



DECISION STATEMENT

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM

1. Hampton Lucy Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 1.1 I confirm that the Hampton Lucy Neighbourhood Development Plan (HNDP), as revised according to the modifications set out below, complies with the legal requirements and Basic Conditions set out in the Localism Act 2011, and with the provision made by or under sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Plan can therefore proceed to referendum. Given current circumstances, it is not currently possible to estimate when a referendum could be held.
- 1.2 I also declare that I have no personal or prejudicial interest in respect of this decision.

Signed

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "JCP Careford". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

John Careford,
Head of Development

1. Background

- 2.1 The District Council confirms that for the purposes of Regulation 5 (1) of The Regulations Hampton Lucy Parish Council is the "Qualifying Body" for their area.
- 2.2 In February 2014, Hampton Lucy Parish Council requested that, in accordance with section 5(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ("The Regulations"), the Parish of Hampton Lucy be designated as a Neighbourhood Area, for which a Neighbourhood Development Plan will be prepared.
- 2.3 In accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, Stratford-on-Avon District Council placed on their website this application, including a Parish boundary map, for a 6 week period in 2014. In addition, it publicised the application by issuing a press release. Similarly, the relevant application,

together with details of where representations could be sent, and by what date, was advertised within the appropriate Parish via the Parish Council.

- 2.4 The District Council designated the Hampton Lucy Neighbourhood Area by way of approval of The Cabinet on 7 October 2014 under section 61G(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
- 2.5 In accordance with Regulation 7 of The Regulations, the decision to designate the Hampton Lucy Neighbourhood Area was advertised on the District Council website together with the name, area covered and map of the area.
- 2.6 The Parish Council consulted on a pre-submission version of their draft Neighbourhood Development Plan between 29 July and 18 September 2022, fulfilling all the obligations set out in Regulation 14 of The Regulations.
- 2.7 The Parish Council submitted their Neighbourhood Development Plan to Stratford-on-Avon District Council in June 2023 in accordance with Regulation 15 of The Regulations.
- 2.8 The District Council publicised the submitted Plan and its supporting documents for 6 weeks between 15 June 2023 and 28 July 2023, in accordance with Regulation 16 of The Regulations.
- 2.9 Dr Louise Brooke-Smith was appointed by the District Council to independently examine the Plan in July 2023, and the Examination took place between October and December 2023, with the final Examiner's report being issued on 11 December 2023.
- 2.10 The Examiner concluded she was satisfied that the Hampton Lucy Neighbourhood Development Plan was capable of meeting the legal requirements set out in the Localism Act 2011, including meeting the Basic Conditions, subject to the modifications set out in her report, as set out in the table below.
- 2.11 Schedule 4B s.12 to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as inserted by the Localism Act 2011, requires that a Local Authority must consider each of the recommendations made in the Examiner's report and decide what action to take in response to each recommendation. If the Local Authority is satisfied that, subject to the modifications made, the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the legal requirements and Basic Conditions as set out in legislation, a referendum must be held on the 'making' (adoption) of the Plan by the Local Authority. If the Local Authority is not satisfied that the plan meets the basic conditions and legal requirements then it must refuse the proposal. Should a referendum take place, a majority of residents who turn out to vote must vote in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan (50% plus one vote) before it can be 'made'.
- 2.12 The Basic Conditions are:
 1. Have regard to national policy and guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
 2. Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
 3. Be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the Authority (or any part of that area).

4. Does not breach, but is otherwise compatible with EU obligations – this includes the SEA Directive of 2001/42/EC and Human Rights requirements.

