

WODC Modifications to Stonesfield Neighbourhood Development Plan

11th September 2026

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no. of Examiners Report/ other reference	Modification	WODC Response to Proposed Modification
Policy SH1 – Meeting the housing needs of the Parish of Stonesfield			
PM1	Page 15	Replace the policy with: <i>‘Within the built-up area, housing proposals on previously-developed land will be accepted where they would meet the need identified in the Housing Needs Assessment prepared for the Neighbourhood Plan, and are otherwise in accordance with other relevant development plan policies.</i> <i>On land adjoining the built-up area, housing proposals on previously-developed land will be supported where they would deliver the Plan’s housing objectives as defined in the Housing Needs Assessment and would otherwise be in accordance with other relevant development plan policies.</i> <i>Housing proposals on greenfield land adjoining the built-up area will not be supported unless there is clear evidence they demonstrate exceptional circumstances and a public interest directly relevant to Stonesfield, as defined in the Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix A), and where the resulting development would otherwise be in accordance with other relevant development plan policies.’</i>	Amended wording is accepted.
Policy SH2 – Size and type of homes			
PM2	Page 16	Replace the opening element of the first part of the policy with:	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

		<i>'Development proposals of ten or more home (except affordable housing) should provide the following mix of dwelling sizes.'</i>	
PM3	Page 16	Replace the second part of the policy with: <i>'Homes with five or more bedrooms will not be supported unless a specific local need can be demonstrated.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM4	Page 16	Replace the third part of the policy with: <i>'New housing on land within the village built-up area and on the edge of the village should seek to make efficient use of space whilst responding positively to the character and appearance of the immediate surroundings.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SH3 – Mix of affordable rented housing			
PM5	Page 17	Replace the policy with: <i>'Development proposals for affordable/social rented dwellings, which include the provision of dwellings which have been designed to cater for the specific needs of young people and working-age people and/or people with disabilities, will be supported where this approach is evidenced by the most up to-date information available demonstrating an identified need from within the parish.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SH4 – Affordable homes			
PM6	Page 17	Replace the policy with: <i>'Proposals which address the specific affordable housing needs identified in the Stonesfield Housing Needs Assessment 2024 including suitable rural exception site(s) for small scale affordable housing schemes to meet specific local housing needs which cannot be met in any other way will be supported.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

		<i>All new homes on these sites should remain affordable in perpetuity to people in housing need who have a local connection with the parish.'</i>	
Policy SH5 – Meeting the needs of older people and those with disabilities			
PM7	Page 18	Replace the policy with: <i>'Development proposals that meet the needs of older people and those with disabilities currently living within the parish or with a local connection to the parish, will be supported where they otherwise comply with development plan policies. This includes accommodation that is suited to the needs of those with limited mobility, and accommodation that meets the requirements of Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations.</i> <i>Development proposals for individual self-contained flats or annexes of 1 and 2 bedrooms which are suitable for older people or people with disabilities and which are within the curtilage of existing properties will be supported where they otherwise comply with development plan policies.</i> <i>Proposals to provide assisted living accommodation which meet the housing needs of the parish will be supported where they otherwise comply with development plan policies.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SH7 – Location of new affordable homes (Rural exception sites)			
PM8	Page 19	<i>Delete the policy</i>	Deletion supported.
PM9	Page 19	Replace the final paragraph of Section 5.4 of the Plan with: <i>'National and local policy comment that the development of small-scale Rural Exception Sites for affordable housing, defined as up to 10 houses, will be supported, provided they meet an affordable housing need identified in the Housing Needs Assessment, and provided they do not form part of any development</i>	Supported.

