in the Plan to its 'Position Statement - Development affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB - Adopted June 2011'.	The Board's acknowledgement that the Plan recognises the sensitivity of the non-AONB sites in the south by adopting reduced densities is welcomed. Reference to the Position Statement will be added in the Submission version of the Plan
The Chilterns Conservation Board		9. Reference could be made to the Chilterns Building Design Guide and the Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2014-2019.	Reference is made to both on page 19 of SCNDP's Sustainability Scoping Report - April 2015. References will be added also in the Submission version of the Plan.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		10. Policy ENV1a is not worded as a development plan policy.	page 75 Rewritten as Policy ENV1 .
The Chilterns Conservation Board		11. Re SON 2/3 proposed allocation. Fostering the economic and social wellbeing of local communities does not carry the same weight as conserving and enhancing the AONB. Where there is conflict between the two the latter carries the greater weight.	Noted. Remedying Sonning Common's recognised recreation deficit, which is set to increase further with 138+ new homes, is a key priority for the SCNDP. SON 3 is the most appropriate available site to fulfil this and the only opportunity of dealing with the deficit is through the Plan.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Thames Water		<p>Policy CSH1c -Thames Water</p> <p>To ensure that any necessary upgrades to water and wastewater infrastructure are delivered alongside development and to ensure consistency with Policy CSI1 of the Core Strategy, Policy CSH1c should be revised to read:</p> <p>Planning permission will only be granted for developments which increase the demand for off-site water and wastewater infrastructure where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sufficient capacity already exists; or 2. Extra capacity can be provided in time to serve the development that will ensure that the environment and the amenities of other users are not adversely affected. In accordance with the Planning Policy Guidance, when there is a capacity constraint and improvements in off-site infrastructure are not programmed, planning permission will only be granted where the appropriate infrastructure improvements will be completed prior to occupation of the development. <p>Thames Water would therefore recommend that developers engage with us at the earliest opportunity to establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the developments demand for water supply and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; • the developments demand for sewage treatment and sewerage network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; and • the surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the area and downstream and can it be met. 	<p>page 64</p> <p>Policy CSH1c and supporting text amended as suggested.</p>
SSE		The housing and development land areas detailed in the SCNDP are typical of a number of recent sites across Southern England where insufficient discussion has taken place between planning authorities and ourselves prior to planning permission being granted. (Copy of letter to chief planning officers in Mar 2012 attached).	SCPC and potential developers are being alerted via the relevant Individual site policies in the Plan that discussion with SSE should take place prior to a planning application being submitted.
Mobile Operators Association (MOA)		<p>Objective EE3</p> <p>While we support the objective we have some concerns about the proposed wording which is considered to be ambiguous. We suggest adding the following wording: 'providing that the sitting and appearance of the proposed apparatus seeks to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area.'</p>	<p>page 62</p> <p>Recommended wording included.</p>
Kidmore End Parish Council		With reference to previous correspondence regarding the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan and to the draft sent to the Council, the Council has resolved to endorse the draft Plan	

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council		<p>3. Housing - Policies H2 & H2a - evidence base shows an ageing population but there are no policies for sheltered housing.</p> <p>Policy H3a - some of these characteristics are more restrictive than the SODC planning policy.</p>	<p>pages 51& 52 Policy H2b is new and covers Extra care/senior living.</p> <p>SOHA advised that in their view there was a much greater need in Sonning Common for affordable housing, so senior accommodation could not be considered.</p> <p>SON 7 (reserve) is a potential site for Extra care homes.</p> <p>page 53 Policy H3a revised.</p>
Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council		4. Village centre - Policy VC2b - RPPC does not support the proposed 'Park and Ride.' There is an existing bus route; all this will do is create a large car park in the parish.	Policy removed from the Plan following strong opposition from residents.
Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council		6. Sport and recreation - Policy CSH2 - the existing sport and recreation facilities in Sonning Common and nearby should be investigated further and improved before additional leisure facility is built.	<p>page 25 SODC has identified recreational deficiencies in Sonning Common in three studies undertaken in 2008, 2011 and 2015.</p>
Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council		7. Movement, road safety and parking - SON 3 is to have a car park of at least 100 spaces which is nearly double that of the Henley Leisure Centre and has the potential to be used as an unintended park-and-ride.	<p>pages 90 & 95 Policy HS1 amended and replaces 100 with 60.</p> <p>The point about the potential misuse is noted. Given that Chiltern Edge school is opposite, as well as parking for use of recreation land and future sports/community hall, the idea is to provide a parking drop-off for buses and cars at the beginning and end of the school day to alleviate the pressures on Reade's Lane.</p>
Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council		8. Environmental - protect AONB - RPPC does not support any building on AONB land where there is suitable, available non-AONB land.	All non-AONB SHLAA sites are now included in the Plan.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Roger Newton	SON 8 Kennylands Gymnastics	Site unjustifiably excluded from the Plan for future development on the grounds of the restrictive covenant.	