2.13 In a small number of instances, some additional modifications to the Plan are also proposed by the District Council for reasons of clarity or accuracy. These are detailed within Table 1 (p.4) below, in conjunction with the policies to which they apply. These modifications are not considered to require a further Regulation 17A consultation under the conditions set out by paragraph 13(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Examiner's Recommendations and Local Authority's Response (Regulation 18(1))

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 1, Page 8			
National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) (Revised in 2018 and 2019) and reissued with further amendments in 2021. In September 2023 a Written Ministerial Statement updated policy on planning for onshore wind development in England. Hence the leading document for the purposes of this Examination is the 2023 version of the NPPF. It is advised that this is acknowledged within the NP and Basic Conditions Statement – possibly by way of an addendum. The QB / LPA has the option to note at the beginning of the NP / SBC that salient NPPF paragraph references are to the 2021 version of that document – or – undertake a review and update any changed paragraph references to the 2023 version of the NPPF. I am content to leave this to the discretion of the QB/LPA providing the user of the NP is left in no doubt or confusion as to the NPPF version referenced in the explanatory text through the NP document	Throughout NDP	<i>Modification Agreed</i> To accord with Basic Condition 1	Update NPPF references to 2023 version throughout NDP and Basic Conditions Statement.
Recommendation 2, Page 17			
In the third sentence of paragraph 1.6, add the following text: "In September 2022, a Regulation 14 consultation was undertaken with the	Paragraph 1.6 and 1.7, Section 1	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> The proposed	Amend paragraph 1.6 to add in the following: " <u>In September 2022, a Regulation 14 consultation was</u>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>community (residents and businesses) within the Neighbourhood Area and with statutory consultees. A public meeting was held when the policies in the Plan were explained, and the view of stakeholders were heard. Responses to the Regulation 14 consultation were subsequently assessed and factored into the emerging Plan.”</p> <p>Revise paragraph 1.7 to commence with “The Council will review the Plan in two years’ time when all stakeholder (residents, landowners, businesses and statutory consultees) will be invited to provide their views again after the 2022 SAP has been adopted. Work has now commenced on the South Warwickshire Local Plan which will replace the strategic policies of the Core Strategy. The progress of this will also be considered by the Council in its review of the Neighbourhood Plan in two years’ time.”</p>		<p>modification is required for clarity and accuracy.</p> <p><i>Additional Modification proposed by SDC:</i></p> <p>A slight amendment is made to paragraph 1.7 to state that the “The Council expect to review the Plan in two years time” to account for the possibility that Plan may need to be reviewed earlier or later than in two years time.</p>	<p><u>undertaken with the community (residents and businesses) within the Neighbourhood Area and with statutory consultees. A public meeting was held when the policies in the Plan were explained, and the view of stakeholders were heard. Responses to the Regulation 14 consultation were subsequently assessed and factored into the emerging Plan.”</u></p> <p>Revise paragraph 1.7 to commence with <u>“The Council expects to review the Plan in two years’ time when all stakeholder (residents, landowners, businesses and statutory consultees) will be invited to provide their views again after the 2022 SAP has been adopted. Work has now commenced on the South Warwickshire Local Plan which will replace the strategic policies of the Core Strategy. The progress of this will also be considered by the Council in its review of the Neighbourhood Plan in two years’ time.”</u></p>
Recommendation 3, Page 18			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Figure 2 indicating Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings is accompanied by Appendix 1. However, I concur with the comments made by the LPA that Fig 2 should be at a scale that is more easily read with individual sites of note listed out. I also advise that the whole NP boundary should be clearly indicated.</p>	<p>Figure 2, Section 2</p>	<p><i>Modification Partially Agreed</i></p> <p>It is agreed that Figure 2 needs to be at a larger scale and with individual sites of note listed out for clarity. However, it is not considered practical to show the whole NP boundary whilst showing the heritage assets at a readable scale.</p>	<p>Amend Figure 2 to be at a scale more easily read with individual sites of note listed out.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4, Page 18</p>			
<p>The approach of the policy is clear, as is the accompanying explanation. I note however that the QB has offered to modify the text referencing 'unacceptable harm' in light of Reg 16 representations and to reflect more appropriately the guidance in the NPPF. I concur and advise that the first line of the policy be rewritten as follows; 'Proposals that would cause less than substantial harm to the special architectural or the historic significance of designated Heritage Assets.....'</p>	<p>Policy BE1</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The modification is required in order to meet Basic Condition 1</p> <p><i>Additional Modification proposed by SDC:</i></p>	<p>Amend first line of policy as follows: "Proposals that would cause unacceptable less than substantial harm to the special architectural or the historical significance of designated Heritage Assets <u>(including the Conservation Area) listed in Appendix 12 and shown in Figures 2, 3 and 4</u> or their settings or fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the designated Heritage</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
