



**A REPORT TO STRATFORD ON AVON DISTRICT COUNCIL OF THE
EXAMINATION
of the
WELFORD ON AVON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2015-2031
by
Dr LOUISE BROOKE-SMITH, HonDTech, BSc(Hons), DIP TP, FRICS, MRTPI
INDEPENDENT EXAMINER**

NOVEMBER 2015



CONTENTS:

SUMMARY AND OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION**
 - 1.1 The Neighbourhood Planning Regime**
 - 1.2 Background to the Welford Neighbourhood Plan**
 - 1.3 Appointment and Role of the Independent Examiner**
- 2.0 THE EXAMINATION PROCESS**
- 3.0 COMPLIANCE WITH MATTERS OTHER THAN THE BASIC CONDITIONS**
- 4.0 THE BASIC CONDITIONS**
 - 4.1 National Policy Advice and Guidance**
 - 4.2 Sustainable Development**
 - 4.3 The Development Plan**
 - 4.4 European Union (EU) Obligations**
- 5.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE WELFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**
 - 5.1 Overview**
 - 5.2 Overall Presentation and Form of the Plan**
 - 5.3 Foreward**
 - 5.4 Welford on Avon – a Pen Picture**
 - 5.5 Introduction**
 - 5.6 Vision and Objectives for Welford on Avon**
 - 5.7 Heritage and Environment**
 - 5.8 Infrastructure**
 - 5.9 Economic Development**
 - 5.10 Housing and Land Use**
- 6.0 GLOSSARY AND APPENDICES**
- 7.0 REFERENDUM**
- 8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

APPENDICES

Appendix A– Index of Examination Documents

Summary and Overall Recommendation

As the Independent Examiner into the Welford Neighbourhood Plan (NP), I have been requested by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), Stratford on Avon District Council to present my professional assessment of the Plan, in terms of its compliance with the 'Basic Conditions' as set out in extant legislation, regulations and guidance.

I confirm that I am independent of the Qualifying Body (QB), namely Welford Parish Council and the Local Planning Authority. Furthermore, I do not have any interest in any land or property that may be affected by the Plan.

I am a Chartered Surveyor and Chartered Town Planner. I hold professional qualifications and have relevant experience of the planning regime, gained over the past 29 years in both the public and private sectors, to enable an independent judgement of the documents before me. I am also a member of the National Panel of Independent Examiners Referral Service, endorsed by the Department of Communities and Local Government.

Further to my examination of the Welford Neighbourhood Plan, which has comprised a review of all lodged documents, supporting information and consultations, I have no concerns over the defined Plan area or the manner of its confirmation.

However, it is my considered opinion that a number of clarifications and formal modifications, need to be made before the said Plan meets the Basic Conditions, as set out in the respective legislation and guidance.

My report highlights the areas where I contend that a number of proposed policies should be modified, and where text could be amended or illustrations added or improved, in order to make the document clearer, remove ambiguity and ensure conformity.

My proposed changes have been made in such a way so as not to detract from the essence of the vision of the Parish Council - but I consider they should be taken into account before it proceeds to a Referendum.

Given the nature of these modifications and indeed the stage of the emerging Core Strategy, I have given some consideration to advising that the NP be suspended until the Core Strategy has been adopted. However, there is little clarification as to when the Core Strategy might be formally adopted or a Site Allocation Plan be finalised, and hence there is a risk that the NP could be delayed unnecessarily.

In contrast, the NP could proceed but be a very short-lived document if the Core Strategy and other Development Plan documents are indeed brought forward quickly and then supersede NP policies.

I am minded that the NP has been the subject of considerable local involvement and has been some time in the preparation and as such, I consider it is appropriate for it to proceed, subject to my recommended changes. However, given the nature of

the issues raised in my report, this decision is at the discretion of the LPA and the QB.

If it is to proceed, it is important that all parties recognise that to do so, and to be considered compliant with the Basic Conditions as set out in current guidance, in my view, a number of modifications and clarifications are required.