		The SCNDP Working Party incorrectly suggested at a public meeting that the existing restrictive covenant precluded development of SON 8 other than for recreational and amenity uses. We say that the only way to sustain the current use of the site is through a mixed development which would assist the funding of improved recreational facilities. As the beneficiary of the covenant is the planning authority itself, it is able to release the restriction in whole or part.	Clarification on the covenant sought by SCNDP Working Party from SODC. Their view is that it will be resolved through the planning process. They are not saying that the site is undeliverable.
		Spurious claims have been made by The Sonning Common Millennium Trust (SCOMIT) regarding the ownership of the access road from Bird Wood Court to SON 8. As the right of way is in perpetuity, the road itself will never revert to the owner of the underlying land. Thus the only dispute is over its width restrictions. SCOMIT is refusing further debate.	<p>Three representatives from the SCNDP Working Party met Mr & Mrs Newton on 30 July 2015. Given the remit from SODC to consider all non-AONB sites, their views on the covenant and the potential impact of the SHMA on the total housing allocation for Sonning Common, it was agreed that a proposal would be drafted to include SON 8 as a reserve site.</p> <p>14 September 2015 - Working Party met with neighbouring residents of SON 8 to discuss the draft proposal.</p> <p>pages 119 and 120 Policy HS6 added: SON 8 included as a reserve site for Phase 1: 4 homes and Phase 2: 10 more conditional on SCPC developing a similar recreational facility on SON 3.</p>
Mrs MM Hardy	SON 11 (smaller part thereof)	<p>Seeking confirmation that this smaller part belonging to Mrs Hardy is included as a potential site for development in the Plan.</p> <p>This part site is identified as SON 11 on map in Plan showing the SHLAA sites and is conjoined with part of Blackmore Farm. However, Mrs Hardy's site is separate from Blackmore Farm and lies outside the AONB.</p> <p>Mrs Hardy's site was part of Reddish Manor when it was excluded from the newly-formed AONB in 1956.</p>	<p>All maps show SHLAA sites in Plan separating the smaller site from the larger SON 11 and it can be seen that the site is indicated as lying outside the AONB.</p> <p>However, the site is not taken forward for development as part of the SCNDP. Residents who surveyed the site believed that developing it would have a detrimental effect on the 'setting' of the AONB particularly with reference to views into it from Blackmore Lane.</p>

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Bewley Homes/ Dijkman Planning	SON 9 - Lea Meadow	3. Bewley welcomes the NDP's realistic expectation that the current figure of 138 dwellings represents a minimum and not a maximum.	
		4. Peripheral development around Sonning Common is constrained by the AONB. The NDP must accord with NPPF advice that development should prefer land of lesser environmental value' than land in the AONB.	All non-AONB SHLAA sites are now part of the Plan.
		8-11. Bewley considers the site policy and concept statement to be overly prescriptive and requests relocation to an appendix. Additionally, the allocation of 60 homes should be for a minimum of 60 dwellings.	pages 122 – 125 Policy HS7 revised. Policy and associated material remain in place within Part Four. 60 homes remains unchanged, respecting discussions with residents and having due regard to CCB's Position Statement - Development affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB – Adopted June 2011.
		16-18. Bewley questions whether a local survey and analysis of existing housing stock is a meaningful substitute for the work undertaken within the SHMA and objects to Policy H2.	page 51 Policy H2 unchanged but supporting evidence on housing mix strengthened. NDPs are about meeting the needs of local communities and to this end ORCC is recognised as a credible 'local' surveyor.
		21. Bewley objects to the imposition of increased parking standards as set out within Appendix 3.	page 71 Policy MRP3 replaces MRP4 and is modified in the light of OCC advice.
TA Fisher/Pro Vision	SON 5 Kennylands Paddock	The Plan as presently drafted fails to meet the four Basic Conditions and is thus unlikely to be acceptable on examination.	Basic Conditions statement, available on the SCNDP website, confirms that the Plan is compliant.
