

TRAFFIC LIGHTS AUDIT REPORT

On Saturday 9 November 2019, 12 local residents met in the Village Hall in Sonning Common to consider the 'Traffic Light' rankings allocated by a sub-group of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party to each of the 10 new sites put forward for development by landowners/land agents. All of the participants had undertaken at least two Site Assessment surveys of the new sites and none were affiliated to either Sonning Common Parish Council, or to the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Working Party.

Process

Participants were asked to check each red, amber or green colour annotation on the Site Ranking Criteria & Summary of Site Evaluations grid (referred to hereinafter as the 'Traffic Lights') against their own knowledge and what had emerged from the summaries of the 80 Site Assessment Surveys completed by local residents. If they queried any annotation, they noted this in writing with, in most cases, an argument as to why and a suggested new annotation. In effect they were acting as auditors.

They were divided into pairs and each of the 10 sites was audited twice by different pairs. Information available to the auditors included (a) maps of the village and of individual sites, (b) descriptions of each site, (c) verbatim summaries of the 80 Site Assessment Surveys, (d) evaluation grids showing the suggested 'traffic light' rankings of individual sites against key planning criteria and (e) guidance notes on the criteria.

Three members from the NP Working Party were present throughout the audit to assist with any questions.

Detail

Residents undertaking the site surveys were asked to complete a **tick box** assessment of questions within Parts 2A-E of the surveys. The results were duly transferred to the Traffic Lights.

The Working Party interpreted the **comments** by surveyors to questions within Parts 3A and B of the surveys and allocated red, amber or green colour annotations. These were also transferred to the Traffic Lights. Outside of the surveys, the Working Party allocated colour annotations to questions A to AK on the Traffic Lights.

All conclusions were assessed by the auditors.

Clarifications

Auditors commented both in written remarks and during the audit itself that the notes alongside some of the site ranking criteria on the Traffic Lights grid could have been clearer and in one particular instance the colour coding for Yes/Maybe/No was, indeed, counter-intuitive. These comments were taken on board during the audit and clarification provided. Where appropriate, written amendments (*see blue italics below*) were also later included on revised versions of the grid and the guidance notes.

Item 8 – Survey Part 3B

All clear = Green; Partial = Amber; No *potential for development*/major concerns = Red

Criteria AA to AF – since the audit the overarching colour coding guidance of y=Yes=Red; maybe=Amber; n=N=Green has been deleted and replaced with separate colour guidance for each of the six criteria. The colour interpretation confusion was raised by auditors during the meeting and clarified verbally by the NP Working Party.

Criterion AA - the guidance notes provided on the criteria should have emphasised that the reference to ‘another settlement’ in the question ‘Would development of this site risk a significant trend toward merging with another settlement?’ was in regard to settlements **outside** Sonning Common, (eg Reading, Kidmore End, Rotherfield Peppard). SON 26 was considered as a high risk (Red) towards Reading, with SON 27 (Amber) trending towards Reading. *Written guidance notes duly amended.*

Criterion AD - which originally read ‘Would the development support or undermine the vitality and viability of the (village) centre?’ could not be answered Yes or No. Following discussion during the audit the words ‘*or undermine*’ were deleted.

The Audit

What follows is a verbatim report of all comments made by the 12 auditors with regard to each site considered. The post-audit responses completed by the NP Working Party sub-group, are recorded in *blue italics* and take account of the notes from the auditors and their suggested revisions to colour annotations/flags on the Traffic Lights grid.