Only subject to theses being addressed can I find that the Welford Neighbourhood Plan compliant and hence;

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in current legislations and guidance;*
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;*
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;*
- not breach, but be compatible with European Union obligations and the European Convention of Human Rights; nor likely to have a significant effect on a European Site or a European Offshore Marine Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*
- meet prescribed conditions*

In summary, therefore, I contend that, further to the recommended modifications, the Neighbourhood Plan complies with the requirements set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and can proceed to a Referendum, but reiterate that this lies at the discretion of the LPA and the QB.

Dr Louise Brooke-Smith, HonDTech, BSc(Hons), DipTP, FRICS, MRTPI

Brooke Smith Planning Consultants Ltd – November 2015

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING REGIME

- 1.1.0 The Neighbourhood Planning regime provides local communities with the ability to establish specific land use or planning policies which can influence how future development comes forward in their area. It not only provides the opportunity for local people to shape their locality, it also provides guidance for developers and landowners when considering new proposals.
- 1.1.2 Any Neighbourhood Plan should therefore be clear not only in its goals and ambitions but also in how any policies are presented. The background behind how policies have emerged should be easy to understand and robust in terms of justification.
- 1.1.3 This Report provides the findings of an examination into the Welford Neighbourhood Plan, which is hereafter referred to as the Plan or the Neighbourhood Plan (NP).
- 1.1.4 The Plan was prepared by the Welford Parish Council, the Qualifying Body, referred to herewith as the QB, having consulted with its community, Stratford on Avon District Council, referred to herewith as the LPA, and a range of interested parties, statutory bodies, landowners and other local stakeholders.
- 1.1.5 My Report provides a recommendation as to proceeding to a Referendum subject to modification of the Plan. If this takes place and the Plan was endorsed by more than 50% of votes cast, then it would be 'made' by the LPA and would be used to assist in the determination of any subsequent planning applications.

1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE WELFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 1.2.1 The Neighbourhood Plan area, reflects the Parish of Welford on Avon and comprises a rural area lying to the south west of Stratford on Avon, centred upon the village of Welford on Avon.
- 1.2.2 I note that a formal application was made by Welford on Avon Parish Council in March 2013, being an appropriate body under Section 61G of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, proposing the Parish area be the subject of a Neighbourhood Plan. Stratford on Avon District Council confirmed this in June 2013.
- 1.2.3 A Steering Group had already been established prior to this, in 2012, and subsequently on behalf of the Parish Council engaged with the community and stakeholders in order to identify key issues. The formation of the Plan has been the subject of consultation. I comment on this below.
- 1.2.4 It is clear that some assessment of the various consultation comments was made and indeed the Plan was subject to some changes before the Examination Version was duly prepared and submitted to the LPA in August 2015. It was subsequently the subject of a further period of public consultation which concluded on 23rd October 2015.
- 1.2.5 Representation to the Examination Version of the Plan were received from 16 parties, some of whom had made previous representations.
- 1.2.6 The Examination Version of the Plan is accompanied by a Consultation Statement and Statement of Basic Conditions prepared by the QB which states that, in its view, the Welford

Neighbourhood Plan meets all procedural requirements as set out in legislation. I comment on both documents below.

1.3 APPOINTMENT AND ROLE OF THE INDEPENDENT EXAMINER

1.3.1 In accordance with current regulations, I was appointed by the LPA as the Examiner of the Neighbourhood Plan in September 2015 and issued with a set of relevant document relating to the Plan on the 5th November 2015.

1.3.2 My role has been to consider whether the Plan meets the 'Basic Conditions', as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to Neighbourhood Plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

1.3.3 While elements of this only apply to Neighbourhood Orders, in order to meet the Basic Conditions, the making of any Neighbourhood Plan must:

(a) Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;

(d) Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;

(e) Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;

(f) Not breach, and must be otherwise compatible with, European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations.

