Report on Shillingstone Parish Neighbourhood Plan First Review 2016 - 2031

An Examination undertaken for Dorset Council with the support of Shillingstone Parish Council on the Neighbourhood Plan First Review published in April 2026.

Independent Examiner: Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Date of Report: 7 September 2026

Contents

Main Findings - Executive Summary 3
1. Introduction and Context 3
Shillingstone Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2016–2031, First Review 2025 3
The Independent Examiner 4
Submitted Documents 4
Planning Policy Context 4
2. Procedural Considerations 5
Initial Determination 5
The Scope of the Examination 7
The Basic Conditions 8
Site Visit 9
Written Representations with or without Public Hearing 9
Examiner Modifications 9
3. Compliance Matters and Human Rights 10
Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area 10
Plan Period 10
Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation 10
Development and Use of Land 10
Excluded Development 10
Local Nature Recovery Strategy 11
Climate Change 11
Human Rights 11
4. Assessment of the Basic Conditions 11
Assimilated Obligations 11
Main Issues 12
Policy Modifications (Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 13) 12
Unchanged Policies (Policies 7 and 8) 14
Completed Policies (Policies 9 and 12) 14
Alterations to the Text 15
All Other Matters 15
5. Conclusions 15
Summary 15
Examiner Recommendation 15
Overview 15
Appendix: Examiner Modification 17

Main Findings - Executive Summary

I made an initial determination on 4 August 2026 that the modifications contained in the Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031, First Review 2025 (the Review Plan/First Review Plan) are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the extant Neighbourhood Plan which the Review Plan would replace.

From my examination of the Review Plan and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the Examiner Modification (**EM**) set out in this report, the Review Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- The Review Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Shillingstone Parish Council (SPC);
- The Review Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – the parish of Shillingstone as shown on Map 1 page 1 of the Review Plan;
- The Review Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2016 - 2031; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

Therefore, I recommend that Dorset Council (DC) should make the Review Plan with the **EM** specified in this report (there will be no statutory requirement for a referendum).

1. Introduction and Context

Shillingstone Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2016–2031, First Review 2025

1.1 Shillingstone is within the attractive rural area of the Blackmore Vale. The village lies in the Stour Valley, on the A357, about mid-way between Blandford Forum 8km to the south east and Sturminster Newton 6.5km to the north west. The designated Neighbourhood Plan Area covers the parish of Shillingstone. The parish population in 2021 was 1,165.[1] It is the subject of the Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan which was "made" (approved and adopted) in February 2017 by North Dorset District Council (NDDC).

1.2 In the following years, the main source of Government planning policy, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been updated.[2] The Plan has been reviewed to ensure that it remains up to date and reflects the needs and aspirations of parish residents.

[1] 2021 Census: page 3, paragraph 2.95 of the Plan.
[2] In this regard, see footnote 5 below.

The Independent Examiner

1.3 As the Review Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Shillingstone Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2016 - 2031, First Review 2025 by DC with the agreement of the SPC.

1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former Government Planning Inspector. I am an independent examiner, with experience of examining many neighbourhood plans and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the Review Plan.

Submitted Documents

1.5 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:

- the Shillingstone Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031, First Review 2025 (April 2026);
- the summary of proposals and reasons for the modifications as set out in the Plan[3];
- the Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan Review Modifications Statement (May 2026);
- the statement from DC in their Regulation 16 representation on the nature of the proposed modifications (July 2026);
- Map 1 on page 1 of the Plan area, which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Review relates;
- a copy of the extant Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031, as made;
- the Consultation Statement (November 2025);
- the Basic Conditions Statement (May 2026);
- the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report (May 2025);
- all the representations which have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation; and
- the responses from SPC and DC received on 17 and 18 August 2026 respectively in answer to my questions of clarification dated 4 August 2026.[4]

Planning Policy Context

1.6 The Development Plan for this part of Dorset Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, includes the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (NDLP) adopted in 2016. The Local Plan was produced by the former North Dorset District Council. The NDLP is being replaced by the Dorset Council Local Plan (DCLP). DC have agreed that the DCLP will now be prepared in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2026. The next

[3] See paragraphs 2.4 – 2.10 below.
[4] View all the listed document at: https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/shillingstone-neighbourhood-plan

step will be a scoping consultation, which involves asking people what the new Local Plan should cover and how they would like to be involved. The scoping consultation is expected to take place between 21 September and 25 October 2026. Gateway 1 (self-assessment) is expected on 30 November 2026. Adoption is not expected until 2029.

