

1. Good afternoon everyone....well... where can we go from here....
2. It is highly unusual for an LPA to reject **all** the proposed allocations in a NP and in doing so, set itself at odds with one of its settlements and at odds with the aspirations for neighbourhood planning set out in the Localism Act, the NPPF and PPGs.

The Qualifying Body has a right to bring forward an updated neighbourhood plan with allocations under the Regulations, regardless of the circumstances in which the earlier NP with no allocations became made in 2016.

The 'agreement' under which that earlier NP became made was **not** that the SDNPA would then undertake the allocations, **but** that the SDNPA would do that **only after** carrying out full consultation with the community and FPC to a similar extent to that recommended by the Examiner in his report on the Reg 16 submission of the earlier NP. That has not happened in any meaningful way.

3. In these circumstances, the Qualifying Body invites committee members to seek further clarification from officers on matters which the Qualifying Body considers to be contentious:

Firstly, has the SDNP properly followed NPPF policy and PPGs on working with a qualifying body on the preparation of the UNP, in particular, para 43 on where a LP and NP both intend to allocate housing sites, and para 44 on where a NP proposes to allocate **alternative** housing sites. Para 44 does clearly distinguish between **additional** allocations and **alternative** allocations.

Secondly, why hasn't the SDNPA give any weight to the extensive local consultation undertaken by the qualifying body on housing site preferences during the preparation of the UNP, why does the SDNPA seriously underestimate, or ignore local resistance to LP allocation sites and why did the SDNPA not carry out any proper and

meaningful consultation with the community and FPC before bringing forward the LP allocations in the pre submission LP.

Thirdly, the officers report silent on some key matters which have been highlighted in the UNP and the Evidence Base, which the Examiner will consider, in particular:

Why does the SDNPA now have an 'in principle' objection to new housing at the valley bottom, south west end of Findon, when in 2015 it was promoting this location for housing. Further, WSCC, the highway authority have now confirmed that a 40mph limit and an improved crossing will be introduced on the A24 at Findon.

Arun DC, the housing authority and owner of the site immediately north of Nightingales, pro actively supports the UNP allocation at this location.

The NPPF encourages neighbourhood plans to allocate smaller sites, like the former fire station, in rural areas. The current employment use, repair and maintenance of private ambulances, is an unneighbourly activity in a residential area and employs no local people.

Initial proposals on LP allocation site are not enhancing the local landscape character at these sensitive downland locations, are not delivering affordable housing for rent, are silent on the imminent consultation on Nepcote Green Conservation Area and on the agricultural and racing stables occupancy condition on the existing house at SD72.

Fourthly, the summary of the legal advice in Appendix 4 is at best, only **equivocal**.

Para 44 of the PPG and para 30 of NPPF 2019 do give absolutely clear priority to neighbourhood plan allocations, reflecting the position in s 38 (5) of PCPA 2004. If both sets of allocations become part of the development plan, there is clearly a **conflict** with the LP strategic housing policy SD26, but this conflict would potentially be resolved by reference to s 38(5), when a UNP with allocations becomes 'made' and is the latest development plan document.

Applications coming forward on LP allocation sites could justifiably be refused as they would be in conflict with allocation policies the made UNP, being the latest development plan document,.

Control of the risk of over provision of housing through two sets of allocation policies therefore clearly lies with the stance the SDNPA decides to take on the matter of interpretation of 'conflict' of policies and priority for NP allocations. This does not need to involve any removal or amendment of LP allocation policies.

On that matter, however, the qualifying body would point to the South Oxfordshire Council LP where LP allocations were able to be removed when the Thame NP with alternative allocations emerged. There is also a requirement in para 33 NPPF 2019 that policies in LPs are regularly reviewed and updated as necessary.

4. **In conclusion**, the Qualifying Body would hope that the SDNPA will recognise that its response to the consultation should be more transparent in making make clear which parts of the response are derived from purely planning considerations and which are derived from other, perhaps more political or 'defence of first position' considerations.

The SDNPA is entitled to make political judgements on its planning policy approach to an UNP with different housing site allocations, and to make subjective judgements on particular allocations (as the LP Inspector noted) but it should make clear when that has been done and present appropriate and sound justification.

Greater clarity should also be given in the response, for the benefit of the Examiner, on what stance the Authority will actually take on the matter of the priority that would be given to UNP allocations should the Examiner recommend that the UNP can go to referendum and the referendum was passed.