		Sites within the AONB are allocated in preference to those outside the AONB.	All non-AONB SHLAA sites are now part of the Plan, including SON 5, which goes forward as an allocated site.
		Policy ENV1a - protecting the AONB. The implication is that the protection of the AONB <u>only</u> relates to development adjacent to the AONB and not to development within it.	page 73 Now Policy ENV1 The NPPF requires that protected landscapes, including the AONB, are conserved and enhanced. This requirement is affirmed in the Core Strategy and to this end SODC has advised that the wording 'To conserve and enhance the land designated as AONB' as unnecessary repetition in this policy.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
TA Fisher/Pro Vision	SON 5 Kennylands Paddock	Policy ENV2 - environment - landscape setting. The plan is lacking in robust policy that reflects the NPPF and the objective of focusing allocations outside of the AONB.	Policy ENV2 revised to accord with SODC advice. All non-AONB SHLAA sites are now part of the Plan.
		Policies provided within Part Five in support of Objective SCH1 are imprecise and ambiguous and therefore fail to meet the Basic Conditions tests.	Part Five: Delivery rewritten and dates regarding the lifetime of the Plan in accord at 31 March 2027.
		Environmental Report - not available with the Plan, therefore fourth Basic Condition not met.	Publication delayed. Consultation period duly extended to provide the statutory six weeks appraisal of this report.
Gallagher Estates/ Barton Willmore	SON 6 Kennylands Infill	Policy H1 - we do not support the figure of a minimum of 138 new homes which does not address increased need arising from the SHMA or Oxford City's unmet need.	Policy H1 and supporting text revised. The Plan recognises the likelihood of an increased requirement and the need to prepare for it. All non-AONB sites are now part of the Plan and new homes from allocated sites total 195.
		The allocation of additional land to the rear of SON 6 could deliver 95 dwellings, approximately 70 more than currently proposed in the NDP for this site.	Policy HS4 unchanged: 26 homes. The proposal to build 95 homes on an enlarged site not included on SODC's register of SHLAA sites is too late to consider coming after the publication of the Pre-submission draft plan.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Earthborn Developments Ltd/ Scarp Landscape Architecture	Land to the rear of Kennylands Road	Less emphasis should be placed on provision of housing in the AONB and 'Land to the rear of Kennylands Road' should be allocated as a housing site.	No amendment. The SCNDP began three years ago. Through a series of public meetings and presentations, regular updates in the village magazine and articles in the Henley Standard, residents, landowners and neighbouring parishes have been informed and involved with the Plan as it has progressed.
		Earthborn Developments Ltd commissioned Scarp Landscape Architecture to undertake an outline landscape and visual appraisal of a new potential housing development site, 'Land to the rear of Kennylands Road' with a view to informing feedback on the Draft SCNDP.	No amendment. The 15 sites considered for the possible location of the minimum of 138 homes to be built in Sonning Common were taken from SODC's SHLAA sites map and register for the village. As such, the site 'Land to the rear of Kennylands Road' cannot be considered for inclusion in the Plan at this late stage.
Woolf Bond Planning	Advisors on a number of infill developments in the local area	Q9 - Do you broadly support the draft Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan? - NO Part 3 - Policies - Do you think the proposed Policies are about right for Sonning Common? - NO . Certain policies are inconsistent with national or local planning policy and fail to contribute towards sustainable development. On this basis we consider that the Plan does not meet the Basic Conditions and should not proceed to referendum.	 A Basic Conditions document is being prepared to ensure compliance.
		Policy H2 - housing mix There is an absence of detail relating to evidence underpinning the requested housing mix in particular to market housing.	page 51 Policy H2 The mix has been reviewed and additional evidence included.
		Policies H3a & D1d - infill & design on unallocated sites Policy H3a should be framed positively to acknowledge the benefits of such development. The Core Strategy acknowledges that infill can contribute towards meeting local housing needs. Policy D1d does not add to the content of Policy H3a that supports infill development.	pages 53 and 55 Policies H3a and D1d Both policies have been revised.
		Policy MRP4 - parking provision for new developments Plan proposals deviate from the requirements of OCC parking standards; little in the way of detail to underpin parking provisions outlined in the Plan	page 71 Policy MRP3 replaces MRP4 and is modified in the light of OCC advice.