1.7 This Plan has been prepared in the context of the version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in December 2024. A revised NPPF was published during the examination on 17 August 2026. However, the revised version does not apply for the purposes of this examination.[5] Unless otherwise stated, all references in the report are to the December 2024 NPPF and the accompanying Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

2. Procedural Considerations

Initial Determination

2.1 As the proposal has been submitted as a modification of the made Neighbourhood Plan, I undertook an initial determination under Paragraph 10(1) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"). This concerned whether the modifications contained in the Review Plan are so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the Neighbourhood Plan which the Review Plan would replace.

2.2 If there is no change to the nature of the made Plan, the modification proposal can be examined under the streamlined process set out in Schedule A2 of the 2004 Act (requiring no referendum). Otherwise, the examination would proceed under Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), whereby an examination and referendum would be required.

2.3 SPC and DC are required to publish statements setting out their reasoned views on this matter. For SPC, the provision is contained in Regulation 15(1)(f) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ("the 2012 Regulations"). For DC, the provision is at Regulation 17(e)(ii).

2.4 The views of SPC were publicised at the Regulation 14 stage[6] (see the first page of the Consultation Statement). The reasons for the review are further publicised in the Basic Conditions Statement (p4; paras 2.2 and 3.5). This information indicates that the modifications made require examination but not a referendum.

[5] See the transitional arrangements provided by Annex A, Paragraph 6 of the August 2026 NPPF: National Planning Policy Framework - GOV.UK
[6] Regulation 14(a)(v).

2.5 To inform the determination, I considered all the relevant submitted documents and representations. In particular:

- the Consultation Statement which demonstrates that, through the Modifications Statement, SPC alerted respondents to the nature of the changes being made to the Plan through the review;

- the comments throughout the submission draft Neighbourhood Plan First Review (Regulation 15), which explain very briefly the reasons for reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan, along with the more detailed Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan First Review Modifications Statement, May 2026[7];

- the written statement on this matter provided by DC to comply with Regulation 17(e)(ii).

2.6 The draft Plan does not propose any significant changes. The SPC state in their Modifications Statement that the Plan period (2016 – 2031), vision and objectives remain unchanged. The changes do not look to add, delete or significantly modify the extent of any of the proposed site allocations. The policies covering site allocations that have now been completed have been removed as they no longer serve any clear purpose. Changes to the site allocation policy for site HTL-N primarily relate to relatively minor matters of design, and changes to the site allocation policy for site OX reflect its partial completion and extant consent. The clarification in relation to house types and ensuring affordable housing is brought forward through the efficient use of land does not change the thrust of these policies in meeting local housing needs, in line with national planning guidance.

2.7 The addition of two new Local Green Spaces into the policy protecting green spaces does not change the thrust of the policy. The addition of the Co-op store into the policy protecting community facilities, does not change the thrust of the policy. The requirement for evidence on viability prior to determining whether the loss or reduction in a community facility may be allowed does not change the thrust of the policy which is to safeguard important community facilities. The additional detail on highways matters reflects the issues raised previously through the Neighbourhood Plan process and align with the concept of a vision-led approach to transport planning promoted through national planning policy.

2.8 Additional matters in relation to design are not considered to be a substantive change but ensure that due consideration is given to both climate change and retaining local character. Accordingly, SPC consider that the proposed modifications are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan.

[7] I consider, in essence, STC has sought to substantially comply with the requirements of Regulations 14(a)(v) and 15(1)(f).

2.9 Similarly, DC have compared the policies in the made Plan with those of the Review Plan, summarised the key differences in their Regulation 16 response (pages 40 – 43) and concluded that whilst there have been a large number of changes, none of the proposed modifications are so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the Plan.

2.10 Having assessed all the written documents submitted, including the representations and relevant statements, I am content that the modifications proposed in the draft Plan are material but do not change the nature of the made Plan. I set out my determination in my procedural letter of 4 August 2026 to DC and SPC. Therefore, the examination can proceed under the terms of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act which I set out below and, as a consequence, should I recommend that the draft Plan be made (with or without Examiner Modifications), a referendum stage will not be a necessary part of the statutory process.

2.11 I note that the vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan Review remain the same as the made Plan and the overall nature of the Review Plan including its scope, issues, aims and policy context is similar to the made Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

2.12 As the independent examiner, I am required to produce this report and recommend either:

(a) that the local planning authority should make the draft plan; or

(b) that the local planning authority should make the draft plan with the modifications specified in this report; or

(c) that the local planning authority should not make the draft plan.

2.13 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 11(1) of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act. The examiner must consider:

- Whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions.