		<i>constituting a major development as defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF (i.e. more than 10 homes or on a site of 0.5 ha or more).</i>	
Policy SH8 – Infill development			
PM10	Page 20	Replace the opening element of the first part of the policy with: 'Proposals for residential development on small infill or redevelopment sites within Stonesfield will be supported where the proposal:'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM11	Page 20	Replace criterion f with: 'it is consistent with the approach for the development of gardens in Policy SH10'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM12	Page 20	Delete criterion j	Deletion supported.
PM13	Page 20	At the end of the policy add a free-standing element (and not in the alphabetic sequence) to read: 'Where the development proposed is back-land development (the residential development of land behind an existing frontage ,or placing of further dwelling/s behind existing dwelling/s within the existing site) or if there are existing properties behind the infill properties, safe and convenient access to all the resultant properties should be provided. The access to be provided should be wide enough and far enough from the boundary and any front property to accommodate delivery, service and emergency vehicles without causing unnecessary disturbance to neighbours or the adjacent property.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant
Policy SH9 – Sub-division of dwellings to create smaller units			
PM14	Page 20	Replace the final part of the policy with: 'Proposals should be designed in a manner which respects the historic, architectural and landscape character of the locality and contributes to local distinctiveness. Wherever practicable, development proposals should take opportunities to enhance the character and quality of the surroundings.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant

Policy SH10 – Development in residential gardens			
PM15	Page 21	Delete 'where the development meets all relevant requirements set out in other policies in this plan and the Local Plan especially Policy SPD2 (Locally appropriate design), and'	Deletion is supported.
PM16	Page 21	At the end of a-c add '; and at the end of d add '; and'	Minor amendment is supported.
PM17	Page 21	In d replace 'with access' with 'with safe access'	Minor amendment is supported.
PM18	Page 21	At the end of 5.5.4 add ' <i>Part e of Policy SH10 refers to the need for development proposals to delivery biodiversity net gain. This should be 10% in accordance with national policy.</i> '	Support although note typo (should be 'deliver' not 'delivery').
Policy SH11- Residential parking			
PM19	Page 22	Replace the first part of the policy with: <i>'Wherever practicable, development proposals should provide for one off-street residential parking space for each bedroom. Any such development proposals should ensure that their design and layouts respect their immediate localities and are not dominated by motor vehicles. Otherwise, development proposals should comply with Oxfordshire County Council parking standards.'</i>	Amended wording is accepted.
PM20	Page 22	Replace the second part of the policy with: <i>'Development proposals that involve the loss of existing parking and which would result in parking provision falling below the relevant parking standards should make provision for at least an equivalent number of parking spaces.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant
PM21	Page 22	At the end of paragraph 5.6.3 add: ' <i>The third part of Policy SH11 offers support to the delivery of additional parking in the village.</i> '	Amended wording is supported.
PM22	Page 22	<i>Change the title of the policy to 'Parking'</i>	Agreed.
Policy SEA1 – Protecting and enhancing retail, employment and services			
PM23	Page 23	Delete the second part of the policy	Deletion is supported.
PM24	Page 24	Replace the third part of the policy with	Need to amend wording to include the word 'not' before capable as shown:

		<i>'Where land is already being used for employment purposes and it is possible for such use to continue, the loss of space through development will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that the site is capable of being redeveloped for employment use, or where the site is unsuitable for employment on environmental and amenity grounds, or where substantial community benefits can be demonstrated.'</i>	<i>'Where land is already being used for employment purposes and it is possible for such use to continue, the loss of space through development will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that the site is not capable of being redeveloped for employment use, or where the site is unsuitable for employment on environmental and amenity grounds, or where substantial community benefits can be demonstrated.'</i>
PM25	Page 24	<i>Delete the fourth part of the policy</i>	Deletion supported.
PM26	Page 24	Replace the sixth part of the policy with: <i>'Development proposals for commercial properties that result in a loss of independently accessed associated residential accommodation on the premises will not be supported unless the proposed commercial uses would be incompatible with residential uses on environmental and amenity grounds.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM27	Page 24	Replace the seventh part of the policy with: <i>'Development proposals that would involve the loss of the White Horse Public House will not be supported.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant
PM28	Page 24	Replace the eighth and ninth parts of the policy with: <i>'Wherever practicable development proposals should demonstrate how they will support home working.</i> <i>The re-use of non-residential buildings for employment, tourism and community uses to support the local economy will be supported.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant
Policy SEA2 – Protecting community facilities			
PM29	Page 25	<i>Delete the third part of the policy</i>	Deletion agreed.
PM30	Page 25	<i>In the final paragraph of the supporting text in the Justification delete the penultimate sentence.</i>	Deletion agreed.
Policy ST1 – Sustainable transport			

PM31	Page 26	Replace the policy with: <i>'As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should demonstrate how they have maintained and, where practicable, enhanced public transport links and ensure that future residents can walk to bus stops safely and easily. Development proposals that would enhance the viability of local bus services and enhance access to bus stops will be supported where they respond positively to the character and appearance of the environment and to the amenity of residents in the immediate locality.'</i> <i>Where appropriate development proposals should secure bicycle storage facilities in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council cycle parking standards.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy ST2 – Road safety and easy access for all			
PM32	Page 26	Delete the final sentence of the first part of the policy.	Deletion and inclusion in supporting text is supported.
PM33	Page 26	Replace the second part of the policy with: <i>'As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should demonstrate that they do not substantially increase congestion, danger to drivers, cyclists and pedestrians, particularly at school pick-up and drop-off times.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM34	Page 27	At the end of paragraph 7.2.1 add: <i>'Policy ST2 addresses this matter. Pavements are not a practical proposition in the 'narrow roads' areas of the village, which include Pond Hill, Church Street, Churchfields, Peak's Lane, High Street, Boot Street, Laughton Hill and Witney Lane and therefore development on and off these streets which would significantly increase vehicular traffic will not be supported.'</i>	Supported.
PM35	Page 27	Include a map indicating the 'narrow street' zone included within the supporting text.	This was recommended by WODC and is supported.

Policy ST3 – Walking and cycling			
PM36	Page 27	Replace the policy with: <i>'Where appropriate, development proposals should secure bicycle storage facilities in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council cycle parking standards.</i> <i>As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should promote and enable safe and attractive walking and cycling routes to village facilities wherever practicable.</i> <i>Development proposals which promote connectivity across the village through new or improved pedestrian and cycling links between different parts of the village will be supported.</i> <i>Development proposals, otherwise satisfactory, which would directly or indirectly improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists along the approach roads to the village or offer alternative safe cycle routes avoiding these roads will be particularly supported.</i> <i>Development proposals which would contribute to the availability of new or improved dedicated cycling and walking paths to neighbouring settlements with due regard for proportionately managing the character, aesthetics, flora and fauna, will be supported. In particular, support will be given for the construction of cycling/walking pathways to the following destinations along the following or other suitable routes: (include list from the policy).</i> <i>Measures that would improve the effectiveness and safety of walking and cycling along The Ridings to the junction with the B4437 will be supported.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

Policy ST4 – General parking			
PM37	Page 28	Replace the first part of the policy with: <i>‘Proposals which alter demand and usage of services and facilities should ensure that appropriate parking provision is provided. Proposals for extensions and alterations of existing buildings should not result in a net reduction of parking spaces.’</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM38	Page 28	<i>Delete the final sentence of the second part of the policy.</i>	Deletion is supported.
PM39	Page 28	Replace the third part of the policy with: <i>‘Measures to limit parking that causes a safety or nuisance issue, particularly around the school, shop, village hall and the corner of Churchfields and Church Street, will be supported where they respect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and do not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity in their immediate location.’</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SHW1 – Working towards better health and wellbeing			
PM40	Page 29	Replace the policy with: <i>‘Development proposals designed to further the Oxfordshire Health and Well-Being Strategy 2024 2030 and in particular addressing health inequalities, preventing ill health and promoting closer collaboration between relevant organisations and services will be supported where they otherwise comply with development plan policies.’</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM41	Page 29	At the end of paragraph 8.2.6 add <i>‘Policy SHW1 seeks to weave key elements of the Strategy into a land use Plan. These building blocks are addressed respectively throughout this Plan through the policies on sports facilities (Section 6.4 and Policy SHW2 below), on housing (Sections 5 and 11), on the countryside and natural environment (Section 9) and on the economy and amenities (Section 6). DP will be particularly supported which seek to promote one or</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

		more of the 'building blocks of health' defined by the Strategy. These building blocks are addressed respectively throughout this Plan through the policies on sports facilities (Section 6.4 and Policy SHW2 below), on housing (Sections 5 and 11), on the countryside and natural environment (Section 9) and on the economy and amenities (Section 6).'	
Policy SHW2 – Protecting and enhancing local sports facilities			
PM42	Page 30	Replace the policy with: <i>'The development of new leisure facilities and the extension of sports and leisure facilities to meet local needs will be supported.</i> <i>Measures to improve access to such local facilities, especially on foot, will be supported where they respond positively to the character of their immediate locality.</i> <i>Development proposals should not result in the loss of open space, sports and recreational buildings and land unless up to date assessment shows the asset is surplus to requirements, or the need for and benefits of the alternative land use clearly outweigh the loss, and alternative replacement provision is made. Where appropriate, development should provide or contribute towards the provision of necessary improvements to open space, sports and recreational buildings and land.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SEL1 – Protecting the Cotswold National Landscape			
PM43	Page 31	Replace the final part of the policy with: <i>'Development proposals for affordable housing that meet identified housing needs in either the District or the parish will be supported where they are consistent with the great weight that must be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape, natural scenic beauty, wildlife and heritage of the National Landscape.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SEL2 – Protecting important views			

PM44	Page 32	Replace the policy with: <i>'Development proposals should respond positively to Stonesfield's character as a gateway from the nearby UNESCO Blenheim World Heritage site into the Cotswolds National Landscape, and further the statutory purpose of the CNL to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area. Development proposals which detract from Stonesfield's character or inhibit furtherance of the statutory purpose of the CNL will not be supported.'</i> <i>The Plan identifies key views on Figure 9.3. The design, layout, height and massing of development proposals should respond positively to the identified key views. Development proposals that unacceptably impact on the identified key views will not be supported.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM45	Page 33	<i>On Figure 9.3 delete the two elements of view 10 and the southern two elements of view 11.'</i>	Supported
PM46	Page 33	Replace the Protecting important views looking out of the village section with: <i>'The Village Character Assessment (Appendix D) highlights the importance of landscape views to the character of the village and the wider parish. A specific policy protecting the Evenlode Valley (Policy SEL3) has therefore been developed, and also for protection of Local Green Spaces (Policy SEL4).</i> <i>Policy SEL2 of the Plan is based on the fixed viewpoints shown on Fig 9.3. Other views that provide a positive experience of the village's landscape character landscape are shown in the Landscape Character Assessment (Appendix B). These other views underpin the Plan's more general approach towards landscape character.</i> <i>The following views are identified as important views for the purpose of this policy: Repeat the list (1-11) from</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

		<i>the submitted Plan with the relevant adjustments (in text) to views 10 and 11.'</i>	
Policy SEL3 – Protecting the Evenlode Valley and the adjacent dip-slope lowland			
PM47	Page 34	Replace the opening element of the policy with: 'Development proposals to the south-west, south and south-east of the existing building line defined housing settlement boundary as defined by the red line on Figure (include number) of Brook Lane, Churchfields, Church Street, Boot Street, Combe Road and Witney Lane will only be supported where they meet the following criteria:'	The West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 does not include defined settlement boundaries and nor does the draft Stonesfield Neighbourhood Plan so we suggest this is amended to: <i>'Development proposals located south-west, south or south-east of the existing building line that defines the settlement boundary along Brook Lane, Churchfields, Church Street, Boot Street, Combe Road and Witney Lane will be supported only where they meet the following criteria.'</i>
PM48	Page 34	Replace the second bullet point with: <i>'Major development proposals can robustly demonstrate that the consequent public benefit outweighs any harm to the landscape.'</i>	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM49	Page 34	<i>Delete the third bullet point</i>	Deletion is supported.
PM50	Page 34	Include an additional figure in the Plan to show the defined housing settlement boundary.	Not supported – See PM47. This negates the need to include an additional figure defining a settlement boundary for the village as a whole.
Policy SEL4 – Protecting Stonesfield's Local Green Spaces			
PM51	Page 47	Delete LGSs 1, 3, and 15	Deletion is supported.
PM52	Page 47	Delete LGSs 1, 3, and 15 from Figure 9.4	Deletion is supported.
Policy SEL5 – Blue/green corridors			
PM53	Page 48	Replace the policy with: 'Stonesfield's natural environment should be protected, and where practicable enhanced, to achieve an overall net gain in biodiversity as set out in Local Plan 2031 Policy EH3 and Cotswolds Management Plan policy	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

		CE7. Stonesfield's SSSIs and designated wildlife sites will be protected. Development proposals in the three blue/green corridors identified on Fig 9.7 should take appropriate opportunities to enhance the environment and in particular to contribute towards the Northern Evenlode Conservation Target Area. Development proposals that would detract from the character, appearance and integrity of a blue/green corridor will not be supported. Where appropriate, development proposals should incorporate measures that contribute to delivering overall gains for biodiversity, and in particular the aims of the relevant Conservation Target Area in achieving net gains for each of the Oxfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Targets.'	
PM54	Page 48	At the end of the second paragraph of the Justification add the deleted second paragraph of the policy.	
Policy SEL6 – Biodiversity			
PM55	Page 49	Replace the second part of the policy with: 'Where appropriate, development proposals should result in a net biodiversity gain of at least 10%.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM56	Page 49	Replace the opening element of the third part of the policy with: 'Wherever practicable, development proposals should take opportunities to incorporate wildlife improvements in and around developments to help secure measurable overall gains for wildlife. As appropriate to their scale nature and location of the development concerned this could include the implementation of measures such as:'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SEL7 – Protecting footpaths			
PM57	Page 49	Replace the policy with: 'Proposals which add to or enhance the availability of footpaths within the parish will be supported. Development proposal which would involve the obstruction, stopping up or diversion of any public	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

		footpath, bridleway or restricted byway will be not supported unless: [list the criteria from the submitted policy].'	
Policy SEL8 – Water quality, sustainable drainage systems and flood risk management			
PM58	Page 50	Replace the policy with: 'Development proposals should be designed to respect the surface water drainage profile of the neighbourhood area and should not increase flood or pollution risk in Stonesfield or elsewhere along the Evenlode Valley. As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems and appropriate measures should be taken to reduce surface water run-off. Development proposals will not be supported if they would: • result in increased surface water run-off without appropriate mitigation measures being included with the details of the proposal, including proposals for the long-term maintenance of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems; or • have an adverse effect on the quality of surface water in the Evenlode Catchment Area.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM59	Page 50	At the end of paragraph 9.7.3 add: 'The District Council will seek to ensure that adequate water and wastewater/ sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/ wastewater/sewerage company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater and sewerage network reinforcement requirements. It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface-water sewer. It must	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

		not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding’.	
PM60	Page 50	Replace paragraph 9.7.4 with the final part of the submitted policy (Grampian conditions).	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SEL9 – Tranquillity and dark skies			
PM61	Page 51	Replace the third part of the policy with: ‘In addition development proposals should, wherever reasonably practicable, respond positively to the Tranquillity and Dark Skies policies of the Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan and any relevant current Conservation Board Position Statement.’	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM62	Page 51	In the fourth part of the policy replace ‘possible’ with ‘practicable’	Minor amendment is supported.
Policy SHE1 – Heritage and archaeology			
PM63	Page 52	Replace the policy with: ‘The heritage values of the village and parish, particularly the designated heritage assets, and potential archaeological remains, should be carefully considered when planning any development. Development proposals should consider the setting of designated heritage assets and demonstrate that any proposal sustains and preserves any setting of an asset that contributes positively to heritage values. Development proposals should consider the potential for below-ground archaeological remains, including the potential evidence for the village’s former slate mining industry. Development proposals within the village outside the conservation area should take account of the design guide and illustrate how the character appraisal of the village has been considered and informed the proposed designs.’	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM64	Page 52	As a free-standing paragraph at the end of the Justification and supporting evidence section add:	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

		'Policy SHE1 sets out the Plan's approach to designated heritage assets. In this context planning application should be accompanied by appropriate evidence-based reports to set out how proposals address the identified character of the village and its surroundings and preserve or enhance heritage values of assets that may be affected. For proposals within the Conservation Area, and proposals affecting Listed Buildings or non-designated assets this would constitute a Heritage Impact Assessment /Heritage Statement. For proposals involving below ground disturbance, an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment should be provided. proportionate statements within the application should set out how proposal designs address the character of the parish. Development proposals which involve significant ground disturbance within the historic village centre (particularly, but not exclusively, the areas described in the 2024 Character Assessment as the Historic Core and Churchfields and Laughton Hill) should be accompanied by proportionate field evaluation assessments.'	There are however a couple of typos which should be addressed.
Policy SHE2 – Protecting non-designated heritage assets			
PM65	Page 53	Replace the policy with: 'Development proposals should respond positively to the non-designated heritage assets (in Fig 10.3) and their setting, and to the contribution that they make to the character and appearance of Stonesfield. The design, form and massing of development proposals (including their scale, form and character) should be sympathetic to non-designated heritage assets. The effect of an application on the significance of the identified non-designated heritage assets in Figure 10.3 should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

		indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Any application for development within the setting of a non-designated heritage asset should respond positively and sensitively to the relevant heritage asset.'	
Policy SBD1 – Locally appropriate design: Development and new building			
PM66	Page 53	Replace the fourth part of the policy with: 'Within the conservation area, development proposals should use traditional building materials (limestone, lime mortar and wooden window frames) wherever practicable. The incorporation of modern materials within development proposals in the Conservation Area will be supported where they show a high degree of design integrity in relation to the building concerned.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM67	Page 54	Delete the final three parts of the policy	Deletion supported.
PM68	Page 54	At the end of the policy add: 'Development proposals in the Conservation Area should incorporate existing dry-stone walls. Proposals that would result in the permanent loss of dry-stone walls in the conservation area will not be supported.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SBD2 – Locally appropriate design: Listed buildings, non-designated heritage assets and existing buildings			
PM69	Page 54	Delete the policy	Deletion supported.
Policy SBD3- Locally appropriate design: Natural Environment			
PM70	Page 55	Replace first part with: 'As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should positively enhance the character and appearance of their immediate locality, maintain and enhance the character and appearance of the village, and contribute to local distinctiveness and biodiversity.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM71	Page 55	In the second part of the policy replace 'which detract' with 'which unacceptably detract'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.

PM72	Page 55	Replace the third part of the policy with: 'Proposals which would restrict access to the countryside or wildlife-rich sites will not be supported.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM73	Page 55	Delete the final part of the policy	Deletion supported.
Policy SBD4 – Environmental design standards: New developments and refurbishments			
PM74	Page 55	Replace the opening element of the first part of the policy with: 'Proposals for new buildings should demonstrate how they would deliver excellent environmental performance. The following measures will be supported provided in each case that they demonstrate they avoid unacceptable harm to heritage assets, the village character and to the wider Cotswolds National Landscape.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM75	Page 56	Replace the second, third and fourth parts of the policy with: 'Development proposals should be designed to be water-efficient and reduce water consumption. Wherever practicable, refurbishments and other non-domestic development should meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential developments should not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption) using the 'Fittings Approach' in Table 2.2 of Part G of Building Regulations'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
PM76	Page 56	Delete the penultimate part of the policy.	Deletion is supported.
PM77	Page 56	Delete the final part of the policy.	Deletion is supported.
PM78	Page 56	At the end of the second paragraph of the Justification add: 'Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Policy SBD5 – Environmental design standards: Listed buildings, non-designated heritage assets and existing buildings			

PM79	Page 56	Replace the policy with: 'Wherever practicable proposals for alterations and extensions should take opportunities to improve the environmental performance of the building concerned. Proposals to improve the thermal efficiency of the roofs, walls, windows and doors whilst maintaining the external appearance of buildings will be supported, where they demonstrate that they avoid unacceptable harm to heritage assets, the character of the village and the wider Cotswolds National Landscape.'	Amended wording is supported and considered to be policy compliant.
Implementation and monitoring			
PM80	Page 57	At the end of paragraph 2.6.3 add: 'The adoption of the Local Plan 2043 will alter the strategic planning context in the District. The Parish Council will consider the need for a full or partial review of the neighbourhood plan within six months of the adoption of the Local Plan 2043.'	Additional wording is supported