



DECISION STATEMENT

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM

1. Bidford-on-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan

1.1 I confirm that the Bidford-on-Avon 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 anticipated that the referendum will be held sometime in summer 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 19 November 2013 Bidford-on-Avon 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 28 November 2013 and 17 January 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 Bidford-on-Avon Neighbourhood Area by way of approval of The Cabinet on 10 February 2014.

2.5 In accordance with Regulation 7 of The Regulations, the decision to designate the Bidford-on-Avon 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 24 September and 6 November 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 10 June 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 23 June and 5 August 2016 in accordance with Regulation 16 of The Regulations.

2.9 Ms Ann Skippers was appointed by the District Council to examine the Plan, and the Examination took place during September and October 2016, including an additional two week 'targeted' consultation (between 12 and 23 September) with all who made representations at Regulation 16 stage. The Examiner's report was issued on 31 October 2016.

2.10 The Examiner concluded she 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 her report, as set out in the table below.

2.11 Schedule 4B s.12 to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as inserted by the Localism Act 2011, requires that a Local Authority must consider each of the recommendations made in the Examiner's report and decide what action to take in response to each recommendation. If the 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 her 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 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1.0 – Introduction: | | | |
| <p>Replace the second sentence in paragraph 1.2 with:</p> <p>“It cannot prevent development, but must plan positively to support local development and is a powerful tool in shaping that development in line with local wishes.”</p> | <p>Section 1: Introduction (p.4)</p> | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>It was considered the original version may be interpreted as being negative and out of line with the NPPF which requires neighbourhood plans to “plan positively”. The modification was suggested to ensure compliance with the NPPF.</p> | <p>Second sentence of paragraph 1.2 modified as follows:</p> <p>“It does not have the power to stop all development, but it <u>It cannot prevent development, but must plan positively to support local development</u> and is a powerful tool in shaping that development in line with local wishes and the local environment.”</p> |
| <p>Replace paragraphs 1.14, 1.15 and 1.16 with a new paragraph which reads:</p> <p>“This NDP has been prepared in the context of the Stratford on Avon District Local Plan Review 1996 -2011 (LP) adopted in 2006 and an emerging Core Strategy. The Core Strategy determines how many new homes are to be built, how many jobs will be created and how people can travel to get to things they need over the next</p> | <p>Section 1: Introduction (p.5)</p> | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>Reference was made to the emerging Core Strategy in these paragraphs as originally drafted. With the passage of time, the Core Strategy has been adopted and these paragraphs have been updated in the interests of accuracy.</p> | <p>New paragraph inserted as follows:</p> <p><u>1.14 This NDP has been prepared in the context of the Stratford on Avon District Local Plan Review 1996 -2011 (LP) adopted in 2006 and an emerging Core Strategy. The Core Strategy determines how many new homes are to be built, how many jobs will be created and how people can travel to get to things they need over the next 15 years amongst other things. The Core Strategy was adopted by SDC on 11 July 2016.</u></p> <p>1.14 This NDP is in general conformity with existing strategic local plan policy, and takes account of SDC’s emerging Core Strategy. The</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|---|--|---|--|
| 15 years amongst other things. The Core Strategy was adopted by SDC on 11 July 2016." | | | <p>Core Strategy will determine how many new homes are built, how many new jobs are created and how people can travel to get to the things they need over the next 15 years.</p> <p>1.15 Following the conclusion of examination hearings in January 2015, the Inspector published his Interim Report and SDC subsequently published modifications to the Core Strategy. A further series of examination hearings took place in January 2016 which was followed by the release of an updated version of the core strategy by the Inspector on 4 March 2016.</p> <p>1.16 This NDP has had regard to the latest advice from the Inspector and the latest iteration of the emerging Core Strategy.</p> |
| Consequential paragraph renumbering will be needed. | Section 1: Introduction (p.5- 6) | Modification agreed. Required to take account of paragraphs being amended and deleted. | Subsequent paragraphs 1.17, 1.18 and 1.19 in the Submission version of the Plan have been re- numbered 1.15, 1.16 and 1.17 respectively in the Referendum version of the Plan. |
| 2.0 – Background: | | | |
| Add the word "area" after "(SDC)" in paragraph 2.1 | Section 2: Background (p.7) | Modification agreed. For clarification purposes, only. | Final sentence of paragraph 2.1 modified to read: "It is within Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC) <u>area</u> which is its Local Planning Authority (LPA)". |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|--|--|--|---|
| Change the word "seven' to "eight' in paragraph 2.5 | Section 2: Background (p.7) | Modification agreed. For clarification purposes, only – to correct a factual error. | First sentence of paragraph 2.8 modified to read: "Another decision that influenced the development in Bidford-on-Avon was being nominated one of seven <u>eight</u> Main Rural Centres by SDC". |
| Policy H1 – Village Boundary: | | | |
| Reword the last sentence of the policy to read: "New housing development in the countryside will usually be limited to dwellings for rural workers, replacement dwellings and housing development permitted under Policy H2." | Section 3: Policies (p.9) | Modification not agreed. It is decided to delete the word 'usually' from the policy and also replace 'permitted' with 'supported by'. It is considered that the inclusion of the word 'usually' is imprecise and can lead to confusion and differing interpretation and inconsistent decision making. The removal of the word will not prevent a future applicant submitting a particular case to the LPA and this being considered on its own merits. It is not considered the removal of this word would lead to the | Final sentence of policy H1 modified as follows: "New housing <u>development</u> in the countryside will be strictly controlled and usually limited to dwellings for rural workers, replacement dwellings and new dwellings <u>housing</u> <u>development</u> in accordance with permitted <u>supported by</u> Policy H2". |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>policy failing the Basic Conditions tests and its deletion is recommended.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies throughout the Examiner's report in the use of the words 'permitted' and 'supported'. The Examiner has asked for 'permitted' to be changed to 'supported' in a number of policies, but not others. This amendment is proposed to introduce a consistency of approach throughout the NDP.</p> | |