With this modification, I find Policy BE1 compliant.		The first paragraph of the Policy has been amended slightly from the Examiner's modification, to acknowledge the fact that Conservation Areas are designated heritage assets, and to indicate where details of the heritage assets can be found in the NDP.	Assets will not be supported unless it can be shown that the public benefits would outweigh the harm."
Recommendation 5, Page 19			
<p>Bullet (a) and bullet (f) appear to be unnecessary duplications. I advise that bullet (f) should be removed, and bullet (a) be redrafted as follows; (a) 'Does not have an unacceptable impact on the visual landscape amenity, valued views or heritage assets within the area and;'</p> <p>I concur with the LPA and consider that each subsequent bullet point (except for the last one) should conclude with 'and;' to avoid any confusion on the part of a user of the Plan that just one bullet need apply to a development,</p>	Policy BE2	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy</p>	<p>Amend Policy wording as follows: Delete criterion (f): "It will not cause unacceptable harm to the visual and landscape amenity of the Neighbourhood Area, particularly to Valued Views and Heritage Assets."</p> <p>Redraft criterion (a): "Does not have an unacceptable impact on the visual landscape amenity, valued views or heritage assets within of the area"</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
when in reality, they all apply.			Insert the word "and" at the end of each bullet point.
Recommendation 6, Page 19			
I note that the QB accepts that the Highway Authority controls street lighting and reference to this should be added to the explanatory text, to assist both the user of the Plan and indeed the Highway Authority.	Policy BE3	<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy	Add reference into explanatory text: <u>"It is acknowledged by the Council that the responsibility for street lighting remains with Highway Authority."</u>
Recommendation 7, Page 19			
I note and concur with the QB's proposal in response to Reg 16 representations to delete one element of the text, so it reads as follows; "Development proposals resulting in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Agricultural Land Classification Grades 1,2 and 3a) will only be supported where it is demonstrated that poorer quality land is not available."	Policy BE4	<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 and 3	Amend policy wording as follows: "Development proposals resulting in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Agricultural Land Classification Grades 1, 2 and 3a) will only be supported where it is demonstrated that the impact of the loss of the land will not adversely affect the viability of the relevant landholding, and it is demonstrated poorer quality land is not available."
Recommendation 8, Page 21			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>I note the offer by the QB to reference Policy SAP 6 (Preferred Option 2022) in the policy but do not consider this appropriate. I feel that sufficient guidance as to the scale and impact of any development adjacent to the NP boundary exists in AS.10 and other policies within the NP.</p> <p>In light of this, the reference in Policy H1 to 'self-build and custom-build housing' should be omitted, as it fails to provide any guidance on the scale of such development. Policy AS.10 does not reference self-build and/or custom-build development and the inclusion of such, within Policy H1, has not been supported by evidence.</p> <p>Hence, subject to the deletion of the reference to 'self-build and custom-build' in the third paragraph of Policy H1, I find the rest of the text compliant.</p>	<p>Policy H1</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>To meet Basic Condition 3</p>	<p>Amend policy wording as follows:</p> <p>"The boundary of Hampton Lucy village ('The Village Boundary') is shown in Figure 7. New housing developments within the Village Boundary will be supported in principle, subject to them being in accordance with other policies in this plan.</p> <p>All areas outside the Village Boundary are classed as 'Countryside'.</p> <p>New housing within the Countryside will be strictly controlled and limited to rural exception sites, community-led housing, dwellings for rural workers, self-build and custom-build housing outside but adjacent to the Village Boundary, replacement dwellings (see policy BE2) and the appropriate development of brownfield land and other housing as in CS Policy AS.10.</p> <p>Within the Countryside the construction of houses of exceptional design in accordance with NPPF 80(e) will be supported."</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 9, Page 22	Policy H2		
<p>This policy addresses a key issue raised during the community consultation process. Five appropriate criteria are set out to guide any user of the NP which reflect Core Strategy Policy CS15. I note that the QB is happy to amend the first paragraph of the policy. I concur and advise that it should read;</p> <p>“Small scale Community-Led Housing (CLH) schemes and small-scale development for First Homes, as defined in the explanatory text below, beyond but adjacent to the village boundary will be supported where all the following criteria are satisfied....”</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 3</p>	<p>Amend policy wording as follows: Small scale Community-Led Housing (CLH) schemes and small-scale development for First Homes, as defined in the explanatory text below, beyond, but adjacent to the Village Boundary and developments for First Homes (as defined below) will be supported where all the following criteria are satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is a proven local need, having regard to the latest Housing Needs Survey commissioned by the Council; b) No other suitable and available sites exist within the Village Boundary; c) That secure arrangements exist to ensure the housing will remain affordable and available to meet the continuing needs of local people; d) Households with a qualifying connection to the Parish of Hampton Lucy will have first priority; and e) The content of the scheme, in terms of type, size and tenure of homes proposed and their accessibility reflect the local identified need.”