- Whether the plan complies with provisions under s.38A and s.38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ('the 2004 Act'). These are principally:

  - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;

  - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land and does not go beyond the scope of what may be included in a draft plan[8];

  - it specifies the period during which it has effect;

[8] See s.38B(A1) and s.38B(2C)(a) of the 2004 Act.

- it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;

- it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development';

- so far as the qualifying body considers appropriate, and having regard to the subject matter of the plan, it is designed to secure that the development and use of land in the neighbourhood area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change[9]; and

- so far as the qualifying body considers appropriate, and having regard to the subject matter of the plan, it takes account of any local nature recovery strategy, under section 104 of the Environment Act 2021, that relates to all or part of the neighbourhood area.[10]

- Whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the plan proceed to referendum.

- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)('the 2012 Regulations').

2.14 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 11(1) of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the draft Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

2.15 The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in Paragraph 11(2) of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the draft Plan must:

- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;

- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;

- Not result in the development plan for the area of the authority proposing that less housing is provided by means of development taking place in that area than if the draft plan were not to be made;[11]

[9] This additional requirement was commenced on 25 March 2026 by virtue of *The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026*, which brought into force section 98 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023.
[10] See footnote above.
[11] This Basic Condition applies from 25 March 2026 by virtue of *The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026*, which brought into force section 99 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023. This replaces the former Basic Condition which required a

- Be compatible with, and not breach, assimilated obligations[12]; and
- Meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

2.16 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the Neighbourhood Plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.[13]

Site Visit

2.17 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 7 August 2026 to familiarise myself with the Plan area and visit relevant sites and locations referenced in the Review Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

2.18 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. At the Regulation 16 stage, no representors suggested that a hearing would be necessary. Sufficient written evidence has been provided which I have supplemented by my site visit. In all respects, the representations clearly articulate their submissions to the Review Plan. There are no exceptional reasons to justify convening a public hearing.[14]

Examiner Modifications

2.19 Where necessary, I have specified Examiner Modifications (**EMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have included this modification separately in an Appendix.

neighbourhood plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area.

[12] See: The Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 (Consequential Amendment) Regulations 2023, which replaced the previous reference to 'EU' obligations.

[13] This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

[14] See Paragraph 12(2)(a) of Schedule A2.

3. Compliance Matters and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

3.1 The Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2031, First Review 2025, has been prepared and submitted for examination by SPC, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by the former NDDC in September 2013. NDDC was replaced by DC on 1 April 2019 which carries over the statutory designation.

3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

3.3 The Review Plan clearly specifies the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2016 to 2031 and is unaltered from the existing made Plan.

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

3.4 Details of the Review Plan preparation, events, activities and consultation are set out in the SPC Consultation Statement (CS), as submitted to DC.

3.5 Regulation 14 consultation took place between 1 June 2024 and 8 August 2025. The main issues and concerns raised by residents and statutory consultees and how they were considered by SPC are included as a table on pages 2 -17 of the CS.

3.6 At the Regulation 16 stage, between 12 June 2026 and 24 July 2026, ten representations were received, including one from DC, and are provided in the submitted Regulation 16 Consultation Schedule.

3.7 I confirm that the legal requirements have been met by the consultation process. In addition, there has been regard to the advice in the PPG on plan preparation and engagement.

Development and Use of Land

3.8 The Review Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with Section 38A of the 2004 Act and does not exceed the appropriate scope of a neighbourhood plan.[15]

Excluded Development

3.9 The Review Plan does not include provisions and policies for "excluded development".[16]

[15] See s.38B(A1) and s.38B(2C)(a) of the 2004 Act.
[16] The meaning of 'excluded development' is set out in s.61K of the 1990 Act.

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

3.10 The Basic Conditions Statement (BCS) comments that the Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) was published in December 2025 and that whilst it was not possible to take account of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy in the preparation of the Regulation 14 version of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Plan is broadly in accord with the policy and no clear conflicts have been identified. DC considers that the qualifying body have given the matter due consideration. Having read the LNRS, I consider that none of the Plan's policies are in direct conflict with it.

Climate Change

3.11 I am also satisfied that, overall, the Plan as proposed to be modified does not conflict with the aims of securing development which contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change.

Human Rights

3.12 The BCS advises that no issues have been raised in relation to the possible contravention of Human Rights in the preceding consultations and given the conclusions on the Plan's regard to national planning policy, it is reasonable to conclude that the making of the Plan should not breach human rights. I have considered this matter independently and I have found no reason to disagree with the statement in the BCS and I am satisfied that the policies will not have a discriminatory impact on any particular group of individuals.