| <p>Include all of the housing commitment sites within the village boundary shown on Map 1.</p> | <p>Maps (p.79)</p> | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>As originally drafted, the settlement boundary included some sites with planning permission, but not others. The revision provides a consistent and accurate representation of the new settlement boundary including all housing commitments within the village.</p> | <p>Village boundary as shown on Map 1 at page 25 of the Referendum version of the Plan has been amended to include all housing commitment sites.</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|---|--|--|---|
| Change "565" in paragraph 3.2 to "770" and change the timescale accordingly if need be. | Section 3: Policies (p.9) | Modification agreed. Figure amended to take account of the most up-to-date data on housing commitments. | Paragraph 3.2 modified to read as follows: "Bidford-on-Avon has played a significant role already, contributing 565 <u>770</u> new dwellings between April 2011 and June 2016. A number of these houses have yet to be completed so are recognised in this NDP as housing commitments (see Map 1)". |
| Update paragraphs 3.1 and 3.8 in relation to the now adopted Core Strategy. | Section 3: Policies (p.9) | Modifications agreed. Required in order to take account of the adoption of the Core Strategy during the life of the neighbourhood plan. | Paragraph 3.1 modified to read: "This NDP acknowledges that the Neighbourhood Area is required to play its part in the supply of housing for the district and is required to be in general conformity with the strategic vision of local planning policy. This will include taking account of SDC's emerging Core Strategy as set out above". Paragraph 3.8 modified to read: "87% of respondents to the NDP questionnaire said they would prefer to see Bidford-on-Avon remaining broadly the same size. The latest version of the <u>adopted</u> Core Strategy endorsed by the Inspector does not allocate any further housing within the Parish of Bidford-on-Avon to assist in the supply of housing in the district". |
| Policy H2 – Rural Exception Housing: | | | |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>Reword the first paragraph of the policy so that it reads:</p> <p>"Affordable housing development will be permitted on small sites beyond, but reasonably adjacent to the village boundary of Bidford-on-Avon and the settlements of Barton, Marlcliff and Broom where the following is demonstrated:..."</p> | <p>Section 3: Policies (p.10)</p> | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>As originally drafted, the Policy referred to the 'development boundaries' of Barton, Marlcliff and Broom, but these settlements do not have defined settlement boundaries. The policy has been amended to reflect this for clarification purposes.</p> <p>However, there are inconsistencies throughout the Examiner's report in the use of the words 'permitted' and 'supported'. The Examiner has asked for 'permitted' to be changed to 'supported' in a number of policies, but not others. This amendment is proposed to introduce a consistency of approach throughout the NDP.</p> | <p>First paragraph modified to read:</p> <p>"Affordable housing development will be permitted <u>supported</u> on small sites beyond, but reasonably adjacent to, the development boundaries <u>village boundary of Bidford-on-Avon and the settlements of the villages of Bidford-on-Avon</u>, Barton, Marlcliff and Broom where the following is demonstrated:"</p> |
| <p>Reword criterion b) to read:</p> <p>"No other suitable and available sites exist within the village boundary of Bidford-on-Avon</p> | <p>Section 3: Policies (p.10)</p> | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>As originally drafted, the Policy referred to the 'development boundaries' of</p> | <p>Criterion b) modified to read:</p> <p>"No other suitable and available sites exist within the development <u>village</u> boundary of the settlement <u>Bidford-on-Avon and the built-up-</u></p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 the built-up areas of the settlements of Barton, Marcliff and Broom; and..." | | Barton, Marcliff and Broom, but these settlements do not have defined settlement boundaries. The policy has been amended to reflect this for clarification purposes. | <u>areas of the settlements of Barton, Marcliff and Broom; and"</u> |
| <p>Replace paragraph 3.11 with:</p> <p>"One of the ways local needs can be demonstrated is through a housing need survey or up-to-date evidence of local housing need. In addition Core Strategy Policy CS.15 allows local needs schemes within and adjacent to settlements including small-scale community-led schemes to meet a need identified by that community.</p> <p>For the purposes of local needs housing for Policy H2 this will usually be based on a local connection with the Parish. A local connection is usually defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Someone who has lived in the Parish for a minimum of six months | Section 3: Policies (p.10) | <p>Modification not agreed.</p> <p>It is proposed to delete the word 'usually' from the policy, as suggested by the Examiner.</p> <p>It is considered that the inclusion of the word 'usually' is imprecise and can lead to confusion and differing interpretation and inconsistent decision making. It is not considered the removal of this word would lead to the associated policy failing the Basic Conditions tests.</p> | <p>Paragraph 3.11 modified to read:</p> <p>"For the purpose of local needs housing a local connection is defined as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have lived in the village for a minimum of 6 months. Have previously lived in the village for 6 out of the last 12 months or 3 out of 5 years. Have close family currently residing in the village and for at least 5 years* Has full or part time work (not voluntary, seasonal or casual) in the village and has been employed for at least 6 months. <p>*A close family connection is defined as mother, father, sister, brother or adult children".</p> <p><u>"One of the ways local needs can be demonstrated is through a housing need survey or up-to-date evidence of local housing need. In addition Core Strategy Policy CS.15 allows local needs schemes within and adjacent to settlements including small-scale community-led</u></p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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"> • Someone who has previously lived in the Parish for 6 out of the last 12 months or 3 out of 5 years • Someone who has close family (parents, siblings or children) residing in the Parish for at least 3 years • Someone who has full or part-time work in the Parish and has been employed for at least 6 months • Someone who can otherwise demonstrate a connection to the Parish.” | | | <p><u>schemes to meet a need identified by that community.</u></p> <p><u>For the purposes of local needs housing for Policy H2 this will usually be based on a local connection with the Parish. A local connection is usually defined as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Someone who has lived in the Parish for a minimum of six months</u> • <u>Someone who has previously lived in the Parish for 6 out of the last 12 months or 3 out of 5 years</u> • <u>Someone who has close family (parents, siblings or children) residing in the Parish for at least 3 years</u> • <u>Someone who has full or part-time work in the Parish and has been employed for at least 6 months</u> • <u>Someone who can otherwise demonstrate a connection to the Parish.”</u> |