Appendix 7b: Public consultation (2)

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC - Part 1	Policy H1 page 46	The Plan provides for more than 138 homes so the policy wording should reflect this.	page 46 Policy H1 amended to include: 'Planning permission will be granted for a minimum of 138 homes...'
	Policy HER1 page 79	Section 12 of the NPPF protects both designated and non-designated heritage assets. The requirement of Policy HER1 for all future development to conserve and enhance features of historic interest conflicts with national policy.	page 79 Policy HER1 rewritten to read: 'All future developments will be required to respect any features of historic interest.' Wording recommended by Historic England and agreed with SODC.
SODC - Part 2	Development choices/potential pages 25 and 35	SON 2/3 is listed as 'subject to CCB approval.' CCB are not the determining body as to whether this site can be developed although their comment as a consultee will have to be considered.	pages 25 and 35 'Subject to CCB approval' removed.
SODC	Table of sites and densities page 36	SODC policy requires a minimum density of 25dph. Three sites have lower densities. A variance in densities is something that could be determined with appropriate evidence by the NDP. Having a housing number of 'around' X homes allows for flexibility if a site is found capable of delivering more or less on landscape grounds.	No amendment. The SCNDP Working Party believes absolute numbers should remain in place as they have been discussed and agreed with residents and most landowners/developers as part of the public consultation process. However, all site policies now include a requirement for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to accompany applications to help in determining the final capacity of the site.
SODC		Non-AONB sites SONs 5, 6 and 9 are allocated at densities below 25dph yet SON 2, an AONB site, is allocated at 25dph.	SON 2 has a high density of housing on two sides and a large swathe of land has been left as a buffer. Each of the non-AONB sites lies within the 'setting' of the AONB and therefore in order to protect the AONB densities are lower. Furthermore, the sites have very low density housing adjacent to them.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC		Comments from the Chilterns Conservation Board question whether non-AONB sites are being used efficiently and whether land in the AONB is being allocated needlessly. (June 2015)	<p>All non-AONB SHLAA sites are now included in the Plan.</p> <p>The Board also noted that SONs 6 and 9 form part of the 'setting' of the AONB and have a reduced capacity for development which they said appears to have been taken on board in the proposed allocated numbers. (June 2015)</p> <p>In December 2015, the Board commented that it welcomed the buffer requirements in the SON 5 site policy and the reduced development area given the site's adjacency to the AONB.</p>
SODC	2nd paragraph page 44	It is unclear why the statement about a possible 3rd Thames bridge is in the supporting text for the gaps between villages policy. The paragraph refers to traffic which is a separate issue.	Additional text included explaining that should any new roads be built in the future, the residents of Sonning Common would wish to maintain the gap between their village and other conurbations.
SODC	Policy D1d page 55	This policy does not add any requirements not covered in Policy D1a which is a general design policy and would therefore cover infill and unallocated sites.	Policy D1d removed and remaining three policies renumbered as D1 , D1a and D1b and grouped together.
SODC	Policy MRP3 page 71	The policy needs to be clear that it only applies to the 'sensitive' areas and not to all development and it should be clear which properties fall within the 'sensitive' areas.	<p>page 71</p> <p>Policy MRP3</p> <p>Given that all allocated sites have access from and exits onto the key highways of Sonning Common the word 'sensitive' has been removed.</p> <p>Additionally, the parts of the three key highways where new developments are most likely to lead to overspill of on-road parking have been clarified.</p>
SODC	Policy MRP3 and Table 3.10 page 72	While Oxfordshire County Council has not objected to this policy, SODC wishes to highlight the impact that additional parking can have on the overall look of a development.	No amendment. Comments noted.
SODC	Policy HER1 page 79	You can only seek developers' contributions by S106 agreement for historic features where a development directly impacts on those historic features. Is this likely?	<p>page 79</p> <p>Policy HER1 rewritten to exclude the seeking of developer contributions.</p>

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Non-land use policies CSH3, MRP1, MRP2b and ENV2d pages 81-83	These are not planning policies that will be used to guide development or to be used by planners to determine applications. It would be more appropriate to have these as actions for the parish council.	pages 81-83 Non-land use policies replaced with Actions for parish council in respect of CSH3, MRP1, MRP2b and ENV2d.
SODC	Site policies HS1 to HS7 pages 94-125	To allow for flexibility refer to housing numbers as 'around' X.	pages 94-125 Policies HS1 – HS7 No amendment. The SCNDP Working Party believes absolute numbers should remain in place as they have been discussed and agreed with residents as part of the public consultation process.