SON 12a - Blackmore Lane North (lower)

Group A

Item 8 – Survey Part 3B – sought the Site Assessment surveyors’ views including whether the site should be considered for development. Auditors suggested expanding the guidance notes alongside the criteria to increase clarity. *This has been done as explained in the Clarifications paragraph above.*

Criterion R – Are local schools reasonably accessible? Flagged Amber. Although in agreement, the auditors commented that this was marginal for the secondary school. *The view is that secondary school pupils should be able to walk or cycle this distance.*

Criterion S – Will the local traffic impact be acceptable? Flagged Red given the narrowness of Blackmore Lane which further along is signposted as a ‘Failed Road.’ The auditors suggested it could be scored Amber with sufficient road infrastructure and parking provision. *Comment noted but Red remains because of road width limitations and limited sight lines at the junction.*

Criterion AB – ‘Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale and character with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?’ Red flag confirmed by auditors but with a note that colour annotation guidance was counter-intuitive. *Comment noted and appropriate written amendments in place as previously mentioned.*

Criterion AC – ‘Is development compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses?’ Flagged as Red. Auditors suggested Amber because it would be compatible with neighbouring houses albeit **not** with neighbouring fields. *Given the existing housing on neighbouring Peppard Road and Blackmore Lane, the flag has been changed to Amber.*

Group D

Item 4 – Survey Part 2C – covered neighbouring character and uses - Auditors commented that the tiered nature of build would impact Blackmore Lane and AONB negatively and therefore the flag should be Red not Amber. *Comments noted but Amber remains in place because the 9 Site Assessment surveyors' scorings comprised 5 Amber and 4 Red.*

Criterion AA – ‘Would development of this site risk a significant trend toward merging with another settlement?’ Auditors suggested that this should be flagged Red and not Green because development near Blackmore Lane would open up further development. *No change to the Green flag because development of SON 12a would not involve a trend towards merging with another settlement (ie outside of Sonning Common).*

Criterion AB – ‘Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?’ Red flag. Auditors suggested Green. *Verbal clarification during the audit meeting of the ‘correct’ colour annotations for this category of criteria was acknowledged and the Red flag thus remains and was accepted by the auditors.*

Criterion AC – ‘Is development compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses?’ Flagged Red. Auditors suggested Amber/Red. *Given the existing housing on neighbouring Peppard Road and Blackmore Lane, the flag has been changed to Amber. (See also comments above from Group A.)*

SON 12b – Blackmore Lane North (upper)

Group A

Item 5 – Survey Part 2D – covered walking and cycling – Flagged Red. Auditors suggested Amber on the basis that the site is similar to SON 12a and within 800m of the village centre. *Comments noted but Red remains in place because the 9 Site Assessment surveyors' scorings comprised 5 Red, 3 Amber and 1 Green.*

Criteria N to R – each covers accessibility to village facilities – Flagged Red. Auditors suggested Amber to be compatible with SON 12a. *No change because SON 12b (on its own) is not as accessible as SON 12a.*

Criterion S – Will the local traffic impact be acceptable? Flagged Red given the narrowness of Blackmore Lane which is signposted as a ‘Failed Road’ alongside SON 12b. The auditors suggested it could be Amber with provision of sufficient road infrastructure and parking. *Comment noted but site as it exists today on its own is effectively landlocked with limited access only on to the failed road. Red flag remains.*

Group D

Criterion L – ‘Is the site free from flood risk (incl. significant drainage issues)?’ Flagged Red. Auditors suggested Amber on the basis that it is more of a problem with SON 12a. *Following reconsideration there appears to be no known flood/drainage risk on the site and therefore the flag is changed from Red to Green.*

Criteria N to R – each covers accessibility to village facilities – Flagged Red. Auditors suggested Amber to be compatible with SON 12a. *No change because SON 12b (on its own) is not as accessible as SON 12a. (See also comments above from Group A.)*

Criterion U – ‘Are there natural boundaries, or other obvious boundaries to the site?’ Flagged Amber. Auditors suggested Green as there are 4 natural boundaries. *Flag remains Amber as there are open fields with no natural/physical boundary on 2 sides.*

Criterion AA – ‘Would development of this site risk a significant trend toward merging with another settlement?’ Auditor suggested that this should be flagged Red and not Green because development near Blackmore Lane would open up further development. *No change to the Green flag because development of SON 12b would not involve a trend towards merging with another settlement (ie outside of Sonning Common).*

Criterion AB – ‘Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?’ Flagged Red. Auditors suggested Green. *Verbal clarification during the audit meeting of the ‘correct’ colour annotations for this category of criteria was acknowledged and the Red flag thus remains and was accepted by the auditors.*