| <p>Policy H3 – Promoting an Appropriate Mix of Housing:</p> | | | |
| <p>Reword Policy H3 as follows:</p> <p><u>“Market Housing:</u></p> <p>Developments should provide a mix of house types and sizes which reflects the most up to</p> | <p>Section 3: Policies (p.10)</p> | <p>Modification not agreed in its entirety.</p> <p>The Examiner’s amended first paragraph for the Policy is agreed. However, it is considered the wording of</p> | <p>Policy H3 modified to read:</p> <p><u>“Market Housing:</u></p> <p>Developments of 5 or more units should seek to meet the requirements identified by the most current up to date evidence such as the Strategic</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>date needs of the Parish and be informed by the Strategic Housing Market assessment, Parish level surveys or Housing Need Surveys as well as any site-specific issues and evidence of market circumstances.</p> <p>As a guide, market housing should be provided with the following mix:</p> <p>1-bed – 10% 2-bed – 30% 3-bed – 40% 4+bed – 20% Total – 100%</p> <p><u>Affordable Housing:</u></p> <p>Affordable housing should be provided in accordance with Policy CS.18 of the Core Strategy. As a guide a variety of house types and sizes should be provided with the following mix:</p> <p>1-bed – 20% 2-bed – 40% 3-bed – 35%</p> | | <p>the second paragraph of the market and affordable housing sections of the policy should be amended from the Examiner's modification. Additionally, it is proposed to amend the % figures relating to 2-bed and 4+bed market housing to bring them in-line with the Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is considered that the addition of the words 'as a guide' creates uncertainty, is overly flexible and undermines the aim and purpose of the policy, although the thrust of the modification as proposed by the Examiner is understood and agreed in principle. It is accepted that the modification is put forward in order to ensure the policy meets the basic conditions, so alternative wording has been proposed in order to satisfy the Examiner's concerns over the original wording, whilst at the same</p> | <p>Housing Market Assessment, the Residential Parish Survey conducted to inform this NDP or a Housing Needs Survey.</p> <p>In order to meet the specific needs of the Neighbourhood Area, market housing will be provided with the following mix:</p> <p>Developments should provide a mix of house types and sizes which reflects the most up-to-date needs of the Parish and be informed by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Parish level surveys or Housing Needs Surveys as well as any site specific issues and evidence of market circumstances.</p> <p>As a guide, market housing should be provided with the following mix: <u>A variety of house types and sizes should be provided in accordance with the following mix unless evidence indicates otherwise:</u></p> <p>1-bed – 10% 2-bed – 30% <u>35%</u> 3-bed – 40% 4+bed – 20% <u>15%</u> Total – 100%</p> <p><u>Affordable Housing:</u></p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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+bed – 5% Total – 100%</p> <p>The requirement for, and provision of, a mix of different types and sizes of both market and affordable housing within the Parish will be monitored throughout the Plan period to ensure that local needs are being met and to inform this policy.”</p> | | <p>time still meeting the basic conditions.</p> <p>In terms of the preferred housing mix, in her report the Examiner noted that “for market housing, Policy H3 requires a lower proportion of 2-bed houses than CS Policy CS.19. This seems to be at odds with the supporting text that indicates a preference for smaller family homes”. This did not lead to a proposed modification from the Examiner.</p> <p>However, discussions with the Parish Council following the issue of the Examiner’s report indicated that all the percentages set out in Policy H3 should have been within the % ranges set out in the Core Strategy and the lower % for 2-bed market housing was a drafting error. The PC would like this opportunity to change the percentages to</p> | <p>Affordable housing will <u>should</u> be provided in accordance with Policy CS.17 <u>18</u> of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>In order to meet the specific needs of the Neighbourhood Area, affordable housing will be provided with the following size mix:</p> <p>As a guide a variety of house types and sizes should be provided with the following mix: A variety of house types and sizes should be provided in accordance with the following mix unless evidence indicates otherwise:</p> <p>1-bed – 20% 2-bed – 40% 3-bed – 35% 4+bed – 5% Total – 100%</p> <p>The requirement for, and provision of, a mix of different types and sizes of both market and affordable housing within the Parish will be monitored throughout the Plan period in order to ensure that local housing needs are being met and to inform this policy”.</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | bring in-line with the Core Strategy. It is therefore recommended that this proposed amendment to the NDP be incorporated. It is considered that the policy would still meet the basic conditions with this amendment. | |
| Policy H4 – Use of Brownfield Land: | | | |
| Delete paragraph 3.20 in its entirety and make consequential amendments to paragraph numbering. | Section 3: Policies (p.11) | Modification not agreed. The Examiner made this modification 'in the interests of clarity' and not in order to meet the basic conditions. Instead of deleting the paragraph, amended wording is suggested which is factual in nature and is relevant to the context of the associated policy. Bearing in mind this is supporting text, it is recommended that paragraph 3.20 is retained in its amended guise. It is considered that the amendment would still meet the Basic Conditions tests. | Paragraph 3.20 amended to read: "It would be contrary to the principles of sustainable development to allow more homes on greenfield sites than would be necessary to meet identified housing need arising in the Neighbourhood Area". <u>"The reuse and recycling of brownfield land, particularly where it is derelict or underused can help to achieve sustainable development more efficiently than the release of greenfield land".</u> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 ECON2 – Protecting and Enhancing the Village Centre: | | | |
| Include the whole of the Village Centre area in the Bidford-on-Avon CS Inset on an amended Map 1 and make Map 1 clearer in relation to the definition of the Village Centre notation by including a separate inset map at a larger scale. | Section 3: Policies (p.13) | Modification agreed. The Village Centre as originally drafted in the NDP did not include a significant area designated as Village Centre in the Core Strategy. The Map has been amended to rectify this anomaly and display it in the NDP at a scale that is much easier to read. | Map 1 amended as follows: The Village Centre area has been removed from Map 1 and Map 7 created specifically to show the Village Centre at a larger scale. The Village Centre area as shown on new Map 7 has been amended to also include the Village Centre area as indicated on the Core Strategy inset map for the village. |