SODC	Site policies HS3 and HS5	To allow for flexibility refer to housing numbers as 'around' X. SONs 5 and 7 have housing numbers of 'up to.' For the same reason as above these should be changed to 'around' X.	No amendment. Policy HS3 SON 5 - up to 22 homes has been agreed with the developer and residents. Policy HS5 No amendment. SON 7 - 'up to' insertion advised by SODC in June 2015. Given remarks by the Council's Tree Officer, SODC was concerned that the number of homes allocated (25 for SON 7 and 5 for SON 7a) might be unrealistic.
SODC	HS1 to HS7 pages 94-125	Similarly, SODC policies require 40% affordable so unnecessary to divide the figure up in the site policy.	No amendment. Adopting numbers approach rather than quoting a percentage lends clarity and as such is appreciated by residents and landowners/developers have not raised any objections.
SODC	Site policies HS1 to HS7 pages 94-125	All the site policies require a design brief to be discussed and agreed with the parish council. Applicants can be encouraged to do this and encouraged to follow the pre-app protocol. However, to say the brief must be discussed and agreed is unreasonable and not enforceable.	pages 94-125 Policies HS1 to HS7 Wording mirrored advice given in June 2015. Site policies now reworded to say that applicants are encouraged to discuss the design brief with the parish council.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Policy HS1 pages 94-125	Due to landscape sensitivity, planning applications should be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	pages 94-125 Policies HS1 to HS7 As stated earlier, all site policies now include a requirement for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to accompany applications to help in determining the final capacity of the site.
SODC	Policy HS3 pages 104 and 105	The requirements for a 15m landscape buffer and a 3m buffer for neighbours are prescriptive. They reduce the developable area of the site and references to them should be removed.	pages 104 and 105 Policy HS3 No amendment. Due regard was given to this site being within the 'setting' of the AONB and the policy was agreed with the landowner and developer. In this regard, the developer's outline of the development area can be found at page 105. The Chilterns Conservation Board was positive in its December 2015 comments about the buffer and reduced developable area for SON 5.
SODC	Policy HS7 page 125	Requiring a footpath or cycle path to be screened and fenced is not compatible with safe and well-designed spaces as they should be visible so people feel safe using them. The properties that back onto the site must have rear boundary fencing/walls/screening already so this should not be necessary. Delete this bullet point. The policy cannot cover areas that are outside the allocation site (eg rear of Essex Way properties). Delete.	page 125 Policy HS5 No amendment. A crime prevention design advisor for Thames Valley Police has voiced concerns about this footpath/cycleway and its isolation, and more so its location at the rear of existing properties. Furthermore, achieving a 'secured by design' award accreditation would be desirable. Properties that back onto this site have low picket fencing. No amendment. However, outline map is redrawn to show the proposed footpath/cycleway to the rear of Essex Way properties. Land beneath pathways belongs to SON 9 landowner.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
SODC	Allocated sites page 132	Replace 190+ with 'around 230' to capture the reserve sites.	No amendment. Given the importance of gaining support for the NDP, the working party has been assiduous in its explanations to residents regarding the potential impact of the SHMA and of the need to provide for it - a 41% increase to 195 (138) new homes on allocated sites.
SODC	Phasing and traffic management page 133	The requirement for a traffic management plan was intended to overcome the need to phase the sites. Remove all reference to phasing. Restricting when developments can come forward could hold up the delivery of sustainable development.	No amendment. The level of disruption caused by recent infill suggests that without phasing of site development the congestion on arterial routes could overwhelm vehicular access to key parts of the village. The intention behind phasing is to provide a smooth delivery of sustainable development, not to stand in its way.
	Policy HR1 and Table 5.4 page 134	Development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay. If there is no substantive reason to hold back the reserve sites they should be allocated. Delete policy HR1 and Table 5.4 and remove all references to reserve sites throughout the Plan.	No amendments. Reserve site status was requested by the owners of SONs 7 and 8.
Oxfordshire County Council		We note that many of our comments made in March 2015 have been taken on board and resulted in changes to the text.	
	Policy MRP1 page 81	Note support for retention of No 25 bus service which operates commercially. However, also support for a Whites Coaches service and the current proposal is to remove bus service subsidies.	page 81 Policy MRP1 all references to Whites Coaches removed.