Criterion AC – ‘Is development compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses?’ Red flag. Auditors suggested Green. *Verbal clarification during the audit meeting of the ‘correct’ colour annotations for this category of criteria was acknowledged and the Red flag thus remains and was accepted by the auditors.*

SON 21a – Blackmore Lane South

Note to auditors:

Item 3 – Survey Part 2B – covered Green Space and Wildlife - *Site Assessment surveyors’ scores comprised 4 Green, 2 Amber and 2 Red. This was flagged Amber incorrectly by the NP Working Party and has been amended to Green.*

Group B

Item 8 – Survey Part 3B – sought the Site Assessment surveyors’ views including whether the site should be considered for development. Auditors suggested Green flag should be changed to Amber because of access concerns and the bend in the B481 (Peppard Road). *Comments noted but remains Green because Site Assessment surveyors’ remarks indicated 5 Green, 1 Amber and 2 Red.*

Criterion AB – ‘Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?’ Flagged Green. Auditors suggested Red. *Verbal clarification during the audit meeting of the ‘correct’ colour annotations for this category of criteria was acknowledged and the Red flag thus remains and was accepted by the auditors.*

Criterion AG – ‘Does the site offer **particular** scope for provision of Amenity Greenspace (ie grassed and informal recreation)?’ Flagged Amber but auditors commented that that the site was too small and had access difficulties being on the edge of a busy road and therefore should be flagged as Red. *Following reconsideration, the Amber flag has been changed to Red.*

Group E

Criterion AD - ‘Would development support the vitality and viability of the village centre?’ Flagged Amber. Auditors suggested that any development not matched by infrastructure improvement would be detrimental. *Amber flag remains as the site’s proximity to the village centre suggests that residents would be able to walk/cycle to the community facilities.*

Criterion AH – ‘Does site offer scope for development of any appropriate B1 office space?’ Flagged Amber. Auditors considered this would be out of keeping with the AONB and surrounding housing and therefore should be flagged Red. *Following reconsideration, the Amber flag has been changed to Red.*

SON 21b – land north of Reddish Manor

Group B

Criterion K - ‘Is the site particularly sensitive from a landscape (AONB) standpoint?’ Flagged Amber. Auditors suggested this was marginal because the land is not in the AONB but is adjacent to it. *Amber flag remains as the site lies within the **setting of the AONB** which is an important planning consideration.*

Criterion AB – ‘Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale and character with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?’ Flagged Red. Auditors suggested an Amber. *Red flag remains as the site is considered too small to accommodate a number of homes and the ‘density’ and ‘character’ closest to it comprises Reddish Manor and its grounds.*

Criterion AD ‘Would the development support the vitality and viability of the village centre?’ Flagged Green. Auditors suggested Amber. *Agreed as the site is probably too small to support the village centre. Flag colour changed to Amber.*

Group E

The auditors said that this site should be considered **only** if SON 21a was developed. The reason for this recommendation was access to the road for pedestrians and for vehicles was unsafe. *Comments noted.*

Criterion AD - ‘Would development support the vitality and viability of the village centre?’ Flagged Green. Auditors suggested that any development not matched by infrastructure improvement would be detrimental. *Flag changed to Amber on the basis that the potential offered by the site is probably too small to support the village centre. (See also comments above from Group B.)*

Criterion AH – ‘Does site offer scope of any appropriate B1 office space?’ Flagged Amber. Auditors considered this would be out of keeping with the AONB and surrounding housing and therefore should be flagged Red. *Following reconsideration, including the significant access difficulties for vehicles, the Amber flag has been changed to Red.*

SON 22 – Blounts Court Road

Group C

Item 3 – Survey Part 2B –covered green space and wildlife - Auditors suggested that the Red flag should be replaced with Amber on the basis that the scoring presented was balanced. *The 7 Site Assessment surveyors’ scorings comprised 4 Red, 1 Amber and 2 Green. On the basis that Red cancels Green and vice versa, then this reduces to 2 Red and 1 Amber. Therefore, the weighting system which we have adopted means that the Red flag stands.*