| Reword Policy ECON2 as follows: "Proposals for new or enhanced retail, commercial and community uses will be supported within the Village Centre defined on Map 1 and Inset Map X where there is no conflict with other policies in the development plan. The loss of retail, commercial or community uses will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated | Section 3: Policies (p.13) | Modification agreed in the main. The re-wording of the Policy is recommended in order to provide a more practical framework, to take better account of national policy and to ensure there is no conflict between the Plan and the Core Strategy and to make sure the policy meets the basic conditions. However, it is recommended | Policy ECON2 modified to read: "Proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of land or premises within the Village Centre, as defined on Map 1, will only be permitted if it would not result in the loss of a shop or commercial premise. Proposals for new retail or commercial premises will be supported where there is no conflict with other policies in this Plan. Proposals for new or enhanced retail, commercial and community uses will be supported within the Village Centre defined on Map 1 and Inset Map X where there is no conflict with other policies in the development plan" . |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>that the unit is no longer viable for such uses. In the case of changes of use to residential, the provision of flats above shops is supported in principle. Changes of use to residential of the whole unit will not usually be permitted unless it can be demonstrated through a marketing exercise that no alternative retail, commercial or community use will come forward in a reasonable time frame."</p> | | <p>that 'permitted' be replaced with 'supported'. There are inconsistencies throughout the Examiner's report in the use of the words 'permitted' and 'supported'. The Examiner has asked for 'permitted' to be changed to 'supported' in a number of policies, but not others. This amendment is proposed to introduce a consistency of approach throughout the NDP.</p> | <p>The change of use of retail or commercial premises in the Village Centre to residential will not be permitted unless it has been proven that there is no alternative or viable retail or commercial use. Evidence of a robust marketing exercise will be expected as evidence to demonstrate that no alternative use is likely to come forward. The loss of retail, commercial or community uses will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the unit is no longer viable for such uses. In the case of <u>changes of use to residential, the provision of flats above shops is supported in principle. Changes of use to residential of the whole unit will not usually be permitted supported unless it can be demonstrated through a marketing exercise that no alternative retail, commercial or community use will come forward in a reasonable time frame."</u></p> |
| <p>Policy ECON4 – Parking in the Village Centre:</p> | | | |
| <p>Reword Policy ECON4 to read: "Development which would result in the loss of any parking provision in the Village Centre which is defined on Inset Map X will be resisted unless it is replaced by equivalent or</p> | <p>Section 3: Policies (p.14)</p> | <p>Modification agreed. There was an inherent issue with this policy in that it referred to current provision without defining what that was on a map; the policy did not offer any flexibility and</p> | <p>Policy ECON4 modified to read: Development which would adversely affect the current result in the loss of any parking provision in the Village Centre, as defined on Map 1, which is defined on Map 7 will not be permitted <u>resisted unless it is replaced by equivalent or enhanced provision is provided in a suitable location.</u></p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>enhanced provision is provided in a suitable location.</p> <p>Proposals which enhance and improve parking provision in the Village Centre will normally be supported subject to other relevant development plan policies.</p> <p>New development in the Village Centre should provide parking in accordance with the applicable County Council standards or as otherwise agreed on a site-by-site basis."</p> | | <p>the explanatory text also sought enhancement as well as future development according with the County Council's standards; neither point was included in the policy as originally drafted.</p> <p>In order to provide a more practical framework, the suggested modification looks to address these concerns and to ensure the policy meets the basic conditions.</p> | <p><u>Proposals which enhance and improve parking provision in the Village Centre will normally be supported subject to other relevant development plan policies.</u></p> <p><u>New development in the Village Centre should provide parking in accordance with the applicable County Council standards or as otherwise agreed on a site-by-site basis."</u></p> |
| <p>This policy should make reference to the new inset map (whatever number that will be).</p> | <p>Section 3: Policies (p.14)</p> | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>For clarification purposes only.</p> | <p>Reference made within the Policy to new Map 7 in the Referendum version of the NDP, indicating the location of the Village Centre.</p> |
| <p>Policy ENV4 – Reducing Flood Risk:</p> | | | |
| <p>Reword Policy ENV4 as follows:</p> <p>"New developments of ten or more dwellings and major commercial development will be expected to provide and incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless it is</p> | <p>Section 3: Policies (p.17)</p> | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>Sustainable drainage systems help to control surface water run off close to where it falls and to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding. However, they are</p> | <p>Policy ENV4 modified to read:</p> <p>"In order to ensure that all relevant development proposals incorporate suitable and sustainable means of drainage where site conditions are favourable, the following principles will be encouraged. Where site conditions are proven to be unfavourable or unfeasible, an alternative</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>demonstrated that this would be inappropriate.</p> <p>Other measures such as the reuse and recycling of water, the use of permeable paving and other measures that help with water efficiency and those which enhance ecology will be encouraged in all development schemes.</p> <p>Proposals which do not satisfactorily address fluvial and pluvial flooding considerations will not be supported."</p> | | <p>not appropriate for all types of new development.</p> <p>In addition, the Government has created a new approach to setting technical standards for new housing development. Another Written Ministerial Statement makes it clear that neighbourhood plans cannot set out any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings.</p> <p>Therefore to bring the policy in line with national policy and guidance, it requires amendment as put forward by the Examiner to ensure it meets the basic conditions.</p> | <p>drainage solution will need to be agreed by the council and the relevant water authority. <u>New developments of ten or more dwellings and major commercial development will be expected to provide and incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless it is demonstrated that this would be inappropriate.</u></p> <p><u>Other measures such as the reuse and recycling of water, the use of permeable paving and other measures that help with water efficiency and those which enhance ecology will be encouraged in all development schemes.