	Policy MRP2b page 82	Concerns regarding workability of traffic measures remain but welcome the reference to working with Oxfordshire County Council.	page 82 No further amendments.
	Policy DE2 page 135 2nd bullet point	Not aware of any potential for match funding for traffic calming investment.	page 135 Policy DE2 reference to match funding deleted from supporting text.
Environment Agency		We do not have any environmental concerns with the proposed allocations and policies. We would add that we are pleased that the Plan includes a policy ensuring that biodiversity and wildlife corridors will be protected.	No amendments necessary.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Historic England	Character page 21	It would be helpful to include a reference to the 'Sonning Common Character Assessment and Design Statement 2013.'	page 21 Reference to the report included.
	Development strategy page 30	Recommend that the Guiding principles are expanded to include protecting the character of the parish.	page 30 Guiding principles now include protecting the character of the NDP designated area.
	Policy D1: Design page 55	Recommend including a reference to 'plotland' character.	page 55 Recommendation implemented.
	Heritage policy page 79	Clarify two elements within the supporting text. Also strengthen the opening sentence of Policy HER1 to read ' All future development will be required to respect any features of historic interest....'	page 79 Policy HER1 wording amended as advised.
Natural England		<p>We understand that the Chilterns Conservation Board has commented on the proposal and recommend that significant weight is given to their representations.</p> <p>The allocation of SON2/3 does not appear to be in line with Sustainability Objective 2 - 'Where possible, promote the use of previously developed land prior to the use of greenfield land.'</p> <p>Several allocations also occur within the 'setting' of the AONB and this will have to be reflected in the Plan.</p>	<p>See Plan responses below a propos comments from the Board.</p> <p>All the SHLAA sites in the parish of Sonning Common are 'greenfield'.</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board has acknowledged the sensitive approach the Plan has adopted with regard to densities on SONs 6 and 9 and, latterly SON 5, all of which lie to the south of the village and each within the 'setting' of the AONB.</p> <p>page 100 The Plan also references the 'Position Statement - Development affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB - Adopted June 2011'.</p>

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
The Chilterns Conservation Board		2. We see that SON 5 is now allocated for 22 homes. This site is adjacent to the AONB and we welcome the buffer and reduced area for development.	
The Chilterns Conservation Board		3. We recommend that for sites adjacent to the AONB, reference is made to the Chilterns Conservation Position Statement regarding development affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB.	page 100 Reference is included as to the 'Position Statement - Development affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB - Adopted June 2011'.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		4. The Board welcomes the creation of a Local Green Space on SON 1 within the AONB. It is important to retain its open rural character and take opportunities to enhance its biodiversity value.	Adjustment to description to read 'within the AONB'.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		5. If Son 2 is taken forward for allocation, it should be for a reduced area and the policy should require a substantial green infrastructure link and landscape buffer between the open AONB and the village edge.	pages 94 and 95 Against the backdrop of the likely increase in new homes, courtesy of the SHMA, no adjustment has been made to the area for development. Policy HS1 has always stipulated a requirement for a significant and structured landscape buffer.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		6. Although SON 3 was assessed for housing in the SODC Landscape Assessment, none is now proposed. However, the community sports hall, facilities, car park and school drop-off area are all changes which could impact on the landscape. Careful controls over siting, design, floodlighting etc will need to be exercised.	pages 94 and 95 SON 3 has never been proposed for housing within the NDP. It has always been seen as the most appropriate site for recreational facilities and possibly a community sports hall. Page 95 Supporting text to Policy HS1 has always reflected a due care process, mindful of not being too 'prescriptive'.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		The SODC study recommended a full detailed landscape and visual impact assessment would be required to inform the final capacity of the site.	Policies HS1 to HS7 now include a new first bullet point as part of the Landscape paragraph: 'A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment should be prepared and submitted with the planning application'.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
The Chilterns Conservation Board		7,8 and 9. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF contains important precursor text which has been omitted and should be added.	page 37 The following text has been added: Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of...
The Chilterns Conservation Board		13. To ensure appropriate design and implementation at later stages, reference could be made to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2014-2019, both available at www.chilternsaonb.org	page 91 References to both these documents and the website now included.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		14. Policy ENV1: Protecting the AONB has now lost the wording 'To conserve conserve and enhance the land designated as AONB.' This should be added to ensure compliance with national and district policies.	page 75 SODC previously advised removal of this wording on the grounds that it was affirmed in the Core Strategy and therefore did not need repeating in the Plan. However, recent discussion with them concluded that the wording should be reinstated. Policy ENV1 thus duly amended.