4. Assessment of the Basic Conditions

Assimilated Obligations

4.1 The Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan First Review was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) by DC, which found that it was unnecessary to undertake a full SEA or HRA. Having read the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report, December 2024 (updated May 2025), I support this conclusion. The statutory consultees raised no objections to the Review Plan. From my independent assessment of this matter and having read the Review Plan, the supporting information and the summaries of the representations, I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, I am satisfied that the Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan First Review is compatible with the assimilated obligations that are relevant to this Plan.

Main Issues

4.2 Having considered whether the First Review Plan complies with various procedural and legal requirements, it is now necessary to deal with whether it complies with the remaining Basic Conditions, particularly the regard it pays to national policy and guidance and the contribution it makes to the achievement of sustainable development. I test the First Review Plan against the Basic Conditions by considering specific issues of compliance of all the Plan's policies.

4.3 As part of that assessment, I consider whether the policies are sufficiently clear and unambiguous, having regard to advice in the PPG. A neighbourhood plan policy should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.[17]

4.4 The main changes proposed to the Plan policies are that nine of the policies in the made Plan have been altered; no changes are proposed to two policies which are site allocations; and two policies have been completed (and therefore deleted).

4.5 Accordingly, having regard to the Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan First Review, the consultation responses, other evidence and the site visit, I consider that the main issues in this examination are whether the draft Plan's policies: (i) have regard to national policy and guidance; (ii) do not result in the development plan for the area proposing less housing development than would have been the case if the plan were not to be made; and (iii) would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. I shall consider firstly the modified policies and, secondly, the unchanged policies to ensure they remain compliant.

Policy Modifications (Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 13)

4.6 ***Policy 1 Local green spaces (LGS)***. The policy wording has been expanded to refer specifically to inappropriate development that would reduce the open character or otherwise harm the reason/s for the designation of that LGS and which is supported by DC. Burton Orchard and the adjoining play area have been included as new LGS which are owned by the SPC and are considered to fulfil the criteria for Local Green Spaces set out in the national planning policy and to which I agree. The policy continues to have regard to national guidance[18] and meets the Basic Conditions.

4.7 ***Policy 2 Our roads, lanes and tracks***. The policy has been renamed and significantly expanded to highlight local issues relating to matters impacting on the safe use of the roads and tracks around the parish,

[17] PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.
[18] NPPF: paragraphs 106 - 108.

particularly in relation to parking provision, layout, protection of front and side areas of properties, street trees, permeable surfaces and drainage, provision of pavements, and pedestrian links. DC do not object to the expanded policy. The policy continues to have regard to national guidance[19] and meets the Basic Conditions.

4.8 ***Policy 3 The character and design of new development***. The policy has been expanded to include reference to and support for design measures to reduce carbon use and waste and to improve biodiversity and water efficiency. The revised policy allows for deviations from traditional vernacular where there is a significant improvement to the sustainability credentials of a building. DC support this change. I have taken account of the comprehensive Regulation 16 representations from Mr Hart. However, I consider that the revised policy does not change the nature of the Plan and it continues to have regard to national guidance[20] and to meet the Basic Conditions.

4.9 ***Policy 4 Important community facilities***. The policy has been amended by adding a requirement for clear, independently verified evidence that the partial loss of a community facility would not compromise the viability of the remainder of the facility. As noted in paragraph 2.7 above, the Co-op store has also been added to the facilities listed in the policy. The policy continues to have regard to national guidance[21] and to meet the Basic Conditions.

4.10. ***Policy 5 Development within the settlement boundary***. The policy has been updated by a second paragraph to clarify that development outside the settlement boundary will be strictly controlled unless it is required to enable essential rural needs to be met. The policy continues to have regard to national guidance[22] and to meet the Basic Conditions.

4.11 ***Policy 6 Housing types and sizes***. The policy has been amended to provide guidance on house sizes in relation to local needs in relation to open market housing, so that the mix better reflects the greater need for 2 and some 3 bedroomed properties. There is an additional paragraph in the policy aimed to prevent developers avoiding the requirement for affordable housing by site subdivision. Whereas I agree with the aim of this part of the policy, I consider attributing a motive to site subdivision could be extremely difficult to establish. If there is a widespread issue about the avoidance of affordable housing by site subdivision, I would expect strategic or national guidance. Nevertheless, I consider that an appropriate rephasing of this section of the policy as follows would improve clarity: *"Where planning applications are made for open market housing on a site at which subdivision has occurred, considerations about the quantity of affordable housing will include ensuring that the land is used effectively whilst fulfilling affordable housing obligations."* **(EM1)** The

[19] NPPF: paragraphs 109 - 112, 136 & 181.
[20] NPPF: paragraphs 135, 162 & 202.
[21] NPPF: paragraph 98.
[22] NPPF: paragraphs 61, 109 & 187.

policy would continue to have regard to national guidance[23], would not result in the development plan for the area proposing less housing development and would meet the Basic Conditions.

