



## **DECISION STATEMENT**

### **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM**

#### **1. Salford Seven Neighbourhood Development Plan**

1.1 I confirm that the Salford Seven Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP), 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. It is confirmed that the referendum will be held on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> May 2017.

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,  
Policy Manager (Planning and Housing)

#### **2. Background**

2.1 On 14 January 2014 Salford Priors Parish Council requested that, in accordance with section 5(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ("The Regulations"), their Parish area be designated as a Neighbourhood Area, for which a Neighbourhood Development Plan will be prepared.

2.2 The District Council confirms that for the purposes of section 5 (1) of The Regulations the Parish Council is the "relevant body" for their area.

2.3 In accordance with section 6 of the Regulations, Stratford-on-Avon District Council placed on their website this application, including a parish boundary map, details of where representations could be sent, and by what date, for a six week period between 6 February and 21 March 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 Salford Seven Neighbourhood Area by way of approval of The Cabinet on 16 June 2014.

2.5 In accordance with Regulation 7 of The Regulations, the decision to designate the Salford Seven Neighbourhood Area was advertised on the 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 June and 10 August 2015 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 on 5 May 2016 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 19 May and 1 July 2016 in accordance with Regulation 16 of The Regulations.

2.9 Mr Chris Collison was appointed by the District Council to examine the Plan, and the Examination took place between 18 July and 16 August 2016, with the Examiner's report being issued on 31 August 2016.

2.10 The Examiner concluded he was satisfied that the 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 his 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 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 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. A referendum must take place and 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

**3. Examiner’s Recommendations and Local Authority’s Response (Regulation 18(1))**

Examiner’s Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
<b>Policy SP1 – Protecting the Historic Environment:</b>			
Delete “Development proposals will be expected to preserve and enhance” and insert “To be supported development proposals must demonstrate how they reflect, preserve, and enhance the locally distinctive design attributes of” (p.24)  Delete “contributes” and insert “contribute” (p.24)	Section 6: Policies (p.16)	Modification agreed. The policy had been originally written with an expectation without implication. The modification was suggested to provide a practical framework within to make decisions as required by paragraph 17 of the NPPF.	First paragraph of policy SP1 modified as follows:  “ <del>Development proposals will be expected to preserve and enhance</del> <u>To be supported development proposals must demonstrate how they reflect, preserve, and enhance the locally distinctive design attributes of</u> the historic and cultural built heritage that contributes to the character and identity of the Parish by:”
Delete point e) (p.24)	Section 6: Policies (p.16)	Modification agreed. Point e) was imprecise as written and did not comply with the provisions of para 17 of the NPPF.	Criteria e) deleted:  <del>e) encouraging new development that requires planning permission to make use of suitable, sustainable materials for surfaces such as roads, paths, hard standings and other surfaces;</del>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
In f) delete "working with the highway authority and infrastructure providers to ensure" and insert "ensuring" and delete "use suitable materials and" (p.24)	Section 6: Policies (p.17)	Modification agreed. Point f) was imprecise as written and the recommended modification was to delete the imprecise terms and ensure the provision of the policy related to development proposals in order to comply with the provisions of para 17 of NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	Policy modified as follows:  "f) <u>ensuring</u> <del>working with the highway authority and infrastructure providers to ensure</del> roads, streets, lanes and other areas in the public realm <del>use suitable materials and</del> are designed so that they make a positive contribution to the quality and historic value of the street scene; and"  Following deletion of criteria e) criteria f) changed to criteria e) and criteria g) changed to criteria f)
<b>Policy SP2 – Buildings of Local Importance:</b>			
Second paragraph, delete "permitted" and insert "supported" (p.25)	Section 6: Policies (p.18)	Modification agreed. Policies should use the term 'supported' in recognition that the basis of decision making is the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, as set out in the NPPF.	Second paragraph of policy modified to read:  "Alteration and conversion will be supported when the building is retained and the proposed development is sympathetic to the heritage value of the building. The loss of these buildings will only be <del>permitted</del> <u>supported</u> in the following circumstances:"

<b>Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his report)</b>	<b>Section/page no. in submission draft NDP</b>	<b>SDC Decision and reason</b>	<b>New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP</b>
Delete criteria c) and include in Appendix 1 a reason for inclusion of each building (p.25)	Section 6: Policies (p.18)	Modification agreed. Procedures in respect of dangerous structures are established within the statutory Building Control function of Local Authorities. It is inappropriate to link this matter of public safety to other decision making processes and should be deleted. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	Criteria c) deleted from the Plan and original criteria d) changed to criteria c):  <del>"c) the building is a danger to public safety, or"</del>
<b>Policy SP4 – Sustainable Construction:</b>			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete Policy SP4. (p.27)	Section 6: Policies (p.25)	Modification agreed. The policy as written was considered imprecise and did not provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications could be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. It was not considered appropriate to promote additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings.	Policy SP4 deleted:  <del>"To help reduce the impact of climate change, minimise use of resources and minimise household running costs all new residential development will be encouraged to seek to exceed national standards prevailing at the time. In particular, this will be done by encouraging the inclusion of the following:</del> <del>a) measures to reduce and adapt to the impacts of climate change;</del> <del>b) flood prevention and mitigation measures, including the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS); and</del> <del>c) measures to reduce energy consumption and to provide energy from renewable or low carbon sources"</del>
<b>Policy SP5 – High Quality Design:</b>			
Replace b) with "use traditional and reclaimed tiles, slates, bricks, and stone materials unless it is demonstrated that this is inappropriate;" (p.28)	Section 6: Policies (p.25)	Modification agreed. Terms used in b) were deemed imprecise and modifications were recommended so that the Policy provided a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications could be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to	Replacement wording for criteria b) inserted:  <del>"b) where appropriate use traditional and reclaimed materials—such as tiles, slates, bricks and stone;</del> <u>use traditional and reclaimed tiles, slates, bricks, and stone materials unless it is demonstrated that this is inappropriate;"</u>  Policy re-numbered SP4.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	
<b>Policy SP6 – Sustainability and Renewable Energy:</b>			
Delete "full-sized" (p.29)  Delete "will not be supported unless" insert "will only be supported where" (p.29)	Section 6: Policies (p.26)	Modification agreed. Terms used were deemed imprecise and modifications were recommended so that the Policy provided a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications could be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF.	First paragraph of policy modified to read:  "Large-scale commercial renewable energy installations, such as <del>full-sized</del> wind turbines and solar farms, <del>will not be supported unless</del> <u>will only be supported where</u> the proposal can demonstrate, individually, and cumulatively:"
Delete "is minimal and" in b) (p.29)	Section 6: Policies (p.26)	Modification agreed. Terms used were deemed imprecise and modifications were recommended so that the Policy provided a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications could be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF.	Criteria b) modified to read:  "b) The visual impact <del>is minimal and</del> does not adversely affect the rural and historic character and landscape of the parish;"



Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete "minimal and" in c) (p.29)	Section 6: Policies (p.26)	Modification agreed. Terms used were deemed imprecise and modifications were recommended so that the Policy provided a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications could be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF.	Criteria c) modified to read:  "c) The noise impact is <del>minimal and</del> no greater than current noise levels within all inhabited areas of the parish;"
Replace e) with "There are no significant adverse impacts on wildlife; and" (p.29)	Section 6: Policies (p.26)	Modification agreed. Terms used were deemed imprecise and modifications were recommended so that the Policy provided a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications could be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF.	Criteria e) modified to read:  "e) <del>The impact on wildlife is minimal; and</del> <u>There are no significant adverse impacts on wildlife; and</u> "
After "setting," delete "the" in f) and insert "a" (p.29)  Delete reference to Local Green Space following recommendation to delete Policy SP17 (p.29)	Section 6: Policies (p.27)	Modification agreed, for clarification purposes only. There is more than one Conservation Area within the neighbourhood area and the Policy relating to LGS has been deleted from the NDP.	Criteria f) modified to read:  "f) The installation does not affect a Listed Building or its setting, <del>the a Conservation Area, or a Local Green Space (see Policy 17)</del> "  Policy re-numbered SP5.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete the final paragraph (p.29)	Section 6: Policies (p.27)	Modification agreed. The paragraph looked to control development outside the neighbourhood area, which was deemed inappropriate. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	Final paragraph of policy deleted:  "The Parish Council will also seek to ensure that any large-scale renewable energy installation proposal outside of the parish, that will have a noise or visual impact on the parish, should also be subject to the same conditions".
<b>Policy SP7 – New Housing Development in the Parish of Salford Priors:</b>			
Delete "in the Parish of Salford Priors" from the policy title (p.33)	Section 6: Policies (p.28)	Modification agreed. The policy heading is different to wording of the policy and the specification of spatial application is confusing and unnecessary and should be modified for consistency and clarity.	Policy title modified to read:  "POLICY SP7: NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN THE PARISH OF SALFORD PRIORS"
Delete sites SP7/1 SP7/2 SP7/3 SP7/4 SP7/5 (p.33)	Section 6: Policies (p.28)	Modification agreed. There is an absence of information to explain the relationship between the Site Assessment Report (evidence) and the sites	Sites deleted as follows:  <b>Sites within Rushford / Pitchill</b>  SP7/1 – Land adjacent B4088, Rushford, 2 units. SP7/2 – Land and buildings at Salford Lodge Farm,