The Chilterns Conservation Board		15. Regarding the proposed allocations of SON 2/3, the Board recognises that providing improved recreational facilities is an ambition of the SCNDP and that the village community is set to grow but fostering economic and social wellbeing, although a remit of conservation boards, does not carry the same weight as conserving and enhancing the AONB.	page 25 SODC has identified recreational deficiencies in Sonning Common in three studies undertaken in 2008, 2011 and 2015. Note all non-AONB SHLAA sites are now included in the Plan. Following advice from SODC to allow for the potential SHMA impact the Plan shows allocated sites now contributing 195 vs 138 new homes previously, an increase of 41%.
Thames Water	Policy CSH1c pages 64 and 65	Thames Water are pleased that the Plan has retained amended Policy CSH1c and its supportive text. Sewerage/wastewater infrastructure for SON 2/3 and SON 15a is likely to require upgrades ahead of development. The impact of multiple sites in the same area coming forward will have a greater impact. Local network upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	The Thames Water site specific assessments of water supply and wastewater are available in the parish office.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Kidmore End Parish Council		The Council has found nothing in the draft Plan to which it takes exception and is grateful for the opportunity to observe closely the formulation of the Plan. Sonning Common Parish Council has consulted this Council at all relevant opportunities during the process.	
Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council		Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council does not support the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan.	
		<p>1. There is land available in non-AONB sites where housing could have been allocated. The housing allocated to SON 2 could have been spread across the other sites without increasing each development significantly.</p> <p>5. The facilities in Chiltern Edge School could be enhanced rather than develop alternatives. Sports facilities exist at the school that are mentioned as deficient in the plan that could be improved to the benefit of the school.</p>	<p>All non-AONB sites are included in the Plan. 108 out of 195 homes on allocated sites are to the south of the village as are the homes on the reserve sites (SONs 7 and 8).</p> <p>The densities on four of the allocated sites reflect the sensitivity to the neighbouring AONB.</p> <p>The site densities in the Plan generally concur with those shown in SODC's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, including SON 2/3</p> <p>The school needs additional finance for capital expenditure. Sharing facilities with the public is limited to school hours and may not prove cost effective for the school.</p> <p>The preferred mix of housing on SON 15a focusses on smaller family homes and they could be the homes of staff and future pupils thus increasing the viability of the school and securing its future.</p> <p>On 17 December 2015, two representatives of the SCNDP Working Party met with the Chairman of Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council and the councillor in charge of planning to discuss the decision not to support the SCNDP. Reconsideration of the rejection is to be put to their parish council.</p>

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Chiltern Edge School	SON 15a Chiltern Edge Top	<p>The proposals for SON 15a are an accurate reflection of the agreement reached at several meetings between the SCNDP group and ourselves.</p> <p>In addition to respecting residents' prescriptive rights of way from rear garden gates to maintain their hedges (page 99) the following should be included: 'Any arrangements must ensure that the safeguarding policy at Chiltern Edge School and any statutory requirements in respect of this are fully complied with to ensure the safety of the children is a priority.'</p>	<p>page 99</p> <p>Policy HS2 - Layout and design amended to include recommended wording on safeguarding of children.</p>
Roger Newton	SON 8 Kennylands Gymnastics	<p>Further clarification needed regarding the current access road (page 120): 'The current access road is subject to a width restriction, according to the Trustees of the Millennium Green and this is disputed by the landowners of the gymnastics facility. This matter might need to be taken into account in future development proposals.'</p>	<p>page 120</p> <p>Policy HS6 - Access section amended to reflect suggested changes.</p>
Mrs Pelly/ John Martin and Associates	SON 1 Old Copse Field	Our client strongly objects to the designation of SON 1 as a Local Green Space. There is no reasoned justification or evidence to support the proposed designation. (NPPF paragraphs 76, 77 and 184 referenced).	<p>No amendment.</p> <p>Pages 86-88</p> <p>We believe the Concept Statement and accompanying text make a strong case for designating SON 1 as Local Green space and the smaller part of 2.5ha as Amenity Green Space.</p>
			The Plan is based upon all its designated allocation and policies being sustainable. The Plan and supporting documents are in general conformity and comply with SODC's Local Plan, thus meeting the requirements of NPPF paragraph 184.