(g) Ensure that prescribed conditions are met and prescribed matters have been complied with.

1.3.4 Regulations 32 and 33 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) set out that;

- *The making of the Neighbourhood Plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a European Site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012) or a European Offshore Marine Site (as defined in the Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 2007) either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.*

1.3.5 In examining the Plan, I am also required, under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, (TCPA) to establish whether:

- *The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.*
- *The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the TCPA as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA).*
- *The Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the PCPA (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area).*
- *The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the PCPA.*

1.3.6 Having examined the Plan against the Basic Conditions, as set out above, and as the Independent Examiner, I am required to make one of the following recommendations:

a) that the Plan should proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it meets all legal requirements;

b) that the Plan should be subject to modification but will then meet all relevant legal requirements and should proceed to Referendum;

c) that the Plan does not proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it does not meet the relevant legal requirements.

1.3.7 If recommending that the Plan should go forward to Referendum, I am also required to consider whether or not the Referendum Area should extend beyond the defined Welford Neighbourhood Plan Area.

1.3.8 As noted above, the role of any Independent Examiner is to assess a Plan in terms of compliance with the Basic Conditions. While it is not to specifically comment on whether the Plan is sound, I consider that where changes can be made that would result in removing ambiguity, and make the document more user friendly for all parties, these should be considered.

1.3.9 The LPA may wish to consider and may wish to specifically agree these with the QB as they complement a number of Proposed Modifications, which in my opinion need to be addressed in order for the Plan to be compliant.

1.3.10 I have distinguished between recommendations that are considered necessary to meet Basic Conditions and legal requirements, and those that are advisory to provide for a clearer expression of policies and explanation of associated matters and clarity of facts.

2.0 THE EXAMINATION PROCESS

2.1 It is advised that Neighbourhood Plan examinations should proceed without a public hearing i.e. by written representations only, unless the Examiner considers it necessary to ensure adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case. In such cases, a public hearing may be held.

2.2 In this case and further to review and consideration of all the evidence before me, I was able to consider the Plan by a review of the salient background information, supporting reports and written representations.

2.4 My examination findings reflect my review of the following documents which set out extant legislation, regulation and guidance;

- National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) (2012)
- Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
- The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)
- The Localism Act (2011) (as amended)
- The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012)
- Planning Practice Guidance (2014)

2.5 In addition to the Examination Version of the Welford Neighbourhood Plan, I have also reviewed the Evidence Base used to prepare the NP and documents presented to me by the LPA. These are set out in Appendix A. I have also had regard to the saved policies of the Stratford on Avon Local Plan 2006-11.

- 2.6 The Consultation Statement prepared by the QB contains a number of cross references to documents held on the NP web site. I have reviewed this supporting evidence and surveys.
- 2.7 Finally, I confirm that I undertook an unaccompanied site visit to the Plan area and its immediate surroundings in November 2015.

3.0 COMPLIANCE WITH MATTERS OTHER THAN THE BASIC CONDITIONS

3.1 I now report on the procedural tests, as set out earlier in this Report, and find as follows;

- **The Qualifying Body**

3.2 From the documentation before me, I conclude that the Welford on Avon Parish Council is a properly constituted body, i.e. a Qualifying Body for the purposes of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with the aims of neighbourhood planning as set out in the Localism Act (2011) and recognised in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). Accordingly, I find this addresses the necessary requirements.

- **The Plan Area**

3.3 The Welford Neighbourhood Area coincides with the boundary of the Welford on Avon Parish – which has been the subject of minor modification in recent times.

3.4 An appropriately made application was submitted to the LPA and endorsed in June 2013. Due process was undertaken and I contend this satisfies the requirement relating to the purposes and identification of a Neighbourhood Development Plan under section 61G (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and salient regulations of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

- **The Plan Period**

3.5 A neighbourhood plan must specify the period during which it is to have effect. The Welford Neighbourhood Plan states in its introductory sections that it addresses the period between 2011 and 2031. This is to reflect the period of the Emerging Core Strategy for the District. I consider this to be appropriate at this point in time.