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals which do not satisfactorily address fluvial and pluvial flooding considerations will not be supported.</u></p> <p>a) On large-scale developments such schemes will be expected to contribute to ecological enhancement as well as sustainable drainage; b) The re-use and recycling of water; c) The use of permeable paving; d) Sustainable urban drainage schemes should be constructed in line with the Warwickshire Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) manual. Applicants should ensure that the design of SUDs should support the findings and recommendations of the Warwickshire Surface Water Management Plan, the Warwickshire</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>Sustainable Urban Drainage Manual and the District Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Where SUDs are proposed, it should be supported by a groundwater risk assessment and arrangements put in place for the whole life management and maintenance; and</p> <p>e) Water efficiency measures that go beyond the current Building Regulations and non-domestic buildings should as a minimum reach 'Good' BREEAM standards.</p> <p>Proposals which do not satisfactorily demonstrate secure arrangements for the prevention of fluvial and pluvial flooding will not be supported."</p> |
| <p>Move criteria d) and e) of the existing policy to the explanatory text referring to the relevant Core Strategy policies in doing so, but make sure they reflect the Core Strategy policies and do not go beyond their requirements.</p> | <p>Section 3: Policies (p.17)</p> | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>See explanation for modification, above.</p> | <p>Criteria d) of Policy ENV4 moved to Explanatory text as new para 5.13:</p> <p><u>"Sustainable urban drainage schemes should be constructed in line with the Warwickshire Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) manual. Applicants should ensure that the design of SUDs should support the findings and recommendations of the Warwickshire Surface Water Management Plan, the Warwickshire Sustainable Urban Drainage Manual and the District Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Where SUDs are proposed, they should be supported by a groundwater risk assessment and arrangements put in place for</u></p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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><u>the whole life management and maintenance</u>".</p> <p>Criteria e) of Policy ENV4 moved to Explanatory text as new para 5.14:</p> <p><u>"Water efficiency measures that go beyond the current Building Regulations and non-domestic buildings should as a minimum reach 'Good' BREEAM standards"</u>.</p> |
| Policy ENV5 – Foul Drainage: | | | |
| Delete the word "Foul" from the policy's title. | Section 3: Policies (p.18) | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>This policy aims to ensure that necessary infrastructure is in place to serve new development. However, the policy goes beyond dealing with foul drainage and as such the modification to remove the word "foul" from the policy is proposed, since retaining it may limit the scope of works deemed appropriate through the interpretation of the policy.</p> | <p>Title of Policy ENV5 modified to read:</p> <p>"Foul Drainage"</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 word "foul" from the second paragraph of the policy. | Section 3: Policies (p.18) | Modification agreed. See explanation for modification, above. | Second paragraph of Policy ENV5 modified to read: "Proposals to expedite the improvement and upgrade the existing foul-drainage network in the village will be supported". |
| Policy ENV7 – Valued Landscapes, Skylines and Views: | | | |
| Delete "February 2016" from the policy. | Section 3: Policies (p.19) | Modification agreed. There was a miss-match of dates pertaining to the Parish Landscape Character Assessment (PLCA) within the NDP. The Examiner has recommended removing dates to avoid confusion. | Policy ENV7 modified to read: "In order to maintain the distinctive character of the Neighbourhood Area, all new development must have regard to the landscape character and historic landscape features and retention of important landmarks, skylines and views identified in the 'Bidford-on-Avon Parish Landscape Assessment' (February 2016)". |
| Delete "...of February 2016..." from paragraph 5.20. | Section 3: Policies (p.19) | Modification agreed. There was a miss-match of dates pertaining to the Parish Landscape Character Assessment (PLCA) within the NDP. The Examiner has recommended removing dates to avoid confusion. | Paragraph 5.20 re-numbered 5.22 in Referendum NDP and modified to read: "Applicants will be expected to have regard to the 'Bidford-on-Avon Parish Landscape Assessment' of February 2016 . This identifies and describes variations in the landscape across the Parish. It identifies six Parish Landscape Character Areas (PLCAs) which exhibit unique combinations of landscape elements and features which make them distinctive. It considers key |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | | views, landmark features, important skylines and sensitive visual characteristics. It outlines land management and development considerations for each PLCA and gives development guidance for each". |
| Show the key features, landmarks, skylines and views identified in the PLCA on a new Map 'X' and add to the end of the first paragraph of Policy ENV7 "...and as shown on Map 'X'." | Section 3: Policies (p.19) | Modification not agreed. The Parish Council felt that it was not worthwhile producing an entirely new map of the specific valued landscapes, skylines and views which would present difficulties in summarising the PLCA. The Examiner felt it would be "useful" to have such a plan but it was not considered essential or required to meet the basic conditions. SDC officers are of the view that decision makers will have access to the full PLCA as an appendix to the plan. Policy ENV7 refers to it, so in making a case for or against a particular site the PLCA should be considered holistically. As such, officers conclude that there is no | Map of key features, landmarks, skylines and views identified in the PLCA not produced. |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | requirement to produce a new map in order to comply with Basic Conditions and one is not necessary to interpret the PLCA. | |
| Policy ENV8 – Designated Heritage Assets: | | | |
| <p>Reword the first paragraph of Policy ENV8 as follows:</p> <p>“Proposals which may affect a heritage asset will be required to include an assessment which describes the significance of the asset and their setting.</p> <p>Proposals which lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a) the harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or b) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable</p> | <p>Section 3: Policies (p.19)</p> | <p>Modification agreed in the main, except for replacing 'permitted' with 'supported'.</p> <p>Policy ENV8 misses the issue of significance of the designated asset when assessing potential harm and is more restrictive than the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CS.8. The proposed modifications are needed to ensure the policy meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>However, there are inconsistencies throughout the Examiner's report in the use of the words 'permitted' and 'supported'. The Examiner has asked for 'permitted' to be changed to</p> | <p>Policy ENV8 modified to read:</p> <p>Proposals which cause substantial harm to the special historical or architectural fabric and interest of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments and their settings not will be supported <u>may affect a heritage asset will be required to include an assessment which describes the significance of the asset and their setting.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals which lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset will only be permitted supported if it can be demonstrated that:</u></p> <p><u>a) the harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or</u> <u>b) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site and no viable use can be found, and grant or other funding or</u></p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>uses of the site and no viable use can be found, and grant or other funding or ownership is not possible, and the harm or loss is outweighed by bringing the site back into use.</p> <p>Proposals which lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be considered against the public benefits of the proposal including securing the optimum viable use of the heritage asset."</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt the remaining three paragraphs of the policy can be retained.</p> <p>Change the word "preserve" to "conserve" in paragraph three of the policy.</p> | | <p>'supported' in a number of policies, but not others. This amendment is proposed to introduce a consistency of approach throughout the NDP.</p> | <p><u>ownership is not possible, and the harm or loss is outweighed by bringing the site back into use.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals which lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be considered against the public benefits of the proposal including securing the optimum viable use of the heritage asset.</u></p> <p>Proposals, including changes of use, which enable the appropriate and sensitive restoration of listed buildings, will be supported.</p> <p>All proposals must preserve the important physical fabric and settings of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments.</p> <p>Development within and adjacent to all heritage assets will be strictly controlled. Development which fails to preserve <u>conserve</u> or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area will not be supported".</p> |
| <p>Change "(See Map 2)" in paragraph 5.22 of the Plan to "(See Maps 2, 4, 5 and 6)".</p> | <p>Section 3: Policies (p.19)</p> | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>The supporting text refers to Map 2 which shows Bidford-on-Avon's designated heritage assets, but given there are also heritage</p> | <p>Paragraph 5.22 re-numbered 5.24 and modified as follows:</p> <p>"Our villages contain a number of listed buildings, Conservation Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments (See Maps <u>2, 4, 5 and 6</u>). We need to ensure that these buildings and</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | assets in Broom, Marlcliff and Barton and that these are shown on Maps 4, 5 and 6 respectively these should also be referred to in paragraph 5.22 for completeness. | structures are protected and enhanced and that they are not compromised by new developments". |
| Policy ENV11 – Minerals and Aggregates Extraction: | | | |
| Delete Policy ENV11 and paragraph 5.26. | Section 3: Policies (p.20) | <p>Modification agreed.</p> <p>Whilst this policy was clearly worded and reflected the wishes of the community as Broom in particular has seen extensive mineral extraction, part of the Examiner's role (as set out in Section 2.0 of her report) was to check whether the Plan included provision about excluded development.</p> <p>The Examiner considered that this policy fell within the category of excluded development and as a result had no option but to recommend deletion of this policy.</p> | <p>Delete Policy ENV11:</p> <p>"Where mineral extraction occurs this must be clearly time limited. Measures must be in place from the outset to minimize the impact of extraction on residential areas and local roads. Restoration to an agreed appropriate after use such as agriculture, habitat creation or informal recreation must be achieved within an agreed and reasonable clear time limit".</p> <p>Delete Explanation paragraph 5.26:</p> <p>"Parts of the Neighbourhood Area, particularly around the village of Broom, have seen extensive mineral extraction and suffered its impacts. We should ensure that where future mineral extraction occurs it is clearly time limited, that the impact on residential areas and its roads is minimised and that restoration to suitable uses is implemented as quickly as possible".</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 AM1 – Protecting and Enhancing Health Opportunities: | | | |
| Move the first paragraph of the policy to the supporting text. | Section 3: Policies (p.21) | Modification agreed. The first paragraph is not policy, but explanation. As such, it is inappropriate to be retained within the body of the policy itself. | First paragraph of Policy AM1 moved to paragraph 6.2 of Explanatory text: "Providing access to health care is essential in maintaining a healthy community. General population increase and a specific increase in older age groups have placed considerable strain on health care provision within the Neighbourhood Area". |
| Add the following sentence to the end of the second paragraph of the policy: "...unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that: a) there is no realistic prospect of the facility continuing on that site for operational reasons; or b) the site has been marketed or made available for another community use; or c) the facility can be provided elsewhere in a suitable location in accordance with the community's wishes; or d) there are overriding | Section 3: Policies (p.21) | Modification agreed. Although the policy is clearly worded, it does not include sufficient flexibility to be in general conformity with Core Strategy Policy CS.25 and for this reason this modification is necessary to ensure the policy meets the basic conditions. | Policy AM1 modified to read: "Providing access to health care is essential in maintaining a healthy community. General population increase and a specific increase in older age groups have placed considerable strain on health care provision within the Neighbourhood Area. Proposals which would directly adversely affect the provision and delivery of health care will not be supported <u>unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that:</u> <u>a) there is no realistic prospect of the facility continuing on that site for operational reasons;</u> <u>or b) the site has been marketed or made</u> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|--|--|--|---|
| environmental benefits in the use being discontinued.” | | | <p><u>available for another community use; or</u> <u>c) the facility can be provided elsewhere in a suitable location in accordance with the community's wishes; or</u> <u>d) there are overriding environmental benefits in the use being discontinued</u></p> <p>Proposals which would enhance and expand existing health care facilities will be supported providing they do not conflict with adjoining land uses”.</p> |
| <p>Include the aspirations outlined in paragraphs 6.3 and 6.4 in a separate section or annex of the Plan and make reference to those aspirations in this part of the Plan through the inclusion of a new paragraph that reads:</p> <p>“Both of these community aspirations have been included in a separate section XXXX.”</p> | Section 3: Policies (p.21) | <p>Modification not agreed.</p> <p>Due to the inserted paragraph 6.2 (see above), paragraphs 6.3 and 6.4 of the Submission version NDP become 6.4 and 6.5 of the Referendum version. Instead of removing this text and placing it in an Annex or separate section in the Plan, it is recommended to insert a new section heading 'Community Aspiration' above paragraphs 6.4 and 6.5. This modification makes it clear this text does not belong specifically to Policy AM1 but allows the text to</p> | <p>Explanatory text to Policy AM1 modified as follows:</p> <p>Re-numbering paragraphs 6.3 and 6.4 as 6.4 and 6.5 and providing a new heading "<u>Community Aspiration</u>".</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | remain in the main body of the Plan. It is considered that this is an appropriate and logical resolution whilst taking into account the Examiner's recommendation. | |
| Policy AM2 – Protecting and Enhancing Education and Library Facilities: | | | |
| Add the following sentence after "existing play areas" to first paragraph of the policy: "...and sports areas unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that the area is surplus to requirements or any loss of open space, sports or play areas would be replaced by equivalent or enhanced provision in a suitable location and landscape." | Section 3: Policies (p.21) | Modification agreed. As originally drafted, the policy indicated that expansion of the school and library should not be "at the expense of" existing play or sport areas and landscape. This is quite restrictive and may well prevent any expansion taking place. The recommended modifications are to address this concern by adding in some flexibility to the policy, in order to comply with the NPPF. | First paragraph of Policy AM2 modified to read: "Sustaining and increasing the opportunity to access education should be delivered through the protection and expansion of the existing primary school and the library. but Such expansion should not be at the expense of the existing play areas sports areas and landscape and sports areas unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that the area is surplus to requirements or any loss of open space, sports or play areas would be replaced by equivalent or enhanced provision in a suitable location and landscape." |
| Include the aspirations outlined in paragraphs 6.6 and 6.7 in a separate section or annex of the Plan and make reference to those aspirations in this part of | Section 3: Policies (p.21) | Modification not agreed. Due to the inserted paragraph 6.2 (see above), paragraphs 6.6 and 6.7 of | Explanatory text to Policy AM2 modified as follows: Re-numbering paragraphs 6.6 and 6.7 as 6.7 and 6.8 and providing a new heading "Community |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>the Plan through the inclusion of a new paragraph that reads:</p> <p>"Both of these community aspirations have been included in a separate section XXXX."</p> | | <p>the Submission version NDP become 6.7 and 6.8 of the Referendum version. Instead of removing this text and placing it in an Annex or separate section in the Plan, it is recommended to insert a new section heading 'Community Aspiration' above paragraphs 6.7 and 6.8. This modification makes it clear this text does not belong specifically to Policy AM1 but allows the text to remain in the main body of the Plan. It is considered that this is an appropriate and logical resolution whilst taking into account the Examiner's recommendation.</p> | <p><u>Aspiration</u>".</p> |
| <p>Policy AM4 – Local Green Space:</p> | | | |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|--|--|--|--|
| Add BRM 3 Malthouse Close to the list of LGSs under Broom in the policy. | Section 3: Policies (p.22) | Modification agreed. It was noted that Malthouse Close, Broom was shown on Map 4, but did not appear in the list in Policy AM4. This modification was necessary to include it within the policy for consistency of approach. The Examiner did not consider that anyone's interests had been adversely affected by this oversight given the area was clearly shown on the Map. | List of LGS designated areas for Broom amended as follows: Broom 1. Millers Bank 2. Kings Lane Play Area <u>3. Malthouse Close</u> |
| Delete Chestnut Way, Bidford-on-Avon from the policy and the designation "Bid 9" from Map 3. | Section 3: Policies (p.22) and Maps (p.80) | Modification not agreed. The LPA propose to retain site 9 'Chestnut Way' in the list of sites to be designated as areas of Local Green Space in Bidford-on-Avon. There appears to be an inherent inconsistency in the way site 9 (Chestnut Way) and site 7 (Russet Way) have been dealt with by the Examiner. The Examiner has noted that site 7 is a | List of LGS designated areas for Bidford-on-Avon to remain as follows: Bidford-on-Avon 1. Playing Fields West of Dugdale Avenue 2. Dugdale Avenue 3. Paddock Close 4. Allotments, Sports Pitches and Cemetery, Salford Road 5. Big Meadow and Monie Meadow 6. C of E Primary School Playing Fields, Bramley Way 7. Russet Way 8. St Laurence Way |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>“planned open space on new development” which suggests this site is not yet in community use. The Public Open Space at Chestnut Way will be completed in Spring 2017 and handed over to the management company shortly thereafter. As such, by the time the NDP is ‘made’ around summer 2017, Chestnut Way will be delivered and in use and therefore valued by the local community.</p> <p>The Examiner has considered paragraph 77 of the NPPF and concluded that since the land at Chestnut Way is not yet available to be used by the community, it cannot meet the criteria for designation as such. However, it is not clear why Russet Way has been assessed differently.</p> <p>Para 012 of ‘Open Space, sports and recreation</p> | <p>9. Chestnut Way 10. Crompton Avenue 11. The Leys, Hill View Road, Wessons Road and Jubilee Close 12. Wards Lane Play Area</p> <p>Designation ‘Bid 9’ Chestnut Way to be retained on Map 3.</p> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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>facilities, public rights of way and local green spaces' in PPG states "New residential areas may include green areas that were planned as part of the development. Such green areas could be designated as Local Green Space if they are demonstrably special and hold particular local significance".</p> <p>The PC consider the evidence submitted with the NDP was adequate to satisfy para 012 of PPG and para 77 of NPPF for both Chestnut Way and Russet Way. The Examiner states that Chestnut Way does not meet the criteria 'at the present time' but does not state that the site would not meet the criteria once it is in community use in the future.</p> <p>Given the inconsistency of approach employed by the Examiner and given the site</p> | |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | at Chestnut Way will be in community use by the time the NDP is 'made' next year, it is considered that the PC has supplied sufficient evidence to confirm that both sites will meet the criteria once they are brought into use and that they will be in community use prior to the NDP being 'made'. It is recommended that both sites be treated equally and therefore retain site 9, Chestnut Way on the list of sites to be defined as local green space within the NDP. | |
| Policy AM5 – Allotments and Growing Space: | | | |
| Amend the third paragraph of the policy to read: "Residential developments are encouraged to provide shared space or private gardens which are suitable for and encourage and enable residents the opportunity to grow their own food." | Section 3: Policies (p.23) | Modification agreed. The second element of the policy sought to ensure that new dwellings of three or more bedrooms provided private and secure gardens of at least 10.5m in length to give homeowners opportunities to grow their own food. Whilst the | Policy AM5 modified to read: "All new dwelling houses with 3 bedrooms or more should be designed with private and secure gardens of at least 10.5m in length in order to facilitate individual homeowners with Residential <u>developments are encouraged to provide shared space or private gardens which are suitable for and encourage and enable residents the opportunity to grow their own food".</u> |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | supporting text presented a strong argument for the opportunity to grow food, it did not seek to explore the rationale for the high bar the policy set. This needed to be changed so that greater flexibility was incorporated into the policy so that it encouraged this provision rather than thwart development, in order meet the Basic Conditions tests. | |
| Substitute "uncertainty" for "uncertainly" in paragraph 6.14. | Section 3: Policies (p.23) | Modification agreed. Required to correct a drafting error. | Explanatory text to Policy AM5 modified as follows: Due to the inserted paragraph 6.2 (see above), paragraph 6.14 of the Submission version NDP becomes 6.15 of the Referendum version. Penultimate sentence of (new) paragraph 6.15 to read: "Today, with our economic uncertainly <u>uncertainty</u> on a global scale, the desire for more space to grow food locally and experience life's simple pleasures has reignited the call for more allotments". |
| Policy AM6 – Promoting Walking and Cycling: | | | |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 words "All new development..." at the start of the second paragraph of the policy with "As appropriate, development..." | Section 3: Policies (p.24) | Modification agreed. The Core Strategy identifies the need to improve pedestrian and cycle links and this policy will help to achieve that. However, as originally drafted, the policy would apply to all development including (for example) householder extensions which could be regarded as unduly onerous. The proposed modification was necessary to address this concern and ensure the policy met the basic conditions. | Second paragraph of Policy AM6 modified to read: " All new <u>As appropriate</u> , development must demonstrate how walking and cycling opportunities have been prioritised and connection made to existing routes". |
| Appendix 1: | | | |
| Restructure the Plan so that the table on pages 76 and 77 of the Plan appear in Appendix 1. | Appendices (p.25 onward) | Modification agreed. Amendment necessary to overcome a presentational issue with the Submission draft Plan. | The Bidford-on-Avon NDP Regulation 123 List of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 moved from p.76-77 of the Submission Version of the NDP to Appendix 1 (p.29-31) of the Referendum version of the Plan. |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 "Stratford-on-Avon" with "Bidford-on-Avon" and "Town Council" with "Parish Council" in paragraph five on page 25 of the Plan. | Appendix 1 (p.25) | Modification agreed. Paragraph five referred to another neighbourhood plan and Town Council as originally drafted. In the interests of accuracy, these references needed to be corrected. | Appendix 1 - Final paragraph on p.29 of the Referendum version of the NDP modified to read: "The table below has been informed by consultation and preparation of the Stratford-on-Avon Bidford-on-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is important to note that inclusion in this list does not signify a commitment from the Town Parish Council to fund the entirety (or part of) of any particular project through CIL. In addition, the order of projects in the table does not imply any preference for spend". |
| <u>Other amendments to the NDP, not put forward as a proposed modification by the Examiner:</u> | | | |
| Policy H5 – Use of Garden Land: | | | |
| No recommended amendment. | Section 3: Policies (p.11) | Replace 'permitted' with 'supported' in first paragraph of the Policy. There are inconsistencies throughout the Examiner's report in the use of the words 'permitted' and 'supported'. The Examiner has asked for 'permitted' to | Policy H5 modified to read: "Development on garden land within the defined Village Boundary, as defined on Map 1, will only be permitted <u>supported</u> if it can be demonstrated that proposals:" |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 changed to 'supported' in a number of policies, but not others. This amendment is proposed to introduce a consistency of approach throughout the NDP. | |
| Policy ECON1 – Protecting and Enhancing Existing Employment Sites: | | | |
| No recommended amendment. | Section 3: Policies (p.13) | <p>Replace 'permitted' with 'supported' in first paragraph of the Policy.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies throughout the Examiner's report in the use of the words 'permitted' and 'supported'. The Examiner has asked for 'permitted' to be changed to 'supported' in a number of policies, but not others. This amendment is proposed to introduce a consistency of approach throughout the NDP.</p> | <p>Policy ECON1 modified to read:</p> <p>"Proposals for the change of use or re-development of land or premises identified for or currently in employment use will only be permitted <u>supported</u> where:"</p> |
| Policy ENV5 - Drainage | | | |

| Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in her 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 |
|--|--|---|---|
| No recommended amendment. | Section 3: Policies (p.18) | <p>Replace 'permitted' with 'supported' in first paragraph of the Policy.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies throughout the Examiner's report in the use of the words 'permitted' and 'supported'. The Examiner has asked for 'permitted' to be changed to 'supported' in a number of policies, but not others. This amendment is proposed to introduce a consistency of approach throughout the NDP.</p> | <p>Final sentence of first paragraph modified to read:</p> <p>"Proposals that would result in an unacceptable risk to the quality and/or quantity of a water body or water bodies will not be permitted <u>supported</u>".</p> |

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

| Sustainable Development Role (NPPF) | Neighbourhood Development Plan's Contribution |
|--|--|
| Economic | <p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to support the local economy through promotion of new or enhances retail, commercial and community uses; encouraging homeworking 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 looks to protect and enhance 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 and character of the area, and recognise locally important heritage assets.</p> <p>The Plan looks to promote the protection, enhancement and expansion of routes suitable 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 Bidford-on-Avon having a Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings, the Plan has a policy 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> <p>The Plan has a policy to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |

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

- Subject to the modifications above, the Bidford-on-Avon 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/bidfordnp

And can be viewed in paper form at:

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