			Given the requirement to accommodate a minimum of 138 new homes in Sonning Common, the Plan makes provision for 195 homes. The increasing importance of recreation makes open spaces ever more significant. Therefore we believe the criteria in NPPF paragraph 76 is met and that the justification with regard to NPPF paragraph 77 is robust.

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Mrs MM Hardy	SON 11 (smaller part thereof)	<p>The local plan was never intended for the appraisal of individual sites but for the sustainable future of the village as a whole. As it stands, however, it affects my small site adversely.</p> <p>Through no fault of mine it became grouped with the part of Blackmore Farm designated as SON 11 even though my site is adjacent to the AONB not part of it.</p> <p>You have unfairly disqualified my site for future consideration and I request that steps are taken to rectify this so my site can be reassessed as an entity in itself.</p>	<p>In early 2015, outline planning permission for one detached house on this site was refused by the parish council and also SODC. No appeal followed.</p> <p>Development on this site for one house would not be in the economic, social or environmental interests of the village community and as such is not taken forward as part of the SCNDP.</p>
Bewley Homes/ Dijksman Planning	SON 9 Lea Meadow	<p>The SCNDP Working Party notes that Bewley Homes's:</p> <p>Representations to the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation on Pre-Submission Version December 2015 are similar to those made in regard to their Pre-Submission Version February 2015, save for point 21 referencing Policy SCMRP3 instead of Appendix 3 and the summary of observations referring to Policy SCMPP3 as opposed to Policy MRP4.</p>	<p>No amendment.</p> <p>The Plan responses recorded above with regard to Bewley's Draft Pre- Submission Version February 2015 still apply in respect of their Draft Pre- Submission Version December 2015.</p>
Gallagher Estates/ Barton Willmore	SON 6 Kennylands Infill	<p>Development Strategy</p> <p>The SCNDP has not had regard to NPPF requirements, does not plan positively to meet the needs of the area and does not support the strategic elements of SODC's Local Plan.</p> <p>The proposed level of housing provision in the SCNDP, and therefore the total capacity of the site allocations proposed, is restricted to 138 dwellings plus an allowance of reserve/contingency sites. Furthermore, we do not consider that the SCNDP has planned positively to address the increased level of housing need arising from the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including the unmet housing needs of Oxford City</p> <p>Housing policies</p> <p>Policy H1 – Housing distribution</p> <p>We broadly support the principle of allocation of SON 6 for new housing development but conclude that the (overall) level of housing provision proposed is insufficient to support the strategic policies of the Local Plan and does not have regard for the NPPF. We seek a modification to increase the allocation to SON 6 to approximately 95 dwellings.</p>	<p>No amendment.</p> <p>We strongly disagree with these objections and would highlight the support of SODC and their validation of our Basic Conditions statement.</p> <p>Incorrect.</p> <p>As a result of consultations and evidence from the SHMA, the draft Plan relating to the comments already included a 41% increase to 195 new homes for Sonning Common with an additional 44 in reserve.</p> <p>No amendment</p> <p>pages 106-109</p> <p>Policy HS4</p> <p>The allocation remains at 26 homes as previously agreed with the landowner and land agent. The larger site proposal from Gallagher Estates is not included on SODC's register of SHLAA sites and is too late to consider coming after the publication of the draft Pre-submission Plan.</p>

Consultee	Specific interest	Points raised by consultee	Plan response
Gladman Developments	Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation	Relationship to Local Plans The SCNDP is premature in plan making terms in that the strategic priorities for the District are yet to be confirmed in an up-to-date Framework/PPG compliant adopted Local Plan.	Noted.
		As currently proposed the SCNDP is inconsistent with the entire ethos of national policy specifically those requirements set out at paragraphs 14 and 47 of the Framework.	Noted.
		Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy H1 – Housing distribution Gladman questions whether the additional housing numbers will be sufficient to meet Sonning Common’s proportion of the unmet housing needs as this has yet to be confirmed in an up-to-date Local Plan. Policy ENV1 – Protecting the AONB Gladman submit that significant weight is already afforded to the AONB by the requirements set out in the Framework. This issue will be effectively dealt with by SODC and there is no reason for the inclusion of this policy. Gladman recommend that policy ENV1 be deleted.	Noted. page 75 Policy ENV1 No amendment. This policy has been agreed with The Chilterns Conservation Board and SODC.

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY