

## Health check template Report

### Summary of Recommendations

The Plan and its supporting documents is of a very high standard, lucid, readable and largely unambiguous in all it says and I wish to commend the authors. I find there is nothing to which I would draw attention in a sense of it making the Plan unfit for purpose. The comments I have appended under Section 2.9 below are all minor and are offered only to try and put a polish on a fine document. I would simply ask that the suggestions be considered and if they are in part or whole accepted that is fine, if they are rejected I repeat that I would have no objection to the Plan proceeding forward.

I hope this makes clear my opinions in relation to the comments which are appended only because I would wish them to be helpful and not in any way critical.

I have not repeated here my recommendation in Section 2.9 as there seems little point in so doing, but to reaffirm that Section contains the “meat” of my observations.

**Part 1 – Process**

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Welford Comments
1.1	Have the necessary statutory requirements been met in terms of the designation of the neighbourhood area?	Letter from Stratford District Council dated 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2013 confirming the designation.	Yes	
1.2	If the area does not have a parish council, have the necessary statutory requirements been met in terms of the designation of the neighbourhood forum?	There is a Parish Council.	Yes	
1.3	Has the plan been the subject of appropriate pre-submission consultation and publicity, as set out in the legislation, or is this underway?	Lengthy consultation took place. See Consultation Statement.	Yes	
1.4	Has there been a programme of community engagement proportionate to the scale and complexity of the plan?	Reasonable opportunity was afforded for the community to become engaged.	Yes	
1.5	Are arrangements in place for an independent examiner to be appointed?	Working with Stratford District Council arrangements are underway.	Yes	

1.6	Are discussions taking place with the electoral services team on holding the referendum?	As in 1.5 above.	Yes	
1.7	Is there a clear project plan for bringing the plan into force and does it take account of local authority committee cycles?	As in 1.5 and 1.6 above.	Yes	
1.8	Has an SEA screening been carried out by the LPA?	Letter of 7 <sup>th</sup> May 2015 confirms that screening was carried out by Stratford District Council.	Yes	
1.9	Has an HRA screening been carried out by the LPA?	As in 1.8 above.	Yes	

## Part 2 – Content

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Welford Response to Health Check
2.1	Are policies appropriately justified with a clear rationale?	Welford Neighbourhood Plan, Healthcheck version.	Yes, but see remarks under Section 2.9 below where some comments are made in order to ensure there are no ambiguities.	
2.2	Is it clear which parts of the draft plan form the 'neighbourhood plan proposal' (i.e. the neighbourhood <i>development plan</i> ) under the Localism Act, subject to the independent examination, and which parts do not form part of the 'plan proposal', and would not be tested by the independent examination?	Welford Neighbourhood Plan Healthcheck version	Yes - Parish Council aspirations are included in the Plan, but appear separately so confusion will not arise.	
2.3	Are there any obvious conflicts with the NPPF?	Welford Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions Statement	No	
2.4	Is there a clear explanation of the ways the plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development?	Welford Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions Statement	Yes	
2.5	Are there any issues around compatibility with human rights or EU	Letter of 7 <sup>th</sup> May 2015 from Stratford District Council	No	

	obligations?			
2.6	Does the plan avoid dealing with excluded development including nationally significant infrastructure, waste and minerals?	Reading the Plan it is clear that these items are not included.	Yes	
2.7	Is there consensus between the local planning authority and the qualifying body over whether the plan meets the basic conditions including conformity with strategic development plan policy and, if not, what are the areas of disagreement?	Consultation and close co-operation with Stratford District Council has led toward agreement on conformity.	Yes	
2.8	Are there any obvious errors in the plan?	Welford Neighbourhood Plan Healthcheck version, Basic Conditions Statement, Consultation Statement	No	
2.9	Are the plan's policies clear and unambiguous and do they reflect the community's aspirations?	A number of minor points have been discovered and these are listed here. It is not felt that any of these items would create non-conformity or indeed any reason for the Plan not to proceed to formal	<p>Policy HE1 - the last-named view from Rumer Hill is actually looking towards outside the Parish – maybe not required ?</p> <p>Policy HE2 - uses the word “encroach” - if encroaching it would be covered by HE1. Perhaps not needed ?</p>	<p>Minor amendment to clarify view is over southern part of the parish.</p> <p>Relates to Policy HE3. Policy wording amended to remove “encroach”.</p>

		<p>consultation, but it is suggested that some of the elements could improve clarity, if assimilated.</p>	<p>Policy HE7 - might want to consider whether brick walls would be acceptable subject to approval of materials.</p> <p>Policy HE8 - covers replacement by land of equivalent quality which is good, but should add equivalent area - makes the intent unambiguous.</p> <p>Policy HE9 - would be wise to confirm whether the flood areas are FZ 1, FZ2 or FZ3.</p> <p>Policy INF2 - perhaps a little aspirational in that control rests outside Planning largely.</p> <p>Policy INF 3 - if you stick with the Policy as it is the 6 miles should be defined as 6 miles by road or six miles as the crow flies, there is a difference. Use of 45 minutes is unwise as too many variable exist for this to be measurable beyond dispute. You might wish to take out those two elements and leave it simply as development would be supported where school places at Welford are available or will be provided by Sn 106 contribution. Its worth considering.</p> <p>Policy HLU1 - it may be worth checking that a transport assessment/statement can be sought for such small developments - if it can be that's fine.</p>	<p>Not agreed, brick (and block) wall boundaries are not consistent with Welford's rural character.</p> <p>Agreed, policy amended.</p> <p>Agreed, policy and justification clarified in line with current flood zone definitions</p> <p>Agreed, updated to include requirement for a mitigation plan.</p> <p>Agreed, policy amended to make it clear the 6 miles is by road. S106/CIL contributions will be determined by WCC/SDC as appropriate.</p> <p>Policy amended and reasoning for lower threshold provided.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

			<p>Policy HLU4 - you might as per Policy HE7 want to consider brick walls - only a suggestion.</p> <p>Policy HLU5 - is it worthwhile to mention Starter/Social homes by name ?</p> <p>Policy HLU8 - I am not clear, as there is no explanation, as to why new flats/maisonettes are inappropriate. Maybe they are not, but brief justification might help.</p> <p>General point - might be wise to refer to the fact that the Parish Plan carries little weight as it is non-statutory, also a comment on what weight that might attach to the Village Design Statement would assist.</p>	<p>Not agreed, brick (and block) wall boundaries are not consistent with Welford's rural character.</p> <p>Policy amended to include first-time buyers but social housing is out of scope.</p> <p>Agreed, explanation and justification amended to remove reference to flats and maisonettes.</p> <p>References amended to VDS and Parish Plan on Page 8 to indicate that SDC has adopted both as material considerations in determining planning applications.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

--	--	--	--	--

**Notes:**

Parts 1 and 2 of the template should be completed first. The box should be completed in as concise a way as possible. It should state whether the criterion has been met, with a brief explanation (1-3 sentences, preferably). Any recommendations for action should also be included (1-2 sentences preferable). These actions should also be transferred to the 'Summary of Recommendations' section at the beginning of the report, with criteria in brackets after.

The report is meant to help qualifying bodies by identifying any possible problems so that they can address them prior to submission. It should be written in clear, concise and accessible way. Recommendations should be practical and constructive.