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>supported as allocations included in the Policy as originally written. The Core Strategy includes provision for development to occur in the village of Salford Priors and development in that settlement in excess of the strategic allocation made by Core Strategy (CS) Policy CS.16 would remain in general conformity with that strategic policy. In other settlements in the neighbourhood area, the CS states that development is restricted to small scale community led schemes which meet a need identified by the local community. The NDP proposes support for housing development in Rushford, Pitchill and Abbot's Salford but does not set out evidence of need identified by the community and on that</p>	<p><del>Pitchill, 4 units.</del></p> <p><b>Sites within Abbot's Salford</b></p> <p><del>SP7/3—Land and buildings at New Inn Lane, Abbot's Salford, 5 units.</del></p> <p><del>SP7/4—Land between Nos. 2 and 3 Moat Farm Cottages, Evesham Road, Abbot's Salford, 2 units.</del></p> <p><del>SP7/5—Land and buildings at Moat Farm, Abbot's Salford, 5 units.</del></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		basis; sites outside Salford Priors should be deleted.	
<p>Insert "approximately" before the number of units stated in respect of all the remaining sites (p.33)</p> <p>After "2 units" in SP7/6, and after "below" in SP7/7, insert "subject to a flood risk assessment" (p.33)</p>	Section 6: Policies (p.28)	Modification agreed. The inclusion of specific numbers of units to be developed on each site is overly prescriptive and may lead to a particular scheme of sustainable development not being supported. The recommended modification to state the number of units on each site is approximate is required to build in flexibility in order to reflect paragraphs 15 and 16 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	<p>Policy modified to read:</p> <p><b>"Sites within Salford Priors</b></p> <p>SP7/6 Land at The Old Forge, Station Road, Salford Priors, <u>approximately 2 units, subject to a flood risk assessment.</u></p> <p>SP7/7 Land opposite Cleeve View, Evesham Road, Salford Priors, <u>approximately 12 units, see Policy SP8 SP7 below, subject to a flood risk assessment.</u></p> <p>SP7/8 Land at Orchard Farm, School Road Salford Priors, <u>approximately 60 units, see Policy SP9 SP8 below."</u></p> <p>Policy re-numbered SP6.</p>
<b>Policy SP8 – Land opposite Cleeve View, Evesham Road, Salford Priors:</b>			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
insert "approximately" before "12" (p.34)	Section 6: Policies (p.28)	Modification agreed. The recommended modification to state the number of units on the site is approximate is required to build in flexibility in order to reflect paragraphs 15 and 16 of the NPPF.	First paragraph modified to read:  "The land shown in Appendix 2, Figure A15, opposite Cleeve View, Evesham Road, Salford Priors, is allocated for housing for <u>approximately</u> 12 new homes. Development proposals will be supported when they include:"
delete a) (p.34)	Section 6: Policies (p.28)	Modification agreed. The policy as originally written was overly prescriptive in this regard. The recommendation to delete that restriction was therefore required in order to comply with the provisions of para 60 of the NPPF.	Criteria a) deleted from the Plan and original criteria c) changed to criteria a):  <del>"a) a development of 1.5 storeys in height properties built in a cottage courtyard style;"</del>
delete b) (p.34)	Section 6: Policies (p.28)	Modification agreed. The policy repeats the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CS.18 and is unnecessary.	Criteria b) deleted from the Plan and original criteria e) changed to criteria b):  <del>"b) a minimum of 35% affordable housing to meet local needs;"</del>
delete d) (p.34)	Section 6: Policies (p.29)	Modification agreed. The requirement to provide parking provision for properties outside the allocation site is not a legitimate requirement	Criteria d) deleted from the Plan:  <del>"d) parking provision for 6 vehicles for properties known as Cleeve View; and"</del>  Policy re-numbered SP7.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		and not conducive to providing a clear framework for decision making as set out in para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	
<b>Policy SP9 – Land at Orchard Farm, School Road, Salford Priors:</b>			
Insert "approximately" before "60" (p.36)	Section 6: Policies (p.29)	Modification agreed. The recommended modification to state the number of units on the site is approximate is required to build in flexibility in order to reflect paragraphs 15 and 16 of the NPPF.	First paragraph modified to read:  "The land shown in Appendix 2, Figure A16, at Orchard Farm, School Road, Salford Priors, is allocated for housing for <u>approximately</u> 60 new homes and a village green. Development proposals will be supported when they include:"

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete a) (p.36)	Section 6: Policies (p.29)	Modification agreed. The term 'suitable mix' is imprecise. Additionally, Policy CS.18 of the Core Strategy provides appropriate policy context to housing mix and duplication in the NDP is both unnecessary and not conducive to providing a practical framework for decision making.	Criteria a) deleted from the Plan and original criteria c) changed to criteria a):  <del>"a) a suitable mix of types and sizes of new homes, including detached dwelling houses and terraces;"</del>
Delete b) (p.36)	Section 6: Policies (p.29)	Modification agreed. Policy CS.18 of the Core Strategy provides appropriate policy context to affordable housing requirements and duplication in the NDP is both unnecessary and not conducive to providing a practical framework for decision making.	Criteria b) deleted from the Plan and original criteria d) changed to criteria b):  <del>"b) a minimum of 35% affordable housing to meet local needs;"</del>
In criterion d) delete "creates an appearance of" and insert "achieves" (p.36)	Section 6: Policies (p.29)	Modification agreed. More precise wording suggested bringing in line with Local and National policy.	Criteria d) modified to read:  "d) a phasing plan and strategy in accordance with Table 3, below, that <del>creates an appearance of</del> <u>achieves</u> incremental, organic growth rather than a single, short-term, estate type development;

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Replace the second sentence of e) with "The design and layout of the village green must include measures to prevent parking near to the junction with School Road." (p.36)	Section 6: Policies (p.29)	Modification agreed. More precise wording suggested.	Criteria e) modified and changed to criteria c):  "e) <u>c</u> ) a village green of a minimum 3 hectares. The design and layout of the village green <del>should pay careful attention to the junction with School Road and should include measures to prevent any parking in this area</del> <u>must include measures to prevent parking near to the junction with School Road.</u> Landscaping with indigenous species and fencing should be provided around the village green. Suitable foot and cycle links should be provided to the green from the development to other parts of the parish. The surrounding built development should also create strong frontages to the green so that there is a strong sense of enclosure and a degree of natural surveillance;"
Delete g) (p.36)	Section 6: Policies (p.30)	Modification agreed. The requirement to provide parking provision for properties outside the allocation site is not a legitimate requirement and not conducive to providing a clear framework for decision making as set out in para 17 of the NPPF.	Criteria g) deleted from the Plan and original criteria h) changed to criteria e):  <del>"g) a small off street parking area to the northern corner of the site suitably located for the village shop and Post Office;"</del>



Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete "over an appropriate timescale" (p.36)	Section 6: Policies (p.30)	Modification agreed. Text as drafted too vague and deemed unnecessary and as such should be removed.	Penultimate paragraph modified to read:  "Development will only be supported when a planning application is submitted with a masterplan for the whole site together with a delivery statement to ensure open space and housing elements of the scheme are delivered in tandem <del>over an appropriate timescale</del> ".
Delete the final paragraph from the policy and transfer to supporting text. (p.36)	Section 6: Policies (p.30)	Modification agreed. This paragraph of the originally drafted policy contains a point of information rather than policy content and as such should be deleted from the policy and transferred to supporting text. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	Final paragraph deleted:  <del>"The allocation does not affect the existing agricultural and employment uses at Orchard Farm. Any heavy goods vehicle traffic associated with these two existing uses will continue to access Orchard Farm from School Road"</del> .  Policy re-numbered SP8.
<b>Policy SP10 – New housing development on non-allocated sites:</b>			
Delete Policy SP10 (p.37)	Section 6: Policies (p.30-31)	Modification agreed. The policy seeks to establish support for new housing development on non-allocated sites. However,	Policy SP10 deleted:  <del>"New housing development on non-allocated sites will be supported where it retains the essential rural character of the area and meets the following local</del>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		there is no justification or explanation of the policy. In the absence of clear evidence, the policy should be deleted. The intention of the policy remains within the development plan in that Core Strategy Policy CS.15 makes provision for small-scale schemes on unidentified but suitable sites within the physical confines of Salford Priors and for local needs schemes in all the settlements in the neighbourhood area.	<p>criteria:</p> <p><del>Salford Priors</del> — small scale infill proposals within the existing built form of the village where they are in accordance with the policies of the neighbourhood development plan and other development plan policies.</p> <p><del>Abbot's Salford, The Bevingtons, Dunnington, Iron Cross, Pitchill and Rushford</del> — new housing development in these settlements will only be permitted when it is a small scale community led scheme which meets a need identified in an up-to-date housing needs survey".</p>
<b>Policy SP11 – Housing Density:</b>			
Delete Policy SP11 (p.38)	Section 6: Policies (p.31-32)	Modification agreed. The policy does not set out any justification for the proposed density of 20 dwellings per Ha. In the absence of evidence to support this approach, the policy does not comply with Guidance and should	Policy SP11 deleted:  "New housing should be developed at a maximum of 20 dwellings per hectare to preserve the rural character of the area".

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		be deleted.	
<b>Policy SP12 – Affordable Housing:</b>			
<p>Replace the first two sentences with "All proposals for residential development on sites of 0.2 hectares or more and/or comprising 5 or more self-contained homes, will be required to contribute to the provision of affordable housing in accordance with Policy CS.18 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy (or replacement Policy in a later Local Plan)." (p.39)</p> <p>In the first paragraph after "order" insert "of priority" (p.39)</p>	Section 6: Policies (p.33)	Modification agreed. The policy is not in general conformity with several elements of Policy CS.18 of the Core Strategy including the size of the scheme threshold, on-site provision, and viability considerations. The NDP does not therefore meet the basic conditions in this respect and should be modified, accordingly. The word 'order' is imprecise and should be modified to provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF.	<p>First paragraph of policy modified to read:</p> <p><del>"All proposals for 6 or more new homes in Salford Priors village must provide affordable housing on site. On such sites at least 35% of homes must be affordable. All proposals for residential development on sites of 0.2 hectares or more and/or comprising 5 or more self-contained homes, will be required to contribute to the provision of affordable housing in accordance with Policy CS.18 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy (or replacement Policy in a later Local Plan). Allocation of such homes should be in the following order of priority: existing residents of Salford Priors in housing need; residents of Stratford-on-Avon district in housing need; and residents of Warwickshire county in housing need".</del></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
In the second paragraph delete "for more than six homes" (p.39)	Section 6: Policies (p.33)	Modification agreed. The policy is not in general conformity with several elements of Policy CS.18 of the Core Strategy including the size of the scheme threshold, on-site provision, and viability considerations. The NDP does not therefore meet the basic conditions in this respect and should be modified, accordingly. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	Second paragraph of policy modified to read:  "Affordable homes should be designed to be well integrated with their surroundings and with new market homes on the site of which they are a part. The type and size of affordable homes should meet the identified and up-to-date housing needs of the parish. Applications <del>for more than 6 homes</del> should therefore be accompanied by an affordable housing statement. This should be produced in consultation with an appropriate Registered Social Landlord and be discussed and agreed with Salford Priors Parish Council in advance of any planning application".  Policy re-numbered SP9.
<b>Policy SP13 – Conversion of Redundant Agricultural Buildings for Housing and Other Uses:</b>			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
In the first line after "redundant" insert "agricultural" (p.40)	Section 6: Policies (p.33)	Modification agreed. For clarification purposes only, since it is evident the intention is that the policy should relate to redundant agricultural buildings.	First paragraph of policy modified to read:  "Conversion of redundant <u>agricultural</u> buildings for housing and other uses will be supported when proposals can meet the following - they:"
Continue f) with "where Building Regulations permit" (p.40)	Section 6: Policies (p.34)	Modification agreed. For clarification and to ensure the correct technical standards are adhered to. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	Criteria f) modified to read:  "f) retain existing roof structures and floor levels <u>where Building Regulations permit</u> "  Policy re-numbered SP10.
<b>Policy SP14 – Woodlands, Trees and Hedgerows:</b>			
Add a map to confirm the location of the trees listed in Table 5 (p.41)	Section 6: Policies (p.37)	Modification agreed for clarification purposes. Modification necessary in order to pinpoint location of tree and/or trees in each specified location.	New Appendix 3 'Important Trees' added, including table of trees and Figures A14/A15 indicating the location of the trees within the neighbourhood area.
Delete "permitted" and insert "supported" (p.41)	Section 6: Policies (p.36)	Modification agreed. Policies should use the term 'supported' in recognition that the basis of decision making is the	First paragraph of policy modified to read:  "Development proposals should seek to retain existing trees, woodland and hedgerows. The trees identified in Table 5 are locally important. Any new

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, as set out in the NPPF.	development affecting these trees will only be <del>permitted</del> <u>supported</u> when the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss of the tree(s)"
Continue the second paragraph with "unless biodiversity or visual amenity benefits are clearly demonstrated" (p.41)	Section 6: Policies (p.36)	Modification agreed. Modification proposed in order to take account specific cases where hedgerow replacement with other boundary treatments may be a preferred solution, thus building in a degree of flexibility to the policy. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	Second paragraph of policy modified to read:  "Hedgerow replacement with other boundary treatments, such as fences, will not be supported <u>unless biodiversity or visual amenity benefits are clearly demonstrated</u> "  Policy re-numbered SP11.
<b>Policy SP15 – Protecting the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land:</b>			
Replace Policy SP15 with "Development proposals resulting in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Agricultural Land Classification Grades 1, 2 and 3a) will only be supported where it is	Section 6: Policies (p.37-38)	Modification agreed. No evidence has been presented to indicate that loss of one grade of land rather than another grade has differential impact on landscape or settlement	Policy SP15 replaced, as follows:  <del>The loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Agricultural Land Classification Grades 1, 2 and 3a) should be avoided in favour of poorer quality land. To ensure that Grade 1, 2 and 3a land is retained the economic and other benefits of this land</del>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
demonstrated that the impact of the loss of the land will not adversely affect the viability of the relevant land holding, and it is demonstrated poorer quality land is not available" (p.42)		setting or character. It is not in the interests of clarity for any one policy to refer to other policies of the Plan and the balancing of economic benefits is imprecise. The modifications proposed are therefore necessary to provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	<p><del>including the following will be taken in to account:</del></p> <p><del>a) Impact of any loss of the land on the viability of individual agricultural holdings;</del></p> <p><del>b) Landscape;</del></p> <p><del>c) Character and setting of the parish's individual settlements; and</del></p> <p><del>d) The other policies in this neighbourhood development plan.</del></p> <p><del>Planning permission will only be granted when alternative poorer quality land is not available elsewhere, and when the economic benefits of the proposed development clearly outweigh the economic, and other benefits provided by keeping Grade 1, 2 and 3a land open.</del></p> <p><u>"Development proposals resulting in 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 land holding, and it is demonstrated poorer quality land is not available".</u></p> <p>Policy re-numbered SP12.</p>
<b>Policy SP16 – Protected Open Areas:</b>			
Delete Policy SP16, supporting text paragraphs 6.37 to 6.39, Table 6 and Figure 8 (map of	Section 6: Policies (p.38-40)	Modification agreed. The policy seeks to introduce a policy that is distinct	Policy SP16 and supporting text deleted:  <del>"The open areas listed in Table 6 and shown on</del>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
'Protected Open Areas') (p.43)		<p>from Local Green Space and from Green Belt. The three criteria by which proposals will be assessed suggest the basis of designation is historic character and rural setting, wildlife, and views. The Guidance states "Proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. The evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft neighbourhood plan". The reason stated in Table 6 for each proposed area does not satisfy these requirements, and the reasons do not clearly relate to the criteria included in the policy. There is in addition no information to explain the process of selection of these areas. The policy</p>	<p><del>Figure 8 will be protected. Development affecting these open areas will be permitted only when:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a) It does not have a detrimental impact on the historic character or rural setting of the open area;</del></li> <li><del>b) It would not lead to a detrimental impact on the wildlife of the open area; and</del></li> <li><del>c) It would not have a detrimental impact on views in to and out of the open area.</del></li> </ul> <p><del>6.37 The surrounding countryside within the Parish of Salford Priors is essential to maintaining the historic and rural character; maintaining and enhance wildlife; and ensuring the settlements of the parish retain their separate identities. The most significant of these areas are identified in Table 6 and Figure 8 and will be protected.</del></p> <p><del>6.38 These highly important open areas are vital to the character, wildlife and history of the parish and will be protected from development.</del></p> <p><del>6.39 Development may occur near protected open areas providing the development would not have a detrimental impact on views and the landscape."</del></p>



Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		does not provide sufficient information for it to be used as a framework for decision taking when proposals for development are being considered.	
<b>Policy SP17: Protected Local Green Spaces</b>			
Delete Policy SP17; supporting text paragraphs 6.40 and 6.41; Table 7 (list of proposed Local Green Spaces) and Appendix 4 (Descriptions and maps of proposed Local Green Spaces) (p.45)	Section 6: Policies (p.41-42)	Modification agreed. The wording of the Policy attempts to introduce a description, criteria and circumstances that differ from those set out in the Framework. The submission NDP does not offer sufficient evidence for me to conclude the areas proposed for designation as Local Green Space are demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance. There is no confirmation that the Qualifying Body contacted landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of	<p>Policy SP17 and supporting text deleted:</p> <p><del>"The designated Local Green Spaces, listed in Table 7 and Appendix 4, will be protected. Development of these Local Green Spaces will only be permitted in line with national Green Belt policy. Inappropriate development will only be permitted in very special circumstances, that is, when any harm to the local green space, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</del></p> <p><del>6.40 National planning policy allows local communities to identify the spaces most important to them as designated local green spaces. Such spaces should be:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• in reasonably close proximity to the community they serve;</del></li> <li><del>• demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance, for example because of their beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as</del></li> </ul>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>their land as Local Green Space as set out in the Guidance. A Local Green Space designation is an important decision with significant implications for the land included. There must be no uncertainty as to the boundaries of the designation. The NDP does not include a map of the boundaries of The Wetlands; Quarry Pools, and the Brooks. Consultation has been undertaken without clarity of spatial application and this lack of precise definition precludes designation as proposed in the policy. The policy does not provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF and does not meet the basic conditions.</p>	<p><del>a playing field), tranquillity or richness of their wildlife; and</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</del></li> </ul> <p><del>Appendix 4 sets out in more detail how the designated local green spaces meet these criteria.</del></p> <p><del>6.41 Once identified, such spaces should only be developed in very special circumstances and Policy SP17 will ensure any future development of these spaces is consistent with national Green Belt policy".</del></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
<b>Policy SP20 – Footpaths and Cycle Ways:</b>			
delete "when necessary" (p.47)  After "all users" insert "except where it can be clearly demonstrated to be physically impossible." (p.47)	Section 6: Policies (p.44)	Modification agreed. The modifications proposed are necessary to provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	First paragraph modified to read:  "All development proposals should retain public footpaths, cycleways, bridleways and rights of way. Where proposals include new routes these should provide direct, legible connections to the existing network of routes, with clear signposting (with distance and time markers), <del>when necessary</del> , and full accessibility for all users <u>except where it can be clearly demonstrated to be physically impossible.</u> "  Policy re-numbered SP14.
<b>Policy SP21 – Traffic and Highway Safety:</b>			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete Policy SP21 (p.47)	Section 6: Policies (p.45)	Modification agreed. The policy includes several terms that are imprecise including "suitable" "frequently" "appropriate" "excessive" "suitable and appropriate" so that the Policy does not provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. The policy relates to several matters that do not relate to the development and use of land, and others that are not adequately justified or evidenced and should be deleted.	<p>Policy SP21 deleted:</p> <p><del>"To protect the safety of all highway users and maintain the free flow of traffic, development proposals will be assessed so as to ensure that:</del></p> <p><del>a) Existing and proposed road speed limits are suitable for the development proposed;</del></p> <p><del>b) In countryside areas the development can take place without the need for road widening, straightening or introduction of urban kerbing, paving, and street furniture on country roads and lanes;</del></p> <p><del>c) The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the safety of pedestrian and cycle users of frequently walked and cycled routes that connect housing to community assets such as the school, village shop, public houses and playing field through the use of appropriate road speed limits, speed enforcement measures, lighting and suitable foot and cycle ways;</del></p> <p><del>d) Where traffic management measures have to be introduced as a result of a development proposal they should not lead to excessive signage, road markings or lighting; and</del></p> <p><del>e) The incorporation of suitable and appropriate car parking, see Policy SP22 below."</del></p>
<b>Policy SP22 – Car Parking:</b>			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete the first paragraph (p.48)	Section 6: Policies (p.46)	Modification agreed. The first part of the policy twice uses the term, "appropriate levels", that is imprecise and the first part of the Policy should be deleted as it does not provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	First paragraph of Policy SP22 deleted:  <del>"Parking at community facilities such as the playing field and the Memorial Hall must be maintained at appropriate levels and any new community facilities developed must have appropriate levels of parking on or near the site."</del>  Policy re-numbered SP15.
<b>Policy SP23 – Public Transport:</b>			
Delete "maximise" and insert "increase" (p.49)  Delete "may" and insert "will" (p.49)  Delete " In particular the following will be supported:" (p.49)	Section 6: Policies (p.47)	Modification agreed. The terms "maximise" and "may" are imprecise and introduce uncertainty, and the link between the second and third sentences is unclear. These terms should be altered so that the Policy provides a practical	First paragraph modified to read:  "New development should be located and designed, wherever possible, to <del>maximise</del> <u>increase</u> the use of public transport. Development generating significant numbers of journeys <del>may</del> <u>will</u> be required to make appropriate contributions to introducing, or improving, existing public transport. <del>In particular, the following will be supported:</del>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete "Measures" in a) and b) (p.49)		framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	"a) <del>Measures</del> to improve the duration and frequency of bus services; and b) <del>Measures</del> to improve existing public transport links to key town centres and their wider range of facilities."  Policy re-numbered SP16.
<b>Policy SP24 – Existing and New Employment and Business Uses (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8):</b>			
Delete "small" (p.50)	Section 6: Policies (p.48)	Modification agreed. The term "new small buildings" is imprecise. Deletion of the word "small" is recommended with the implication that appropriate scale will be determined on the basis of the four stated criteria within the policy.	Second paragraph modified to read:  "New <del>small</del> buildings for employment uses will be supported in the village of Salford Priors when they meet the following criteria:"
Delete "existing infrastructure and services" (p.50)	Section 6: Policies (p.48)	Modification agreed. Deletion of the imprecise term "existing infrastructure and services" is recommended in order to provide a practical framework within	Criteria b) modified to read:  "b) The development relates well to the built-form of the existing settlement, <del>existing infrastructure and services;</del> "

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF.	
Delete "trips by Heavy Goods Vehicles using" and insert "severe transport impacts on" (p.50)	Section 6: Policies (p.48)	Modification agreed. It is considered limiting the policy to generating trips specifically relating to Heavy Goods Vehicles is too limiting a factor and the policy should cover transport impact in more general terms in order to comply with associated local and national policy. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	Criteria d) modified to read:  "d) That proposals will not generate <del>trips by Heavy Goods Vehicles using</del> <u>severe transport impacts on</u> the parish rural road network".  Policy re-numbered SP17.
<b>Policy SP25 – Farm Diversification:</b>			
Replace c) with "proposals for new built development must demonstrate that existing buildings cannot be used; and" (p.51)	Section 6: Policies (p.48)	Modification agreed. The term "where possible" is imprecise and the Policy should be amended to provide a practical framework within which	Criteria d) modified to read:  "c) <del>where possible existing buildings are used to reduce the need for new built development; and</del> <u>proposals for new built development must demonstrate that existing buildings cannot be used;</u>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	and” Policy re-numbered SP18.
<b>Policy SP26 – Live/Work Units and Home Working:</b>			
<p>Replace Policy SP26 with:</p> <p>“Development proposals will be supported for conversion of a building to live/work use; or the use of part of a dwelling for employment uses, and for small scale free standing buildings within its curtilage, extensions to the dwelling or conversion of outbuildings for employment uses provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• other than minor ancillary support, servicing and maintenance, all work activities are carried out only by the occupants of the dwelling;</li> <li>• no significant and adverse impact arises to nearby</li> </ul>	Section 6: Policies (p.48)	Modification agreed. The phrase “requiring planning permission” is not necessary as all the policies of the NDP only apply where planning permission is required. The term “preference will be for” does not provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. The terms “appropriate to the character of the area, local settlement and the parish”, “small scale”, and “small” are imprecise and also do not provide a	<p>Policy SP26 modified to read:</p> <p><del>“The provision of live/work units and homeworking in the parish will be supported providing the proposals are small scale and they are appropriate to the character of the area, local settlement and the parish. In all cases preference will be for the conversion of existing buildings rather than new build.</del></p> <p><del>Small home based businesses requiring planning permission will be supported when they do not have an adverse impact on residential amenity, local highways, the natural or built environment.</del></p> <p><del>The incorporation of workspace associated with residential development will be supported in order to increase the scope for home based working”.</del></p> <p><u>“Development proposals will be supported for</u></p>



Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>residents or natural environment areas from traffic movements, noise, fumes, odour or other nuisance associated with the work activity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• access arrangements and off-street parking can be satisfactorily provided without impinging on adjoining residential and non-residential uses; and</li> <li>• any extension or free standing building should not detract from the appearance and character of the building to which they are subservient by reason of height, scale, or massing.</li> </ul> <p>Proposals for new build live/work units will only be supported if it can be demonstrated no suitable conversion of an existing building can be achieved.” (p.52)</p>		<p>practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. The policy will need to be re-drafted as proposed in order to meet the basic conditions. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.</p>	<p><u>conversion of a building to live/work use; or the use of part of a dwelling for employment uses, and for small scale free standing buildings within its curtilage, extensions to the dwelling or conversion of outbuildings for employment uses provided that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>other than minor ancillary support, servicing and maintenance, all work activities are carried out only by the occupants of the dwelling;</u></li> <li>• <u>no significant and adverse impact arises to nearby residents or natural environment areas from traffic movements, noise, fumes, odour or other nuisance associated with the work activity;</u></li> <li>• <u>access arrangements and off-street parking can be satisfactorily provided without impinging on adjoining residential and non-residential uses; and</u></li> <li>• <u>any extension or free standing building should not detract from the appearance and character of the building to which they are subservient by reason of height, scale, or massing.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Proposals for new build live/work units will only be supported if it can be demonstrated no suitable conversion of an existing building can be achieved.”</u></p> <p>Policy re-numbered SP19.</p>
<p><b>Policy SP27 – Commercial Development and Highways:</b></p>			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete Policy SP27 (p.53)	Section 6: Policies (p.49)	Modification agreed. It is unclear how economic benefits and traffic impact are to be assessed in order to determine whether the former outweigh the latter. The term "better site with better access" is imprecise. The Policy does not provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. No proportionate, robust evidence to support the choice of the 5% or greater HGV traffic increase threshold is presented. The Framework states "Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe" and as such the policy	Policy SP27 deleted:  <del>"Any business-related proposals which would result in a 5% or greater increase in Heavy Goods Vehicles traffic will need to demonstrate that:</del> <del>a) The economic benefits of the development, particularly to the local community, outweigh the impact of the increase in HGV traffic;</del> <del>b) The proposed development cannot be accommodated on a better site with better access to the Heavy Goods Vehicles Route Network within the District, the route as defined by Warwickshire County Council; and</del> <del>c) The supply and distribution routes proposed to serve the development are the most appropriate with regards to the impacts on the amenities of the village and its hamlets."</del>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		should be deleted.	
<b>Policy SP28 – Rural Tourism:</b>			
Delete Policy SP28 (p.53)	Section 6: Policies (p.50)	Modification agreed. The terms "appropriate to a rural area", "informal recreation", "part of wider" "formal recreation", and "large new buildings" are imprecise such that the policy does not provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF and as such the policy should be deleted.	Policy SP28 deleted:  "Proposals for new tourism development appropriate to a rural area will be encouraged, including:  a) Informal recreation; b) Development that is part of wider farm diversification; and c) Formal recreation proposals that would not require large new buildings and would not lead to significant vehicular traffic and noise."
<b>Policy SP29 – Touring Caravanning and Camping Sites:</b>			
Replace Policy SP29 with:  "Proposals for new touring caravan and camping sites will be supported where they have safe road access; are screened from view off-site; and do not	Section 6: Policies (p.50)	Modification agreed. The terms "small", "good access", "well screened", and "appropriate access" are imprecise and the policy should be modified to provide a practical	Policy replaced, to read:  "Development proposals for the use of land for small touring caravanning and/or camping sites— especially those with good access to local services and facilities will be encouraged where sites are well screened, have appropriate access to the road

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>significantly adversely affect residential amenity or landscape character. Proposals for improvement of existing touring caravan and camping sites will be supported where they provide improved shops or recreation facilities serving site occupants only; or improve site access; landscaping; or the appearance of the site." (p.54)</p>		<p>framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.</p>	<p><del>network, do not adversely affect residential amenity, or the rural character of the parish.</del></p> <p><del>Proposals for improvements on existing sites will be supported when they are for:</del></p> <p><del>a) The provision of improved facilities including shops and recreation opportunities that are of a scale appropriate to the site itself; and</del>  <del>b) Improvements to site access, landscaping, or the appearance of the site."</del></p> <p><u>"Proposals for new touring caravan and camping sites will be supported where they have safe road access; are screened from view off-site; and do not significantly adversely affect residential amenity or landscape character. Proposals for improvement of existing touring caravan and camping sites will be supported where they provide improved shops or recreation facilities serving site occupants only; or improve site access; landscaping; or the appearance of the site"</u>.</p> <p>Policy re-numbered SP20.</p>
<p><b>Policy SP30 – Development and the Community:</b></p>			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Policy SP30 should be deleted and transferred to a separate community aspirations annex that is clearly identified as not forming part of the Neighbourhood Plan (p.55)	Section 6: Policies (p.51)	Modification agreed. The terms "seek to capitalise on", "neighbourly community", "appropriate circumstances", "such as", "other links", and "unite" are imprecise such that the Policy does not provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF and as such the policy should be deleted. With some adjustment the text of the policy could be presented as a community aspiration.	Policy SP30 deleted:  " <del>Development proposals should seek to capitalise on opportunities to create a strong, healthy, neighbourly community by integrating with, and enhancing, existing opportunities for social interaction within the various settlements of the parish. In particular, development proposals in Salford Priors should, in appropriate circumstances, include features (such as footpaths, other links, design features, and signage) to unite the two halves of the village to encourage a more integrated community with a stronger identity as a rural village with a centre.</del> "
<b>Policy SP31 – New and Improved Community Buildings:</b>			
Delete the final sentence (p.56)	Section 6: Policies (p.52)	Modification agreed. The final sentence of the policy is a statement rather than policy and is in any case superfluous as the content is already dealt with earlier in the	Policy SP31 modified to read:  "Proposals for new and improvements to existing community buildings will be supported in order to help sustain a strong community. In particular, the following will be supported:

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		policy. The sentence should be deleted in the interests of clarity so that the policy provides a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	<p>a) TOPs being made into a permanent brick building, either on its current site or elsewhere, providing the current level of facilities are retained, there is improved access and the new building has direct access to a suitable open space.</p> <p>b) The renovation of the existing Scout Building or the provision of new facilities for such a use either in a new building or within an existing building in the Parish.</p> <p><del>There is a need for additional indoor space for community activities. This could be achieved through improvements to the existing buildings."</del></p> <p>Policy re-numbered SP21.</p>
<b>Policy SP32 – Protecting Community Assets:</b>			
<p>The first sentence should be deleted and transferred to a non-statutory appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan and clearly so titled (p.58)</p> <p>Replace the second sentence with:</p> <p>"Development for non-community use of any assets designated by Stratford on Avon District Council as assets of</p>	Section 6: Policies (p.54)	Modification agreed. The designation of assets of community value in the plan area will be undertaken by the District Council as the appropriate body, which is distinct from the local planning authority. The District Council has established a mechanism to nominate buildings and facilities for consideration and possible	<p>Policy SP32 modified to read:</p> <p><del>"The Village Store, Post Office and public houses (The Bell, The Vineyard and The Queens Head), and the Memorial Hall are protected as community assets. Development of these assets for non-community use of assets designated by Stratford-on-Avon District Council as assets of community value under the Localism Act 2011 will only be permitted supported where:</del></p> <p>a) <del>when it is demonstrated</del> the existing use is no longer viable;</p> <p>b) <del>and</del> an alternative community use has not</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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 value under the Localism Act 2011 will only be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o it is demonstrated the existing use is no longer viable; and</li> <li>o an alternative community use has not been found following an active period of marketing of at least 12 months</li> </ul> <p>unless an alternative facility of at least equal community value, and accessibility to the community, is provided as part of the proposal" (p.58)</p>		<p>designation as assets of community value that is completely separate from neighbourhood plan preparation. The Parish Council should put forward the proposals for nomination via the appropriate route for consideration. The designation process which leads, in effect, to a community right to bid is concerned with control through ownership of assets and is not a land use policy. Only land use policies can be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Guidance states, "Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable. For example, set out in a</p>	<p>been found following an active period of marketing <del>for a minimum</del> of at least twelve months.</p> <p><u>Unless an alternative facility of at least equal community value and accessibility to the community is provided as part of the proposal."</u></p> <p>Policy re-numbered SP22.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		companion document or annex." This approach should be adopted here. This will require modification of the policy so that the proposal for designation of assets of community value is transferred to a non-statutory annex to the Neighbourhood Plan. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	
<b>Policy SP33 – Community Safety:</b>			
Delete the first "that" and insert "the following" (p.59)  Delete "included within the proposal, and, where appropriate, the following have been" (p.59)  Delete part b) (p.59)  In part c) delete "suitable"; insert "and" before "spaces";	Section 6: Policies (p.54)	Modification agreed. The term "where appropriate" introduces uncertainty and the words "suitable" and "natural features" are imprecise and the recommend modifications will ensure the Policy provides a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made	Policy modified to read:  "To maintain and improve community safety in the parish applicants must demonstrate <del>that the</del> <u>the following</u> community safety measures have been <del>included within the proposal, and, where appropriate, the following have been</del> addressed:  a) Design and layout enables full access for emergency service vehicles; <u>and</u> <del>b) Adequate water supplies are available for effective firefighting; and</del>



Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
and delete "and natural features" (p.59)		as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Criteria b) should be deleted since it is not a land-use policy. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	e) <del>b)</del> Inclusion of <del>suitable</del> built and landscaped features that provide enclosure and natural surveillance (such as window openings and overlooking) of streets <u>and</u> spaces, <del>and natural features."</del>  Policy re-numbered SP23.
<b>Policy SP35 – Leisure and Recreation Facilities:</b>			

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>in part b) delete "Development by local sports teams who need to make"</p> <p>in part c) delete "activities for all age groups, such as:"</p> <p>in part d) delete "centre"</p>	Section 6: Policies (p.55)	Modification agreed. The terms "local sports teams" and "who need to make" and "village centre" and the requirement for each new leisure facility "to provide activities for all age groups" are imprecise and are recommended for deletion so that the Policy provides a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made as required by para 17 of the NPPF. Subject to the recommended modification this Policy meets the basic conditions.	<p>Policy modified to read:</p> <p>"Current leisure and recreation facilities are to be retained or improved to offer an attractive range of facilities for all age groups. The following will be supported:</p> <p>a) The retention of the facilities currently provided by the Playing Field unless this is provided elsewhere in an accessible location in the settlement of Salford Priors to an equivalent or better standard;</p> <p>b) <del>Development by local sports teams who need to make</del> improvements or additions to outdoor sports facilities;</p> <p>c) New leisure facilities to provide <del>activities for all age groups, such as:</del> a run/trim track, outdoor gym equipment, play equipment for children of all ages and cycle ways; and</p> <p>d) The creation of a village <del>centre</del>/green that provides a focal point to the Parish and offers flexible use as an open green space."</p> <p>Policy re-numbered SP25.</p>
<b>Minor Corrections to the Neighbourhood Plan:</b>			
Renumbering of policies and parts of policies will be necessary as a result of recommended deletions (p.62)	Various	Modification agreed, for clarification purposes only.	All affected policies in the NDP re-numbered as appropriate, some of which are listed in the schedule, above.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>Modification of general text will be necessary to achieve consistency with the modified policies (p.62)</p> <p><b><u>Modifications to comply with Examiner's request listed below:</u></b></p>	Various (see below for breakdown of modifications)	Decisions and reasons set out below in each case:	General revised/new text as set out below:
Include a list of Policies.	Contents (p.2)	Modification agreed, for clarification purposes only.	List of Policies added after the Contents Page.
Amend paragraph 2.5	Section 2: A NDP for Salford Seven (p.7)	Modification agreed to update the stage of the process the Plan has reached.	<p><del>"To prepare our Neighbourhood Development Plan we must follow a set process. Doing this is important if we want our plan to be used in the future to help determine planning applications. The process also gives people who live, work and carry out business in the area plenty of opportunities to help shape the plan. Figure 4 shows the process – after undertaking the minimum six week Regulation 14 consultation we have reached submission stage. Stratford on Avon will now consult on the plan for a further six weeks".</del></p> <p><u>"The Salford Seven Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations set by Government. Figure 4 briefly outlines the main steps within the Neighbourhood Plan process and confirms the stage which the Plan has now reached".</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Amend paragraph 2.6	Section 2: A NDP for Salford Seven (p.7)	Modification agreed to update the stage of the process the Plan has reached.	<p><del>"After this consultation the plan will be subject to independent examination. The examiner will then recommend, with or without changes, whether or not the plan should proceed to local referendum. If, in due course, the referendum vote is a "yes" the plan will be made part of the development plan by Stratford on Avon Council".</del></p> <p><u>"The Salford Seven Neighbourhood Development Plan was subject to independent examination in August 2016. The examiner recommended, with some modifications, that the plan should proceed to local referendum. The referendum will be held on [insert date] and if local people vote "yes", Stratford on Avon District Council will make the plan part of the development plan for the area".</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Amend paragraph 3.9	Section 3: National & Local Planning Policy Context (p.12)	Modification agreed to reflect the change in circumstances in relation to the Policies associated with the Local Plan 1996- 2011.	<p><del>"Our Neighbourhood Development Plan must be in 'general conformity' (see para 3.7 above) with the adopted strategic planning policies for the area. At the moment, these are the saved policies in the Stratford-on-Avon District Plan Review. Those policies which were 'saved' in 2009 and are in accordance with NPPF, remain in force and can continue to be applied".</del></p> <p><u>"Our Neighbourhood Development Plan must be in "general conformity" (see para 3.7 above) with the adopted strategic planning policies for the area. At the time the Neighbourhood Development Plan was submitted for Independent Examination, the adopted strategic planning policies for the area were those saved policies within the Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan Review 1996-2011".</u></p>
Replace paragraph 3.10	Section 3: National & Local Planning Policy Context (p.12-13)	Modification agreed to reflect the change in circumstances in relation to the adopted District Local Plan.	<p><del>"The main policies relevant to the Parish are:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• Policy STR1 – this identifies Salford Priors as a Local Centre Village. Policy COM1 of the Plan makes provision for such settlements to identify housing needs that they would wish to have satisfied at the local level. In assessing this need the local facilities available will be assessed when proposals are considered.</del></li> <li><del>• Outside of Salford Priors all the other settlements are treated as open countryside where development will be limited.</del></li> </ul>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Also of relevance to our plan are the environment, landscape, heritage and employment policies of the District Plan.</del></li> </ul> <p><u>"During the preparation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan, a replacement Local Plan (known as the Core Strategy) was being produced by Stratford-on-Avon District Council. The Core Strategy was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in September 2014 for Examination. The Examination of the Core Strategy began in January 2015 but was adjourned pending further evidential work. The Examination re-commenced and concluded in January 2016 with the Inspector's report being issued on 20 June 2016, recommended the Core Strategy be adopted in accordance with the Schedule of Main Modifications produced as a result of the Examination. The Core Strategy was adopted by the District Council on 11 July 2016"</u></p>
Replace paragraph 3.11	Section 3: National & Local Planning Policy Context (p.13)	Modification agreed to reflect the change in circumstances in relation to the adopted District Local Plan.	<p><del>"The District Plan was for the period 1996-2011, and in some places is out of date and a new plan is being prepared – the Stratford on Avon Core Strategy. When finalised this Core Strategy will replace the saved policies of the District Plan Review"</del>.</p> <p><u>"Planning Practice Guidance recommends that Neighbourhood Development Plans should take account of emerging plans. The Salford Seven NDP was prepared having regard to the policies in the</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>(now adopted) Core Strategy, but in particular the following:</u> [details re: Core Strategy Policies CS.15 and CS.16 followed on from revised para 3.11].
Replace paragraph 3.12	Section 3: National & Local Planning Policy Context (p.13)	Modification agreed to reflect the change in circumstances in relation to the adopted District Local Plan.	<p><del>"National Planning Practice Guidance recommends that Neighbourhood Development Plans should take account of emerging plans such as the Core Strategy. In developing our Neighbourhood Development Plan, we have done this. The Core Strategy was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for independent examination on 30 September 2014. The examination of the Core Strategy has yet to conclude, but this plan has been prepared by having appropriate regard to all the emerging policies in the Core Strategy".</del></p> <p><u>"The Salford Seven NDP was Examined against the adopted Core Strategy, as confirmed in the Examiner's report of 31 August 2016".</u></p>
Update Table 2 – 'Buildings of Local Importance'	Section 6: Policy SP2 (p.20-21)	Modification agreed for clarification purposes and to ensure that the maps corresponded with the data in the table.	<p>Table amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings listed by settlement</li> <li>• Each building given a reference number which cross-references with maps listed at Appendix 1 of the NDP showing the location of the buildings</li> </ul>
Figure 6 – Salford Priors Conservation Area	Section 6: Policy SP1 (p.24)	Modification agreed for clarification purposes.	Map amended to include Listed Buildings and a key to indicate what the map is showing the reader.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Figure 7 – Abbot's Salford Conservation Area	Section 6: Policy SP1 (p.25)	Modification agreed for clarification purposes.	Map replaced with version of the same quality and style as Figure 6, with Listed Buildings and Conservation Area shown.
Amend Paragraph 6.15	Section 6: Policy SP4 (p.29)	Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP policies modified through the Examination process.	"Sustainable construction of well designed, energy efficient homes and commercial buildings <del>must be promoted</del> <u>will be supported</u> . The impacts of climate change <del>must</del> <u>should</u> be considered <del>including</del> <u>and</u> <u>developers will be encouraged to include</u> measures to <u>help</u> cope with and reduce the impact of flooding. <del>Surface water is an important concern within any new development and there is a preference for natural solutions. The Natural England National Character Area document encourages 'the creation of sustainable urban drainage systems, and surface water management plans that can create new wetland features close to urban areas and new development'.</del> "
Amend first part of Paragraph 6.18	Section 6: Housing Policies (p.35)	Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP policies modified through the Examination process.	" <del>However, this requirement does not prevent a community delivering additional development if it considers it appropriate and is supported either through the Neighbourhood Development Plan or through the development of a Local Needs scheme. The Salford Priors Neighbourhood Development Plan will provide a minimum of 134 new homes in Salford Priors over the Plan Period 2011-2031. This includes 60 existing commitments (dwellings under construction or with planning permission) in Salford Priors, see Table 4".</del> "



Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Delete paragraph 6.19	Section 6: Deleted Policy SP10 (p.35)	Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP policies modified through the Examination process.	<del>"Land is also identified for a further 18 new homes in the hamlets, see Table 4. The hamlets of the parish have seen very little or no development for many years. Although not specifically identified for new housing in the emerging Core Strategy, in line with national planning policy, the neighbourhood plan identifies a small level of additional housing in the hamlets. This will be encouraged on small sites (up to 5 dwellings) when it would not have an adverse impact on landscape or settlement character. This will ensure that such growth is managed, helps meet local needs and contributes to maintaining the vitality and social and economic well-being of the area".</del>
Delete paragraph 6.20	Section 6: Deleted Policy SP10 (p.35)	Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP policies modified through the Examination process.	<del>"Housing numbers delivered through the hamlets will not count towards the Category 2 Settlement figure total, but will count in the wider district count towards the rural area total."</del>
Table 5: Important Trees and associated paragraph 6.35	Section 6: Policy SP14 (p.36-37)	Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP policies modified through the Examination process.	<del>"Table 5 Appendix 3 and Figures A14 and A15 identify the lists important trees within the Parish of Salford Priors that are not currently protected by a Tree Preservation Order but should be protected".</del>  Table 5 amended to include a unique reference number for each tree/group of trees and moved from the main body of the Plan to Appendix 3. Maps A14 and A15 created indicating the location of each tree/group of trees within the Parish to be used in conjunction with the table at Appendix 3.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Amend paragraph 6.36	Section 6: Policy SP15 (p.38)		<p>"The land within the Parish of Salford Priors is primarily agricultural land and the parish has a long history of farming: an economic and land management use that should be protected for the long-term. In particular, the best and most important agricultural land should be protected, <u>particularly if its loss would affect the viability of an existing agricultural operation</u> and poorer quality land used in preference to land of higher quality, unless economically, and in terms of the other benefits such higher quality land provides, such as landscape, alternative poorer quality land is not available elsewhere in the parish, or District, and the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the benefits of keeping such land open."</p>
Delete paragraphs 6.51, 6.52, 6.54 and 6.55	Section 6: Policy SP22 (p.46-47)	<p>Referred to Policy SP21 which was deleted by the Examiner. Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP policies modified through the Examination process.</p>	<p>"As a small rural parish the road and roadside footpath network is an important consideration. The character and names of the roads in the parish reflect their location and parish history. Many of the roads throughout the parish are narrow with tarmac pavements. The main roads are rural in appearance having views of open countryside with newer housing roads branching off. Urbanisation of the road network should not take place. Street lighting should be sympathetic to a rural environment regarding light pollution and energy use whilst maintaining safety. To maintain the rural feel of the parish, road signage should be minimal and excessive speed enforcement measures should be</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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><del>proportionate.</del></p> <p><del>Residents frequently walk the roadside footpaths for access to bus stops, public houses, shops, the church, etc. Travelling to work by foot is also a significant aspect of the parish with the 2011 census showing around 5% of people travelling to work in this way. Additionally, 1% travelled to work by bicycle. School children also use the footpaths to get to the local schools, playing field and community facilities. The speed of the traffic on the roads must be limited to ensure these roadside footpaths are safe. Many of the smaller lanes in the parish do not have roadside footpaths and the speed of these roads should reflect this.</del></p> <p><del>A large increase in HGV numbers on the narrow roads throughout the parish would be an additional concern in terms of both safety and noise impacting on the tranquil, rural environment.</del></p> <p><del>To support our Neighbourhood Development Plan policies appropriate speed enforcement measures should be in effect to retain and respect the character of the parish. These measures should not have a detrimental impact on the rural setting and character of the parish."</del></p>
Delete paragraph 6.60	Section 6: Policy SP29 (p.50)	Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP	<del>"In line with national planning policy the Plan seeks to support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses, rural areas,</del>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		policies modified through the Examination process.	<del>communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside."</del>
Replace paragraph 6.60	Section 6: Policy SP29 (p.50)	Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP policies modified through the Examination process.	<p><del>"The parish has many resources to support sustainable tourism. These include the historic character, its shop, public houses, hotel, bed &amp; breakfast establishments, local attractions and facilities, the River Avon, the proximity to Stratford upon Avon and "Shakespeare Country" and the opportunities for recreation in the Cotswolds. The Plan aims to encourage and support appropriate leisure and tourism activities and facilities, particularly green tourism. Noisy activities and sports which will impact on the peace and tranquillity of the parish are considered inappropriate for its rural setting."</del></p> <p><u>"The Parish has many local attractions and natural resources such as the River Avon which attract visitors to the area, notwithstanding the proximity of the Parish to Stratford-upon-Avon itself and opportunities for outdoor recreation in the nearby Cotswolds. The Parish Council therefore wishes to support sustainable tourism and the neighbourhood plan aims to support the appropriate improvement of existing, plus the development of, new caravan and camping sites where appropriate."</u></p>
Delete paragraph 6.79	Section 6: Policy SP34 (p.55)	Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP	<del>"A Welcome Pack that provides details on the local community groups, bus timetables, and local information should be created and distributed to all</del>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
		policies modified through the Examination process.	<del>new residents moving in to the Parish to ensure they are welcomed and can integrate into our community."</del>
New paragraph	Section 6: Policy SP34 (p.55)	Modification to general text required to achieve consistency with NDP policies modified through the Examination process.	<u>"To mitigate the impact of new development, wherever possible, appropriate financial contributions will be sought to ensure that the correct infrastructure is in place. These contributions will include Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). A levy raised on certain types of new development by Stratford-on-Avon District Council and 25% of which will be made available to the Parish Council for having the neighbourhood plan in place."</u>
Delete Section 7.0	Section 7.0: Next Steps (p.57)	Section deleted to reflect the stage the NDP has now reached in the process.	<p><del>"The Salford Seven Submission Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan has been published for consultation from [to be inserted]. Comments should be sent in writing to [SADC details to be inserted].</del></p> <p><del>Copies of the plan and consultation response form can be downloaded at [to be inserted].</del></p> <p><del>The Submission Draft Plan has been informed by the results of various informal and formal public consultations including questionnaires, a drop in and the research and hard work of the Steering Group. The consultations on the plan and how they have influenced the plan's preparation are summarised in the Consultation Statement that accompanies this plan.</del></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>Following the six-week consultation on the Submission Draft it is proposed that the plan and any remaining representations are passed to an independent examiner. The examiner will consider if the plan meets the basic conditions of the Localism Act.</p> <p>If the plan meets, or with modifications meets the basic conditions it will be put to a local referendum. If there is a "yes" vote, by a straight majority vote (50% of turnout +1) of those on the Electoral Register in the parish, the plan will then be made part of the development plan. The approved Neighbourhood Development Plan will then become part of the development plan and be used to help determine planning decisions in the Parish in conjunction with district planning policy."</p>
Appendix 1 – Amend title	Appendix 1 (p.59)	Title amended to correspond with the title of associated policy SP2.	Appendix 1 – Locally Important <u>Buildings of Local Importance</u>
Appendix 1: Figure A1 (Abbot's Salford)	Appendix 1 (p.59)	Whilst listed in Table 2, a map of this property was missing from the submission draft plan.	Added 'The Moat House' to the map.
Appendix 1: Figure A2 (Abbot's Salford)	Appendix 1 (p.59)	Mapping of property was incorrect in the submission draft plan.	Amended the building highlighted as 'Barn south-west of Red House' on the map.

<b>Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his report)</b>	<b>Section/page no. in submission draft NDP</b>	<b>SDC Decision and reason</b>	<b>New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP</b>
Appendix 1: Figure A3 (Dunnington)	Appendix 1 (p.60)	Properties listed were either missing from or incorrectly shown in the submission draft plan.	Amended the building highlighted as 'Little Ragley' on the map. Also added 'The Forge' and 'The Old Post Office' to the map.
Appendix 1: Figure A4 (Iron Cross)	Appendix 1 (p.60)	Re-numbered to account for additional map being included.	Re-numbered as 'Figure A5'.
Appendix 1: Figure A5 (Rushford)	Appendix 1 (p.61)	Mapping of property was incorrect in the submission draft plan.	Amended the building highlighted as 'The Lodge, Chapel Oak' on the map. Re-numbered Figure A7.
Appendix 1: Figure A6 (Salford Priors)	Appendix 1 (p.61)	Mapping of property was incorrect in the submission draft plan.	Amended the buildings highlighted as 'Hawkfield' and 'Old Vicarage' on the map. Re-numbered as 'Figure A9'.
Appendix 1: Figure A7 (Salford Priors)	Appendix 1 (p.62)	Re-numbered to account for additional map being included.	Re-numbered as 'Figure A8'.
Appendix 1: 'New' Figure A4 (Dunnington)	N/A	New map included to show property listed in Table 2, but not mapped in submission draft plan.	New Figure A4 added, highlighting 'Tothall Cottage'.
Appendix 1: 'New' Figure A6 (Pitchill)	N/A	New map included to show property listed in Table 2, but not mapped in submission draft plan.	New Figure A6 added, highlighting 'Pitchill House'.
Appendix 2: Allocated Housing Sites	Appendix 2 (p.63)	Modification necessary to achieve consistency with NDP policy SP6 modified through the Examination process.	Amended Figure A8 'Allocated Housing Sites Index Map' to take account of sites SP7/1, SP72, SP7/3, SP7/4 and SP7/5 being removed from Policy SP7: New Housing Development. Re-numbered map 'Figure A10'.

<b>Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his report)</b>	<b>Section/page no. in submission draft NDP</b>	<b>SDC Decision and reason</b>	<b>New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP</b>
Appendix 2: Allocated Housing Sites	Appendix 2 (p.64)	Modification necessary to achieve consistency with NDP policy SP6 modified through the Examination process.	Deleted Figure A9 'Site SP7/1' at Rushford.
Appendix 2: Allocated Housing Sites	Appendix 2 (p.65)	Modification necessary to achieve consistency with NDP policy SP6 modified through the Examination process.	Deleted Figure A10 'Site SP7/2' at Pitchill.
Appendix 2: Allocated Housing Sites	Appendix 2 (p.66)	Modification necessary to achieve consistency with NDP policy SP6 modified through the Examination process.	Deleted Figure A11 'Site SP7/3' at Abbot's Salford.
Appendix 2: Allocated Housing Sites	Appendix 2 (p.67)	Modification necessary to achieve consistency with NDP policy SP6 modified through the Examination process.	Deleted Figure A12 'Site SP7/4' at Abbot's Salford.
Appendix 2: Allocated Housing Sites	Appendix 2 (p.68)	Modification necessary to achieve consistency with NDP policy SP6 modified through the Examination process.	Deleted Figure A13 'Site SP7/5' at Abbot's Salford.
Appendix 2: Allocated Housing Sites	Appendix 2 (p.69)	Modification necessary to achieve consistency with NDP policy SP6 modified through the Examination process.	Re-numbered Figure A14 as Figure A11 re: Site at Station Road, Salford Priors (itself re-numbered from SP7/6 to SP6/1).



Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Appendix 2: Allocated Housing Sites	Appendix 2 (p.70)	Modification necessary to achieve consistency with NDP policy SP6 modified through the Examination process.	Re-numbered Figure A15 as Figure A12 re: Site at Evesham Road, Salford Priors (itself re-numbered from SP7/7 to SP6/2).
Appendix 2: Allocated Housing Sites	Appendix 2 (p.71)	Modification necessary to achieve consistency with NDP policy SP6 modified through the Examination process.	Re-numbered Figure A16 as Figure A13 re: Site at Orchard Farm, Salford Priors (itself re-numbered from SP7/8 to SP6/3).
Appendix 3: Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings	Appendix 3 (p.72)	Appendix re-numbered to take account of Appendix 3 being revised to list 'Important Trees' associated with Policy SP11 in referendum version of the NDP.	Re-numbered Appendix 4 and given revised title: " <u>Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings: Advice for Applicants</u> "
Appendix 3: Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings: 'Walls'	Appendix 3 (p.72)	Modifications to text agreed in order to improve the content of the design principles prior to adoption of NDP.	<p>1. <u>Try to re-use any existing openings, this will help</u> to retain a building's character and reduce the impact of any new <u>construction</u> works;</p> <p>2. <u>If you have to introduce Any-new openings in existing walls, you should try to keep these should be kept</u> to a minimum and take account of the <del>overall</del> proportions of <u>any existing window and door openings in the original</u> building;</p> <p>3. If an <u>original</u> opening needs to be blocked up, <u>you should</u> consider creating a recessed panel to show where the original opening was located;</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>4. <del>For any works to walls, applicants should use</del> <u>Use</u> materials and methods (e.g. including traditional pointing techniques) which are appropriate to the <u>original</u> building and its setting;</p> <p>5. <u>Conversion also provides an opportunity to consider</u> <del>Consideration should be given to</del> removing any unsuitable or inappropriate materials used in previous alterations <u>particularly if these were unsympathetic to the original building.</u></p>
Appendix 3: Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings: 'Roofs'	Appendix 3 (p.72)	Modifications to text agreed in order to improve the content of the design principles prior to adoption of NDP.	<p>6. <del>Proposals should seek to retain original rRooflines and roof pitch should not be raised nor the roof pitch altered.</del> In exceptional cases where such alterations <u>to the roofline and pitch</u> are necessary, these <del>must</del> <u>should</u> be kept to the <u>a</u> minimum <del>in order and should aim</del> to ensure that the overall character of the building is not <u>significantly</u> changed;</p> <p>7. <u>Proposals should, where possible, seek to restore</u> <del>If the conversion involves restoring a missing or lowered sections of roof to its</del> <u>their</u> original appearance, <del>this will normally be acceptable;</del></p> <p>8. Where a roof needs to be rebuilt, traditional slates or tiles should be retained and re-used;</p> <p>9. The installation of dormer windows <del>will be</del> <u>is</u> discouraged <del>in favour of roof lights. unless there is a</del></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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><del>clear precedent for their use on traditional buildings in the locality</del> <u>Roof lights when used should be kept to a minimum, be flush with the roof surface and not disproportionate to the roof as a whole;</u></p> <p><del>10. Roof lights will be acceptable in principle provided their number is kept to a minimum; they are flush with the roof surface; and are not over-large in proportion to the roof as a whole;</del></p> <p><del>11. 10. If solar panels or photo-voltaic cells are to be installed, care should be taken to ensure their</del> <u>The positioning, number and size of any solar panels or photo-voltaic cells should do not adversely affect the appearance of the building.</u></p>
Appendix 3: Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings: 'Windows and Doors'	Appendix 3 (p.73)	Modifications to text agreed in order to improve the content of the design principles prior to adoption of NDP.	<p><del>12. 11. If the building has traditional or vernacular windows and doors, efforts should be made to</del> <u>should be retained, repaired and re-used these;</u></p> <p><del>13. 12. If it is not possible, new or replacement windows and doors (including patio/French doors) should try to match the originals and/or if it is not considered practical, any new windows and doors should be appropriate to</del> <u>reflect the character of the building. Standard designs primarily intended for insertion in modern buildings will not be acceptable should be avoided;</u></p> <p><del>14. 13. Normally</del> <u>Windows and doors should be</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>15. painted or, in the case of sustainably sourced hardwoods such as oak, <u>suitably treated</u> <del>left untreated</del>—modern timber stains should be avoided;</p> <p><del>15.</del> <u>14.</u> When considering new window and door frames, <u>it will be better if these are</u> <del>should be</del> recessed at least 100 millimetres within an opening <u>within openings. This will help to give</u> depth to the façade <u>elevations</u>;</p> <p><del>16.</del> <u>15.</u> Attention should be given to larger openings (e.g. garage doors) and the use of traditional solutions and materials rather than often <u>inappropriate modern off-the-shelf solutions</u>. For <u>example</u>, modern up-and-over style garage doors will be inappropriate.</p>
Appendix 3: Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings: 'Internal Features'	Appendix 3 (p.73)	Modifications to text agreed in order to improve the content of the design principles prior to adoption of NDP.	<p><del>17.</del> <u>16.</u> Proposals should seek to incorporate and <u>retain</u> internal features that form part the building's character. For example, exposed beams, rafters and purlins; floor joists; roof trusses; solid room partitions; floorboards; tiled or stone floors; and original fittings. <del>should be retained and incorporated in the conversion</del>;</p> <p><del>18.</del> <u>17.</u> This can also include the spaces within a <u>building and how they are considered and treated as part of the proposal</u>. For <u>example</u>, the subdivision of a large internal space may not be appropriate if the space forms an integral part of the character of the</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
			building (for example, the threshing bay of a barn or the loft of a granary).
Appendix 3: Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings: 'Drainage and Waste'	Appendix 3 (p.73)	Modifications to text agreed in order to improve the content of the design principles prior to adoption of NDP.	<p><del>19.</del> <u>18.</u> Try to retain, repair or suitably replace <del>Where there are</del> traditional cast iron rainwater gutters, downpipes and brackets. <del>should be retained and repaired or replaced to match the originals;</del></p> <p><del>20.</del> <u>19.</u> Soil and vent pipes should be positioned internally and the number of vents kept to a minimum;</p> <p><del>21.</del> <u>20.</u> Vents should preferably be sited on a rear roof slope and coloured matt black to reduce their visual impact;</p> <p><del>22.</del> <u>21.</u> Sustainable treatment and disposal of waste water and other wastes should be incorporated in the conversion wherever practicable. The installation of septic tanks and cesspits may not always be appropriate in rural areas and other more environmentally acceptable methods of waste disposal should be considered.</p> <p>22. Septic tanks, oil tanks and other ancillary equipment should be unobtrusively sited and/or screened.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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
Appendix 3: Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings: 'Heating and Ventilation'	Appendix 3 (p.74)		<p>23. Heating system flues and extractors should have a minimal visual impact and galvanised materials are thus unlikely to be appropriate;</p> <p>24. The use of suitably designed vent tiles which complement existing walls and roofs is encouraged;</p> <p>25. Chimney stacks are not normally found on rural buildings and the inclusion of new stacks in a conversion scheme <del>is therefore unlikely to be acceptable</del> <u>should be avoided</u>.</p>
Appendix 3: Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings: 'Extensions and Additions'	Appendix 3 (p.74)	Modifications to text agreed in order to improve the content of the design principles prior to adoption of NDP.	<p>26. The emphasis in any conversion scheme <del>must</del> <u>should</u> be upon demonstrating that the building in its present form is suitable for the proposed new use. Large extensions to the existing building and the erection of new ancillary structures within and adjoining the curtilage should be avoided where possible.</p> <p>27. In the case of residential conversions, garaging and domestic storage requirements <del>must</del> <u>should</u> be met within the original building (or buildings). <u>New buildings, detached from the original building for such uses should be avoided wherever possible.</u></p> <p>28. <u>Modern features such as</u> <del>The attachment of porches and other extraneous features (including conservatories) is likely to</del> <u>can</u> adversely affect the original appearance of the building <u>and its character.</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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>Wherever possible, these and</u> should be avoided.
Appendix 3: Guidelines for Conversion of Rural Buildings: 'Curtilage and Landscaping'	Appendix 3 (p.74- 75)	Modifications to text agreed in order to improve the content of the design principles prior to adoption of NDP.	<p>29. <u>Curtilages (the land immediately surrounding a building and directly related to it) should follow, where possible, existing boundaries. If the proposal incorporates expansion of the existing curtilage, this should be kept to the minimum area required for normal occupation of the premises and should avoid incorporation of adjacent open land and field areas not extend illogically into open fields;</u></p> <p>30. <u>When considering the external boundaries of a proposal, applicants should try to use existing Curtilages should, wherever possible, follow established boundary walls and hedgerows wherever possible;</u></p> <p>31. <u>The use of impermeable surfacing in hardstandings (such as concrete or asphalt) Hard surfaces should be avoided. The use of where none previously existed and permeable materials such as gravel, permeable concrete block paving or porous asphalt will be supported and used to reduce surface water run-off form future development.</u></p> <p>32. <u>Soft landscaping will not normally be appropriate within courtyards;</u></p> <p>33. <u>32. Where there is an existing vehicular access from the highway, this should normally be gained</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his 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><del>from an existing entrance used for new development. If a new entrance is needed, <u>Where a new access point is required</u>, this should be as close to the building as possible <u>relate well to the existing built form in the immediate surrounding area</u>. The construction of lengthy driveways <del>across open fields in the open countryside</del> will not be permitted <u>be actively discouraged</u>;</del></p> <p><del>34. Any hedgerow removal needed to improve visibility at the point of access to the site should be kept to a minimum;</del></p> <p><del>35. 33. Entrances and gateways will be expected to be designed in keeping with the rural character of the area, using <del>should be in</del> simple and traditional styles and ornate entrance features. are unlikely to be acceptable <u>The use of suburban style brick walls with brick piers and wrought iron railings are inappropriate in the rural areas and out of keeping with the rural nature of the Parish</u>;</del></p> <p><del>36. Septic tanks, oil tanks and other ancillary equipment should be unobtrusively sited and/or screened;</del></p> <p><del>External features of interest associated with the original use of the building should be retained and incorporated in the design and layout of the curtilage.</del></p>



<b>Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in his report)</b>	<b>Section/page no. in submission draft NDP</b>	<b>SDC Decision and reason</b>	<b>New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP</b>
Appendix 4 – Local Green 'Spaces'	Appendix 4 (p.76- 79)	Appendix deleted due to Policy SP17 being removed from the Plan.	Appendix deleted.
N/A	N/A	New appendix created to take account of recommendations of the Examiner re: removing community aspirations from the Policy section and setting them out in a separate part of the Plan.	Appendix 5 – 'Community Aspirations' added.

**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):**

<b>Sustainable Development Role (NPPF)</b>	<b>Neighbourhood Development Plan's Contribution</b>
Economic	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to support the local economy through promotion of a viable mix of uses, including small businesses and tourist accommodation and through facilitating environmental improvements.</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 a number of policies that look to support local community facilities.</p> <p>The Plan looks to safeguard and promote improvements of locally important sites.</p> <p>Policies seek to promote the local distinctiveness of the area, and recognise locally important heritage assets.</p> <p>Transport policies seek to mitigate the negative impacts of the existing highways infrastructure, making roads a safer and more welcoming environment for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
Environmental	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out a set of policies that support environmental sustainability for the community.</p> <p>With Salford Priors and Abbot's Salford having Conservation Areas, the Plan has policies that look to protect, and where possible, enhance 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 Salford Seven 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:

[www.stratford.gov.uk/salfordpriorsnp](http://www.stratford.gov.uk/salfordpriorsnp)

And can be viewed in paper form at:

Stratford-on-Avon District Council  
Elizabeth House  
Church Street  
Stratford-upon-Avon  
CV37 6HX