Criteria N to R – each covers accessibility to village facilities – Flagged Amber. Auditors suggested Red so as to be consistent with SON 12b. *Unlike SON 12b, which is landlocked, SON 22 has access to a road network. However, on further consideration we have changed the flags in respect of two of the criteria, namely:*

Criterion O – ‘Is a bus stop reasonably accessible?’ *This is now flagged Red given the distance to the nearest bus stop.*

Criterion R – ‘Are local schools reasonably accessible?’ *This is now flagged Red principally because of distance and potential safety issues with walking children to the primary school.*

Criterion T – ‘On how many sides does the site adjoin existing housing or development?’ Flagged Amber. Auditors suggested a change to Red on the basis that there was no development on any side. *Amber remains in place given that there is existing commercial development on the east side of Blounts Court Road.*

Criterion AA – ‘Would development of this site risk a significant trend toward merging with another settlement?’ Auditors commented that this should be flagged Amber and not Red because the site was not in the direction of any other close settlements. *The auditors’ reasoning is correct. Indeed, the criterion was incorrectly colour annotated to begin with and should have been input as Green. Flag changed to Green.*

Group F

Criterion AB – ‘Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale and character with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?’ Flagged Red.

Criterion AC – ‘Is development compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses?’ Flagged Red.

As highlighted at the beginning under Clarifications, colour guidance covering these criteria at the time of the audit was confusing. The auditors in this group suggested that changing the wording of the questions would clarify.

However, since the audit the overarching colour coding guidance has been deleted and replaced with separate colour guidance for each of the AA to AF criteria.

The auditors understood the issues as these were discussed during the meeting and they confirmed their agreement of the Red scorings in each of the above two criteria.

SON 23 – Johnson Matthey Car Park

Group C

Criterion T – ‘On how many sides does the site adjoin existing housing or development?’ Flagged Green. Auditors recommended a change to Amber given that the site did not adjoin existing housing or development on 3 or 4 sides. *Agreed. The flag has been changed to Amber, which applies to existing housing or development on only 1 or 2 sides.*

Group D

Item 7 – Survey Part 3A – sought the Site Assessment surveyors’ views on the key issues for the site. Auditors suggested that the Amber flag should be replaced with Green on the basis that this was not a particularly sensitive site. *Of the 9 Site Assessment surveyors’ remarks, 5 indicated Amber and 4 Green. Therefore, Amber remains in place.*

SON 24 – Widmore Pond

Group A

Item 3 – Survey Part 2B – covered green space and wildlife - Auditors suggested that the Amber flag should be replaced with Red because of potential pollution to the ponds from building, construction and housing. *Comments noted but Amber remains in place. Of the 8 Site Assessment surveyors’ remarks, 5 indicated Amber and 3 Red.*

Item 7 – Survey Part 3A – sought the Site Assessment surveyors’ views on the key issues for the site – Auditors suggested that the Amber flag should be replaced with Red. *The 8 surveyors’ comments were duly reconsidered and the result (6 Red, 1 Amber and 1 Green) means that a Red flag has been substituted.*

Item 8 – Survey Part 3B – sought the Site Assessment surveyors’ views including whether the site should be considered for development. Auditors suggested that the Amber flag should be changed to Red. *The 8 surveyors’ comments were duly reconsidered (3 Red, 4 Amber and 1 Green) and the Amber flag is therefore confirmed.*

Criterion G – ‘Is the site of archaeological interest?’ – Auditors suggested that the Green flag should be changed to Amber due to the close proximity of the site to Widmore Pond. *The Green flag has been changed to Amber because part of the site is understood to be within an area of archaeological interest.*

Criterion H – ‘Does the site contain or adjoin any heritage/local assets?’ – Auditors suggested that the Amber flag should be changed to Red given that Widmore Pond is regarded as a valued local asset. *Agreed. Furthermore, part of the western boundary adjoins ancient woodland (Slade’s Wood). Amber flag replaced with Red.*

Criterion J – ‘Does the site have any infrastructure deficiencies?’ – Auditors suggested that the Amber flag should be replaced with Red due to very poor road connections and the steep aspect to Widmore Pond. *Amber flag remains because there is access to Blounts Court Road. Comments noted about steep aspect to Widmore Lane.*

Criterion L – ‘Is the site free from flood risk (incl. significant drainage issues)?’ – Auditors suggested the Green flag be substituted with Red because run-off would feed into Widmore Pond and also there would be potential drainage problems for Widmore Lane. *Green flag remains as currently there are no known flood/drainage risks and any future development would have to include a sustainable drainage system.*

Criterion AC – ‘Is development compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses?’ Auditors suggested the Red flag should be replaced with Amber given that the majority of the boundary is farmland. *Red flag stays in place because the majority of the site is farmland and lies within the AONB and is also adjacent to it.*

Criterion AE – ‘Would development remove publicly accessible open space, recreation facilities or a public right of way?’ Auditors suggested the Green flag should be replaced with an Amber given that previous uses have included car boot sales and other events. *Green flag remains because development would not remove any of the uses specified in the question.*

Criterion AJ – ‘Does the site offer **particular** scope for development of a Community Sports Hall with parking and playing fields?’ Auditors suggested the Red flag should be replaced by an Amber. *The Red flag remains given that the site does not offer particular scope for this usage.*

Criterion AK – ‘Does the site offer **particular** scope for the development of schools, shops or healthcare facilities?’ Auditors suggested that the Red flag should be replaced with Green given that there is a proposal by a developer to build a private retirement home complex on this site. *The Red flag remains because the question specifically addresses community facilities such as schools, shops and healthcare and in this regard the site is in a rural setting and is a long way from the centre of the village.*

Group C

Item 2 – Survey Part 2A – covered views and setting - Auditors suggested that the Red flag should be replaced with Amber on the basis that the scoring was balanced. *The 8 Site Assessment surveyors’ scorings comprised 4 Red, 2 Amber and 2 Green. On the basis that Red cancels Green and vice versa, then this reduces to 2 Red and 2 Amber. The weighting system which we have adopted assumes that Amber consists of Red and Green elements and therefore we flag it as Red overall.*

Criteria N to R – each covers accessibility to village facilities – Flagged Amber. Auditors suggested Green so as to be consistent with SON 23. *We note your view that SON 24 could possibly have footpath access to Widmore Lane. However, this access is by no means as complete as the vehicular access onto Widmore Lane from SON 23, which already exists. Additionally, the extent of the SON 24 site means that the distance to the village centre and other facilities from much of the site would be further (and steeper) for pedestrians than from SON 23.*

Criteria V – ‘Could this site take a mixed development of houses?’ Auditors suggested that the Amber flag should be replaced with Green. *After reconsideration, it is agreed that the flag be amended to Green.*

Criterion AA – ‘Would development of this site risk a significant trend toward merging with another settlement?’ Auditors commented that this should be flagged Amber and not Red because the site was not in the direction of any other close settlements. *The auditors’ reasoning is correct. Indeed, the criterion was incorrectly colour annotated to begin with and should have been input as Green. Flag changed to Green.*

SON 26 – Rudgings Plantation

Group B

Criterion R – ‘Are the local schools reasonably accessible?’ – Green flag allocated with the primary school deemed to be within walking distance. However, auditors suggested that insufficient paving on both sides of the road and the speed of traffic along Kennylands Road (consistently above 30mph) made walking with young children a safety issue. *Following reconsideration, the Green flag has been changed to Amber.*

Criterion AB – ‘Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale and character with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?’ Flagged Amber but auditors suggested that given the size of this site, development of all of it would represent overdevelopment in respect of both scale and character of the existing settlement. *Following reconsideration, the Amber flag has been changed to Red.*

Criterion AD ‘Would the development support the vitality and viability of the village centre?’ Amber flag allocated. Auditors suggested Red on the basis that a development of this size would not support the village centre. *Amber flag remains in place because the increase in population should improve the vitality and viability, though it is recognised that it could have a negative impact on the limited parking in the village centre.*

Group F

Item 7 – Survey Part 3A – sought the Site Assessment surveyors’ views on the key issues for the site – Auditors noted that while the Site Assessment surveyors’ remarks resulted in a Red flag, several had indicated additionally that the SON 6 part of the site running along the Kennylands Road, which is an allocated site within the current Neighbourhood Plan, should be the **only** part of the enlarged SON 26 which should be developed. *These observations are noted.*

Item 8 – Survey Part 3B – sought the Site Assessment surveyors’ views including whether the site should be considered for development. – Auditors noted that while the Site Assessment surveyors’ remarks resulted in a Red flag, several had indicated additionally that the SON 6 part of the site running along the Kennylands Road, which is an allocated site within the current Neighbourhood Plan, should be the **only** part of the enlarged SON 26 which should be developed. *These observations are noted.*

Criterion H – ‘Does the site contain or adjoin any heritage/local assets?’ – Auditors suggested that given the local value attached to Bur Wood and to Rudgings Plantation, the allocation of a Green flag was not appropriate. *Agreed, Red flag now in place.*

Criterion R – ‘Are the local schools reasonably accessible?’ – Green flag allocated with the primary school deemed to be within walking distance. However, auditors suggested that this was not consistent with the Amber flags allocated with regard to the accessibility of other community facilities in the village. *After reconsideration, Green flag changed to Amber. (See also comments above from Group B.)*

Criterion S – ‘Will the local traffic impact be acceptable?’ – Auditors suggested that this should be flagged Red instead of Amber. They commented that the area of the site was huge and that the traffic impact on Kennylands Road and the village centre would be significant given that most would not walk to the shops and to other facilities. *Amber flag remains in place which does not indicate that the level is acceptable but questionable.*

Criterion AA – ‘Would development of this site risk a significant trend toward merging with another settlement?’ Flagged Red.

Criterion AB – ‘Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale and character with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?’ *Following reconsideration, Amber flag changed to Red. (See also comments above from Group B.)*

With regard to the above two criteria, the auditors commented that while the SON 6 site in the current Neighbourhood Plan would be in keeping, further development to the south west would not.

SON 27 – Alpen Rose

Group A

Criterion E - ‘Is the site a ‘greenfield’ site?’ Flagged Green indicating a ‘brownfield’ site but auditors suggested that this should be replaced with Amber because the majority of the site was a private garden. *After reconsideration, Green flag changed to Amber.*

Criterion K – Is the site particularly sensitive from a landscape (AONB) standpoint?’ Auditors suggested that the Green flag should be changed to Amber because the site was adjacent to AONB. *Flag changed to Amber to reflect that although the site itself is not in the AONB, it is within the setting of the AONB, which is an important planning consideration.*

Criterion S – ‘Will the local traffic impact be acceptable? Auditors suggested that the Green flag should be Amber because the impact would depend upon the parking provision and size of the development. *Green flag remains in place because this is a relatively small site and as such would have a negligible impact on traffic.*

Criterion V – ‘Could this site take a mixed development of houses?’ Auditors suggested that the Green flag should be replaced with Amber to reflect the concerns raised by surveyors in Parts 3A and 3B of the Site Assessment Surveys. *After reconsideration, the flag has been changed to Amber.*

Criterion AB – ‘Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale and character with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?’ Flagged Green but auditors suggested that an Amber would be appropriate to reflect the concerns raised by surveyors in Parts 3A and 3B of the Site Assessment Surveys. *After reconsideration, the flag has been changed to Amber.*

Criterion AC – ‘Is development compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses?’ Flagged Green but auditors suggested Amber on the basis that it would depend upon the type and scale of development. *After reconsideration, the flag has been changed to Amber as the site is adjacent to open farmland and Rudgings Plantation on two sides.*

Group F

Criterion E - ‘Is the site a ‘greenfield’ site?’ Flagged Green indicating a ‘brownfield’ site but auditors suggested that this should be replaced with Amber because of the existing pattern of development. *Following reconsideration, Green flag changed to Amber. (See also comments above from Group A.)*

Criterion K – Is the site particularly sensitive from a landscape (AONB) standpoint?’ Auditors suggested that the Green flag should be changed to Amber because the site was adjacent to AONB. (See also comments from Group A). *Flag changed to Amber to reflect that while the site itself is not in the AONB, it is within the setting of the AONB, which is an important planning consideration. (See also comments above from Group A.)*

Criterion AA – ‘Would development of this site risk a significant trend toward merging with another settlement?’ Flagged Amber. Auditors asked if SON 26 was not under consideration, why would this SON 27 not be flagged Red? *The view is that SON 27 does not risk a significant trend towards Reading. The flag therefore remains Amber.*

SON 29 – Reddish Manor

Group C

Item 2 – Survey Part 2A –covered views and setting - Auditors suggested that the Red flag should be replaced with Amber on the basis that the scoring was balanced. *The 8 Site Assessment surveyors' scorings comprised 4 Red, 2 Amber and 2 Green. On the basis that Red cancels Green and vice versa, then this reduces to 2 Red and 2 Amber. The weighting system which we have adopted assumes that Amber consists of Red and Green elements and therefore we flag it as Red overall.*

Item 5 – Survey Part 2D –covered walking and cycling - Auditors suggested that the Red flag should be replaced with Amber on the basis that the scoring was balanced. *The 8 Site Assessment surveyors' scores comprised 4 Red, 3 Amber and 1 Green. On the basis that Red cancels Green and vice versa, then this reduces to 3 Red and 3 Amber. The weighting system which we have adopted assumes that Amber consists of Red and Green elements and therefore we flag it as Red overall.*

Item 7 – Survey Part 3A – sought the Site Assessment surveyors' views on the key issues for the site – Auditors suggested that the Red flag should be replaced with Amber to reflect 'moderate' concerns. *The 8 Site Assessment surveyors' comments indicated 4 Red, 3 Amber and 1 Green. On the basis that Red cancels Green and vice versa, then this reduces to 3 Red and 3 Amber. The weighting system which we have adopted assumes that Amber consists of Red and Green elements and therefore we flag it as Red overall.*

Criterion E - 'Is the site a 'greenfield' site?' Flagged Red indicating a 'greenfield' site but auditors suggested that this should be replaced with Amber because the site was split 50/50 between 'greenfield' and 'brownfield'. *Red flag remains in place because the part of the site offered for development is predominantly 'greenfield.'*

Criterion O – 'Is a bus stop reasonably accessible?' Auditors suggest that this should be flagged Amber instead of Red so that it is consistent with other sites. They also reasoned that this would be a fairly easy walk. *Flag changed from Red to Amber because distances to the nearest bus stops are c800m.*

Criterion AB – 'Could development of this site/part site be appropriate in scale and character with the existing settlement (including consideration of adjacent density)?' Flagged Red but auditors suggested that development could be appropriate. *Red flag remains in place because the part of the site offered for development is either in the AONB or within the setting of the AONB. This is an isolated property on the east side of the Peppard Road (B481).*

Criterion AC – 'Is development compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses? Flagged Red but auditors suggested that development could be compatible. *Red flag remains in place because the neighbouring use is farmland within the AONB, and the existing density comprises one house.*

Group E

Item 8 – Survey Part 3B – sought the Site Assessment surveyors' views including whether the site should be considered for development. Flagged Amber but auditors suggested that the comments by the surveyors amounted to a Red flag. *The 8 surveyors' comments were duly reconsidered and resulted in 5 Red, 1 Amber and 2 Green. On the basis that Red cancels Green and vice versa, then this reduces to 3 Red and 1 Amber. This means that a Red flag has been substituted.*

Criterion AD - 'Would development support the vitality and viability of the village centre?' Flagged Amber. Auditors suggested that any development not matched by infrastructure improvement would be detrimental. *Amber flag remains in place because the community facilities are accessible although it is recognised that pedestrians would have to cross the busy B481.*

Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan Working Party

February 2020