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 10, Page 22	Policy H3		
<p>This policy is extensive and sets out 17 criteria that any user of the Plan should consider when promoting new development. Clearly some of the elements raised would not apply to some forms of development and so, the addition of 'where relevant given the nature of the development being pursued' should be added to the first sentence.</p> <p>It is unclear whether bullet (o) leads on from bullet (n) or is a specific principle in its own right. I have assumed the latter and for clarity I consider that bullet (o) should be redrafted as follows; 'New development should be designed to be safe and accessible so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion.'</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p>	<p>Amend policy wording as follows: "Development proposals in the Neighbourhood Area that adhere to the following design principles, <u>where relevant given the nature of the development being pursued,</u> will be supported"</p> <p>Redraft criterion (o) as follows: o) <u>New development should be designed to be</u> Are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion;</p>
Recommendation 11, Page 23	Policy H4		
<p>The text suggests that this policy reflect Core Strategy CS6. It does, but in a very general way. Of more relevance is CS15 and CS16 and these references could be added for clarity. Their omission does not make the policy non-compliant but is presented as a suggestion only.</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy</p>	<p>Insert reference to Policies CS.15 and CS.16 to explanatory text.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 12, Page 23	Policy N1		
I consider there is risk in undermining strategic plan making. Given this, I find the sites identified at Policy NE1 appropriate designations as LGS with the exception of Site 9, which should be omitted. The remaining LGS sites should be renumbered accordingly.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Remove LGS 9 and renumber the remaining LGS sites accordingly.
Recommendation 13, Page 24	Policy N2		
<p>Figure 9 does not clearly indicate the extent of the NP area and I note representations suggest that valued views (3) and (6) may not be valid as they originate beyond the plan boundary. I can understand the point raised but do not concur. The policy is proposed as a means of highlighting the value of the views indicated and to advise against development that could adversely impact that view.</p> <p>I feel the sentiment and approach could be regularised by the modification of the first line of the policy, as follows;</p> <p>'Development proposals within the NP boundary, should demonstrate.....'</p>		<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	<p>Amend wording of Policy as follows: "Development proposals <u>within the Neighbourhood Area</u> should demonstrate how they integrate appropriately with their setting while conserving or enhancing its character. This Plan identifies the Valued Views shown in Figure 9."</p> <p>Amend Figure 9 to show NP boundary.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
With this modification, and definition of the NP area at Figure 9, I find Policy NE2 compliant.			
Recommendation 14, Page 24	Policy N3		
<p>This policy reflects the general principles of Core Strategies 5, 6 and 7 while applying them to the NP area. I find the policy text clear and Fig 10 helpful.</p> <p>There is one typographic error in the last line of paragraph 3 of the policy. Retail should be replaced with 'retain'.</p> <p>With this minor modification, I find Policy NE3 compliant.</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy</p>	<p>Amend final sentence of para 3 as follows: "All new development will be expected to demonstrate a high level of sensitive landscaping and native tree/hedge planting where possible. All Development must retain, where so practical to do so, existing trees and hedges and to preserve and retain retain the Ancient Woodland and Local Wildlife sites, shown in Figure 10 below.</p>
Recommendation 15, Page 24	Policy NE4		
<p>I note that QB has offered to amend the wording of this policy in response to Regulation 16 representations. I have reviewed the issues raised by the representations and concur generally with the QB's amended text. With some small alterations, I advise it is re-written as follows;</p> <p>Developments will be supported, unless; a) They are in Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 or are otherwise assessed by the Environment Agency at high or medium risk of surface water flooding; b) They are neither neutral nor beneficial to the</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p> <p><i>Additional Modification Proposed by SDC</i></p> <p>The Explanation has</p>	<p>Rewrite Policy as follows: <u>Developments will be supported, unless;</u> <u>a) They are in Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 or are otherwise assessed by the Environment Agency at high or medium risk of surface water flooding;</u> <u>b) They are neither neutral nor beneficial to the capacity of these flood zones;</u> <u>c) The risk to flooding to existing</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>capacity of these flood zones; c) The risk to flooding to existing properties and land in the Neighbourhood Plan Area is increased; d) It cannot be demonstrated that every effort has been made to steer developments to areas of lower flood risk where possible; e) The development will not contribute to water bodies (defined as lakes and part of rivers, estuaries, coastal waters and ground water) reaching a good status or potential status in accordance with the Water Framework Directive or equivalent guidance, where this is feasible; f) They do not contribute to the maintenance or restoration of the floodplain, where this is feasible; g) Where appropriate they do not open up any existing culverts on a site providing more open space / green infrastructure of greater amenity or do not keep the creation of new culverts to a minimum; h) In respect of surface water flood and development drainage it has not been demonstrated that the developer has considered options to manage risk in the following priority order: infiltration (water into the ground), discharging into an existing water body, and discharging into a surface water sewer. i) If the above ground attenuation features have not been designed to be multifunctional and do not incorporate the four pillars of SuDs which are</p>		<p>been amended with some additional text/photos to reflect the flooding that took place in January 2024, for factual accuracy.</p>	<p><u>properties and land in the Neighbourhood Plan Area is increased;</u> <u>d) It cannot be demonstrated that every effort has been made to steer developments to areas of lower flood risk where possible;</u> <u>e) The development will not contribute to water bodies (defined as lakes and part of rivers, estuaries, coastal waters and ground water) reaching a good status or potential status in accordance with the Water Framework Directive or equivalent guidance, where this is feasible;</u> <u>f) They do not contribute to the maintenance or restoration of the floodplain, where this is feasible;</u> <u>g) Where appropriate they do not open up any existing culverts on a site providing more open space / green infrastructure of greater amenity or do not keep the creation of new culverts to a minimum;</u> <u>h) In respect of surface water flood and development drainage it has not been demonstrated that the developer has considered options to manage risk in the following priority</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>water quality, water quantity, amenity and biodiversity.</p> <p>All developments will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems with new developments needing to account for flood risk when building on greenfield and brownfield sites, as supported by the sustainable drainage section of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) extant at the time of proposal.”</p> <p>I also advise that Figure 11 (Pluvial Flooding Map) incorporates a key and indicates the extent of the NP area.</p> <p>With the above modifications, I find Policy NE4 compliant.</p>			<p><u>order: infiltration (water into the ground), discharging into an existing water body, and discharging into a surface water sewer.</u></p> <p><u>i) If the above ground attenuation features have not been designed to be multifunctional and do not incorporate the four pillars of SuDs which are water quality, water quantity, amenity and biodiversity.</u></p> <p><u>All developments will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems with new developments needing to account for flood risk when building on greenfield and brownfield sites, as supported by the sustainable drainage section of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) extant at the time of proposal.”</u></p> <p>“Developments will not be supported if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) They are in flood zones 2 and 3 or are otherwise assessed by the Environment Agency at high or medium risk of surface water flooding; b) They are not neutral or beneficial to the capacity of these flood zones; c) The risk to flooding to existing

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>properties and land in the Neighbourhood Area is increased.</p> <p>d) It cannot be demonstrated that every effort has been made to steer developments to areas of lower flood risk where possible;</p> <p>e) They will not provide that water bodies (defined as 'lakes and parts of rivers, estuaries, coastal waters and ground water') will have reached a good status or potential status in accordance with the Water Framework Directive;</p> <p>f) They do not maintain or restore the floodplain;</p> <p>g) They do not open up any existing culverts on a site providing more open space/green infrastructure of greater amenity or do not keep the creation of new culverts to a minimum.</p> <p>Amend Figure 11 to include a key and indicate the extent of the NP area.</p> <p>Amend Explanation with details of January 2024 flooding.</p>
Recommendation 16, Page 25	Policy NE5		
This policy, inter alia, refers to development adjacent to the NP area. This is ultra vires and should be amended to only refer to		<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and	Amend Policy as follows: "Development of riverside activities within the Neighbourhood Area for

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>development within the NP area as follows;</p> <p>"Development of riverside activities within the Neighbourhood Area for navigation or otherwise which negatively impact on land or buildings adjoining the River Avon with only be supported where the activity will....."</p>		accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	navigation or otherwise which negatively impact on land or buildings adjoining the River Avon with only be supported where the activity will....."
Recommendation 17, Page 26			
<p>I accept the stance by one representation that a definition of 'allotment' should be included in the accompany text, to remove any ambiguity or confusion with garden land. To this end I advise that the following is included at the end of the Explanatory text;</p> <p>In this situation, an allotment is deemed to be a plot of land rented by an individual for the growing of vegetables or flowers for personal use or enjoyment. It does not include private amenity / garden land.</p>	Policy LCHW1	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Include following wording within explanatory text:</p> <p><u>"In this situation, an allotment is deemed to be a plot of land rented by an individual for the growing of vegetables or flowers for personal use or enjoyment. It does not include private amenity / garden land."</u></p>
Recommendation 18, Page 26			
<p>I find the accompanying explanatory text helpful in its identification of community facilities within the NP area. However, it would assist any user of the Plan if these facilities were listed and identified</p>	Policy LCHW2	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy</p>	<p>Provide new Figure to show community facilities.</p> <p>Redraft Policy as follows:</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>on a map. This could then be cross-referenced within the policy.</p> <p>Accordingly I advise that the policy be redrafted as follows; 'Development proposals that will lead to the loss or partial loss of any community facility, as indicated at Figure....., and would not enhance and/or improve that community facility, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer in active use and has little prospect of being brought back into use.'</p>			<p><u>"Development proposals that will lead to the loss or partial loss of any community facility, as indicated at Figure....., and would not enhance and/or improve that community facility, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer in active use and has little prospect of being brought back into use."</u></p>
<p>Recommendation 19, Page 27</p>			
<p>Extant Figure 13 which accompanies the policy should be supported by an appropriate key and acknowledgment. The definition of the National Cycle Way and the NP boundary indicated on Figure 14 should be re-coloured so as not conflict with the trunk roads crossing the area. The figure risks confusion by any user of the Plan.</p> <p>I also note the representations from one party that highlights the need to acknowledge horse riding. I support the modification proposed by the QB to address this. Accordingly, reference to 'horse-riding' should be included at paragraph 3 of the explanatory section and the first and third</p>	<p>Policy LCHW3</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy</p>	<p>Include key and acknowledgement at Figure 13.</p> <p>Recolour Figure 14 to define NP boundary and National Cycle Way.</p> <p>Amend policy wording as follows: "Where appropriate, development proposals should demonstrate how walking, horse riding and cycling opportunities have been incorporated and, where possible, how these will connect to existing routes.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>sections of the policy should be amended to read as follows;</p> <p>'Where appropriate, development proposals should demonstrate how walking, horse riding and cycling opportunities have been incorporated and, where possible, how these will connect to existing routes. Proposals which either adversely affect existing walking, horse riding or cycling routes will not be supported.'</p>			<p>Where possible, public rights of way, including bridleways, should be protected, enhanced, expanded and positively utilised in all new developments.</p> <p>Proposals which either adversely affect existing walking, horse riding or cycling routes will not be supported."</p> <p>Amend para 3 of explanatory text as follows:</p> <p>"This Policy ensures rambler, horse riding and cyclist access to the quiet enjoyment and tranquillity of the wider countryside, landscape, wildlife areas and historic features. The encouragement of walking, horse riding and cycling is a key part of improving the health and well-being of our community and of reducing carbon emissions. It preserves the importance of respecting the utility, convenience, recreational value, attractiveness and historic significance of public rights of way."</p>
<p>Recommendation 20, Page 28</p>			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
For consistency, I suggest that a section sub-heading of 'Explanation' is inserted on page 50 before the accompanying text	Policy INW1	<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy	Add subheading " <u>Explanation</u> " on page 50.
Recommendation 21, Page 28			
<p>For further clarity, I advise that the first paragraph is also modified. The policy should therefore read as follows; 'New development proposals should provide off-road vehicle parking in accordance with the standards in SDC's adopted Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document, and/or equivalent guidance, adopted by SDC. Provision of vehicle parking to serve new development should introduce appropriate SUDs, where possible, and ensure that discharge/run off flows do not degrade the quality of accepting water bodies.'</p>	Policy INW2	Modification Agreed For clarity and accuracy	<p>Modify policy as follows: "New development proposals should provide off-road car parking in accordance with the standards in SDC's adopted Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document, <u>and/or equivalent guidance, adopted by SDC.</u></p> <p>Appropriate cycle storage facilities should be provided within the curtilage of each dwelling in accordance with the SDC Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>Electric Vehicle Charging Points should be provided in accordance with the SDC Development Requirements SPD.</p> <p><u>Provision of vehicle parking to serve new development should introduce appropriate SUDs, where possible,</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<u>and ensure that discharge/run off flows do not degrade the quality of accepting water bodies.'</u>

Assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan as a whole, against the three dimensions of sustainable development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Sustainable Development Role (NPPF)	Neighbourhood Development Plan's Contribution
Economic	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to support the local economy through supporting new business premises and home-based working within the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>If implemented these policies will have a positive impact on the local economy, safeguarding jobs and local services.</p>
Social	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets a framework that will help to support the achievement of sustainable social development.</p> <p>The Plan promotes the retention and improvement of local community facilities and services.</p> <p>The Plan looks to safeguard Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Policies seek to promote the local distinctiveness of the area, and conserve and enhance heritage assets.</p>

Environmental	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of policies that support environmental sustainability for the community.</p> <p>The Plan has policies that look to protect heritage assets, natural features, valued landscapes as well as designate areas of Local Green Space.</p> <p>The NDP includes policies to protect the natural environment for future generations which have a positive impact on the environmental sustainability of the plan.</p>
---------------	---

3.1 The District Council concurs with the view of the Examiner that:

- Subject to the modifications above, the Hampton Lucy Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions set out in paragraph 2.12 above; and
- The referendum area should be coterminous with the neighbourhood area.

4. Availability of Decision Statement and Examiner’s Report (Regulation 18(2))

This Decision Statement and the Examiners Report can be inspected online at:

<https://www.stratford.gov.uk/planning-building/hampton-lucy-neighbourhood-plan.cfm>

And can be viewed in paper form at:

Stratford-on-Avon District Council
Elizabeth House

Church Street
Stratford-upon-Avon
CV37 6HX