3.6 I suggest that the final version of the Plan incorporates the dates on its front cover.

- **Excluded Development**

3.7 From my review of the documents before me, the Plan does not include policies or proposals that relate to any of the categories of excluded development, as defined by statute and extant regulations, or to matters outside the Neighbourhood Area. As such, I find that the Plan meets legal requirements.

- **Development and use of land**

- 3.8 A Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with current regulations, should only contain policies relating to the development and/or use of land. While supporting text can reflect the goals and ambitions of any community, they should not be reflected as specific policies.
- 3.9 Where I consider that a policy or part of a policy is ambiguous or relates to matters that do not relate to the development or use of land or property, I have recommended that it be deleted or amended.
- 3.10 I note that the Plan includes a set of objectives that the Parish Council will undertake and these are not presented as formal NP policies. These reflect comments received during the consultation process. I understand that it has been considered important to include these within the Plan, accompanied by an explanation of why they have not been presented as formal policies.
- 3.11 I note that the LPA has suggested that some of these could be rewritten as land use policies. I consider that while this might indeed have been the case, the decision to present the Plan in its current form, with a series of land use policies and a series of aspirations that will be addressed by the Parish Council, is entirely at the QB's discretion. I do not feel it appropriate to insist that any of these matters should be rewritten as formal policies.
- 3.12 However, given that they are clearly defined and explained in the document, I do not consider that this would make the Plan non-compliant but stress that my assessment is of the formally presented land use policies only.

- **Public Consultation**

- 3.13 Planning legislation requires public consultation to take place on the production of neighbourhood plans. Any public consultation should be open and accessible and any information presented should be easy to understand and to comment upon. It should enable all sectors of the local community the ability to comment on and hence shape the policies which may have bearing on where they live, work or spend their leisure time.
- 3.14 I have reviewed the Statement of Consultation which has been prepared by the QB as a requirement of regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, as submitted to the Council.
- 3.15 I am of the opinion that the consultation exercise was acceptable and a wide spectrum of the community was approached through a range of initiatives. All stakeholders were given the opportunity to take part in proceedings. I note that different forms of community liaison were adopted and consider that overall this was undertaken in a logical and professional way to identify key issues and then prepare relevant policies. The consultation activity was extensive and resulted in a good response from stakeholders.
- 3.16 The Statement of Consultation summarises the timescale and approach adopted, and the quantum of survey responses - although not specifically on the comments or observations raised. Instead the Statement is supported by a number of documents which are available in electronic format and cross referenced. While I accept that this is an efficient use of resources, it has made reviewing the process and assessing the stages of the Plan's preparation, difficult.

- 3.17 I note that a summary of the community questionnaire has been provided together with a document that notes the changes to specific policies as the Plan progressed from draft to submission version. However, it would have been helpful for the Consultation Statement to include a clear summary of responses to the Plan at key stages, together with the subsequent response from the steering group, whether this be agreement to issues or justification for cases of disagreement to representation comments.
- 3.18 I find this an omission but not sufficient to conclude that an appropriate consultation exercise was not undertaken and conclude that Regulation 15 has been appropriately addressed.