4.12 ***Policy 10 Hine Town Lane North of the Old Ox (HTL-N)***. This policy continues to allocate land for up to 12 dwellings. A number of minor changes have been included to highlight the need for affordable and smaller dwelling types, and to provide guidance on building heights. The policy also clarifies the need for the landscaping to include areas of permanent green space through the development in order to reinforce the rural character of the village. Issues relating to the disposal of surface water are also made clearer. The policy continues to have regard to national guidance[24] and to meet the Basic Conditions.

4.13 ***Policy 11 Land at the Old Ox (OX)***. This policy has been updated to reflect the most recent approval for further housing to the rear of the Old Ox. The focus on the policy is to ensure the retention of the remaining undeveloped area for parking and pub garden/open space. Although DC queried the map accompanying the policy, I found the explanation clear and logical and see no reason to modify the map. The policy continues to have regard to national guidance[25] and to meet the Basic Conditions.

4.14 ***Policy 13 Whitepit Farm buildings (WPF-B)***. Minor changes to the policy wording have been made to reference the need for a sensitive approach to lighting and avoidance of visual clutter in terms of utilities and which has the support of DC. The policy continues to have regard to national guidance[26] and to meet the Basic Conditions.

Unchanged Policies (Policies 7 and 8)

4.15 ***Policy 7*** - Antell's Haulage Yard (AH); and ***Policy 8*** - Land off Candy's Lane (CAN) are unchanged. These policies allocate sites for residential development still capable of delivery within the Plan period, and no issues have been raised in relation to the policies. Each policy continues to have regard to national guidance, would not result in the development plan for the area proposing less housing development, would contribute to sustainable development and would meet the Basic Conditions.

Completed Policies (Policies 9 and 12)

4.16 **Policy 9** - Land adjoining the Cobbles (COB); and **Policy 12** - Hine Town Lane South of the Old Ox (HTL-S) have been marked in the Review Plan as "completed", the policy wording deleted and the respective accompanying texts replaced, describing the updated position in relation to the implementation of the planning permissions.

[23] NPPF: paragraphs 63 & 65.
[24] NPPF: paragraphs 63, 135 & 181.
[25] NPPF: paragraph 98.
[26] NPPF: paragraph 198 & 187.

Alterations to the Text

4.17 A consequence of the acceptance of the modification would be that amendments might have to be made to the explanation within the Plan in order to make it logical. Other amendments might also include minor contextual updates correcting minor inaccuracies or typographical errors (for example the deletion of paragraph 5.12 which appears to duplicate part of paragraph 5.13), cross referencing and any renumbering of paragraphs and policies. None of these alterations would affect the ability of the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions and could be undertaken as minor, non-material changes.[27]

All Other Matters

4.17 In this examination, I have focussed on differences in the policies between the made Neighbourhood Plan and the Review Plan. Nevertheless, I have considered afresh the whole of the draft Plan. I have reviewed each policy in terms of its consistency with national policy and guidance. Other than the issues that are discussed above, I am satisfied that there are no other matters which affect the Basic Conditions.

5. Conclusions

Summary

5.1 The Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan 2016 –2031 First Review 2025 has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has assessed whether the Review Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Review Plan and the evidence documents submitted with it.

5.2 I have set out modifications to Policy 6 to ensure the Review Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements.

Examiner Recommendation

5.3 I recommend that DC should make the Review Plan with the modification specified in the Appendix to this report.

Overview

5.4 The made Plan was extremely comprehensive, well written and illustrated. The Review Plan is consistent with those qualities. I congratulate those who have been involved. I appreciated the comprehensive documentation which was submitted from both Councils at the various stages of the

[27] PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509.

examination, and especially the helpful comments made in response to my questions. The Review Plan should continue to prove to be a useful tool for future sustainable planning within Shillingstone over the coming years.

Andy Mead

Examiner

Appendix: Examiner Modification

Examiner Modification number (EM)	Policy/other reference	Modification
EM1	Policy 6	Replace the second paragraph in the policy with: **"Where planning applications are made for open market housing on a site at which subdivision has occurred, considerations about the quantity of affordable housing will include ensuring that the land is used effectively whilst fulfilling affordable housing obligations."**