4.0 BASIC CONDITIONS

4.1 NATIONAL POLICY, ADVICE AND GUIDANCE

- 4.1.1 The presiding documents setting out national policy comprises the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) published in 2012 and the Planning Practice Guidance 2014. Both explain that the presumption in favour of sustainable development will mean that Neighbourhood Plans should support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans and plan positively to support local development.
- 4.1.2 The Framework is clear that Neighbourhood Plans should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area, i.e. they must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. They should not promote less development than is set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. Neighbourhood Plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with predictability and efficiency.
- 4.1.3 I note the stance taken by some consultees that the Plan fails in this regard given the age of local plan policies, and the lack of an adopted Core Strategy. I am not able to directly assess the NP in light of adopted Core Strategy policies that do not yet formally exist. However, I am of the opinion that overall, given the acknowledgment in the Plan to the potential for further development at Welford – which I discuss below – and further to modifications to some policies, appropriate regard has been given to the NPPF and the NPPG and the Plan can be considered to positively support local development.
- 4.1.4 The Statement of Basic Conditions (SBC) sets out in Tables 1 and 2 how the Plan generally responds to the NPPF and how individual policies are supported by specific sections of the NPPF.
- 4.1.5 I have had regard to the guidance found within Planning Practice Guidance (2014) and overall, I find this an acceptable approach to explain how the Plan reflects national policies and advice.
- 4.1.6 Some erroneous text could be addressed; I consider that the commentary section in Table 1 should make accurate reference to the emerging Core Strategy, as opposed to the 'emerging Stratford District Local Plan'. Furthermore, reflecting my comments on the matter, below, the second paragraph of text accompanying NPPF 184 should remove the subjective use of 'by a significant margin'. It should also emphasise that this matter is subject to review further to the imminent Core Strategy Inquiry and that further residential development may be required and as noted later in my report, additional explanation and cross reference to the evidence should be considered.

4.1.7 I set out in Section 5 my formal modifications to specific policies and supporting text to enable the Plan to be compliant with Basic Condition (a).

4.2 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

4.2.1 Any Qualifying Body (QB) must demonstrate how a Neighbourhood Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF explains that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.

4.2.2 The QB acknowledges this and the SBC sets out in Table 3 a sustainability matrix. I find this relatively simplistic and hence consider it is important to include specific NPPF references within the Plan itself. As noted elsewhere in my report, providing modification are made to some policies and accompanying text, overall I find that the Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

4.2.3 Whilst there is no legal requirement for any Plan to be accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal, a Strategic Environmental Assessment may sometimes be required if a Neighbourhood Plan is likely to have a significant effect on the environment. I note that a Sustainability Appraisal Screening Opinion was issued by Stratford on Avon District Council which confirmed that in the view of the LPA, no SEA would be required. I comment on this matter below.

4.2.4 That aside, I consider that the overall approach to achieving sustainable development and assessing the Plan's environmental, social and economic effects is appropriate. However, I suggest a number of clarifications and formal modifications to specific policies in Section 5 below, to enable the Plan to be compliant with Basic Condition (d).

4.3 THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

4.3.1 I note that the age of the Local Plan and that the emerging new Core Strategy is relatively advanced – although not yet adopted. Some policies from the outdated Local Plan have been 'saved' although there is some concern raised by some objectors of the reliance on these policies given that they do not all reflect policy within the NPPF. I concur that some saved policies are not consistent with the NPPF. In such cases I find that the NPPF needs to take precedence.

4.3.2 I note that the 'saved policies' have been set out in the SBC and cited in support and justification of some of Welford Plan's proposed policies. I fully accept that the saved policies are likely to very shortly become redundant in the advent of the Core Strategy, but at the time of writing, they are still valid in terms of reference and hence it is of value to include Table 4 within the SBC.

4.3.3 The problem of an outdated Local Plan and the lack of any replacement Plan, is an increasingly common situation in terms of Neighbourhood Plan examination. I am therefore guided by the NPPG and which advises on the matter and contrary to comments through the consultation period, there is no requirement for a Local Plan to be in place or a new Core Strategy to be approved, for any Neighbourhood Plan to proceed. Indeed a draft NP is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan although the reasoning and evidence informing its

preparation may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested.

- 4.3.4 I find that to be the case in this situation and note that the QB has had regard to the supporting documentation which has been prepared by the LPA to support to supports its emerging Core Strategy. I note that some emerging Core Strategy policies were not supported by the Inspector following the first Core Strategy Inquiry and the LPA have not adopted these on an interim basis.
- 4.3.5 Nevertheless, I consider it appropriate that the NP has had regard to some of the emerging Core Strategy supporting documents and evidence base, and find that in terms of visual and heritage assessment, much of the base line information has assisted in the preparation of the NP. *However, appropriate reference to this information is poorly explained and for clarity, this should be addressed through the Plan.*
- 4.3.6 I have concerns that emerging Core Strategy policies are referenced through the Plan and that these policies may change. Hence, as and when any NP is 'made', there may be some confusion if these remain as written.
- 4.3.7 Further to the NPPG, I note that where a NP is brought forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place the QB and the LPA should discuss and aim to agree the relationship between policies in any emerging NP, an emerging Local Plan and the adopted Development Plan with appropriate regard to national policy and guidance. Guidance also advises that the LPA should take a proactive and positive approach, working collaboratively with a QB particularly sharing evidence and seeking to resolve any issues to ensure the draft neighbourhood plan has the greatest chance of success at independent examination.
- 4.3.8 I consider that this has been the case but note that the additional evidence prepared by the LPA to support its approach to housing needs across the District, to be discussed at the forthcoming resumed Core Strategy Inquiry, would not have been assessed by the QB. This is simply a case of unfortunate timing. It is my view that while the emerging Core Strategy has been the subject of initial Inquiry, following which the Inspector found that that further work needed to be undertaken by the LPA to explain its position on housing needs, the general approach on housing strategy in terms of the role of Local Village Centres such as Welford was supported. As such, I consider that a consistent approach has been taken.
- 4.3.9 The Plan refers to an assessment that 2000 units will be allocated to LSV and that given its Category 2 status, Welford would need to accommodate approximately 12% of this housing need during the Plan period. Given the extent of new and consented development in Welford this has been an important factor in the formation of the NP policies.
- 4.3.10 It is understood that the Inquiry into the emerging Core Strategy is to be reconvened early in 2016 where the housing need figures will be the subject of further examination. It is important to acknowledge that additional housing development, over and above, that already provided or in the pipeline in Welford, may be required.
- 4.3.11 It is as yet unclear when the Core Strategy will be approved or indeed whether the approach taken by the LPA will be endorsed by the presiding Inspector and hence whether additional housing land will be required at LSV villages. Whether this proves to be the case or not, I note that in the Core Strategy Proposed Modifications issued in August 2015 by the District Council, while encouragement was given to the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans, with respect to

Local Service Villages such as Welford on Avon, it would be preparing a Site Allocations Plan. (Ref Page 6 CS Modification – Aug 2015).

- 4.3.12 The Welford NP acknowledges this by accepting that the village boundary may be the subject of amendment, further to the ongoing housing requirements which will be the subject of review at the resumed Core Strategy Inquiry and the preparation of the Site Allocations Plan.
- 4.3.13 I consider that QB has taken a pragmatic approach given this situation and has correctly acknowledged the potential to expand the village. It contends that it is not in a position, either professionally or in terms of funding, to fully assess where such new development could be located. Instead it considers that the LPA is best positioned to undertake this work and address any necessary Strategic Environmental Assessments that may be required.
- 4.3.14 While objectors have viewed this as not addressing the issue of accommodating future housing needs and hence being restrictive and in conflict with the NPPF, I do not concur. Given the acceptance that the LPA could allocate further housing land at Welford as part of its Site Allocations Plan and that such a document and indeed the Core Strategy may take precedence over the Neighbourhood Plan, I consider that a reasonable approach has been taken.
- 4.3.15 However, I stress that the critical issue is the fact that the Plan accepts that there may be a need for further housing growth at Welford and hence the village boundary may need to change. In light of this, some of the proposed policies and accompanying text within the Plan will need modification accordingly.
- 4.3.16 I contend therefore, that notwithstanding the dated nature of the Local Plan's saved policies and the yet to emerge Core Strategy, these are not reasons in themselves to delay the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4.3.17 All parties need to be aware that if the Core Strategy or Site Allocations Plan are adopted which contain policies or an allocation which conflict with the NP, the conflicting policies in the last document to be adopted would prevail.
- 4.3.18 In summary, I find the Plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained within the development plan for the area, and hence complicit with Basic Condition (e) but that a number of modifications to the NP need to be undertaken. The later are set out in Section 5 of my report.

4.4 EUROPEAN UNION (EU) OBLIGATIONS

- 4.4.1 Any Neighbourhood Plan must be compatible with European Union (EU) obligations, as incorporated into UK law, in order to be legally compliant.

- **Strategic Environment Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment**

- 4.4.2 Directive 2001/42/EC, often referred to as the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) Directive, relates to the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, and has relevance here. Similarly, Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds (referred to as the Habitats and Wild Birds Directives respectively) aim to protect and improve Europe's most important habitats and species and can have bearing on neighbourhood plans.

- 4.4.3 I note above that a screening opinion was sought and that neither a Strategic Environmental Assessment nor a Habitats Regulation Assessment was considered to be required by the LPA. Given the policies proposed, it was considered that there would be no significant effects in relation to the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the SEA Regulations, nor are there any internationally designated wildlife sites within the NP area or within 20km.
- 4.4.4 The Environment Agency has suggested that the Screening Statement did not specifically address the potential for development in the floodplain. From my reading of the Screening Report, I consider that flooding issues did form part of the screening process. Should development in this location be proposed, further to any increased need for housing at Cat2 Local Service Villages such as Welford, an appropriate assessment would be undertaken under standard planning practice, be it through the determination of a planning application or work associated with the LPA's Site Allocation Plan. Hence I contend that the concerns of the EA would be addressed.
- 4.4.5 However, the SEA Screening Report at para 8.2 notes that;
- "This screening report has explored the potential effects of the proposed WANDP with a view to determining the likely requirement for an environmental assessment under the SEA directive. Results of the screening process indicate that there is uncertainty associated with the size, nature and location of likely proposals in the NDP."*
- 4.4.6 The Submission version of the NP has not specifically allocated any new site for development and hence this reference may have been overtaken by events. However, I consider it introduces some confusion.
- 4.4.7 The SEA Screening was prepared in light of draft NP which acknowledged that the village boundary might need to be the subject of amendment by the LPA and that a Site Allocations Plan would be prepared. This might concern the allocation of further residential land at Welford and indeed is expressed in the Policy Advice Note – Neighbourhood Planning and Housing issued by the LPA in June 2015.
- 4.4.8 The Submission Version of the NP at page 34, acknowledges that any allocation of additional land would be the subject of full assessment by the LPA, including if necessary assessment under the SEA regulations or Habitats Directive.
- 4.4.9 **If this is the basis for the reference in para 8.2 of the SEA Screening Report then it should be clarified. If another explanation exists then it should be set out by the LPA.**
- 4.4.10 In terms of the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR), any NP should have regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the ECHR and comply with the Human Rights Act.
- 4.4.11 I do not consider that the Welford Neighbourhood Plan challenges this position and further to the modifications proposed with respect to individual policies, detailed below, I conclude that the Plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, the ECHR.
- 4.4.12 In summary I find that while generally, the Plan does not breach and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations, the reference to para 8.2 of the SEA Screening Report needs to be clarified and **only with this point addressed, can I find the Plan is compliant with Basic Condition (f).**
- 4.4.13 **I am minded that given NPPG 11-031 it is the ultimately the responsibility of the LPA to determine whether the NP meets EU obligations and given the nature of one formal submission through the Plan consultation period that has challenged the NP on non-**

compliance with basic condition (f), I recommend that further legal opinion is sought on this matter.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE WELFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

5.1 OVERVIEW

5.1.1 I now consider the Neighbourhood Plan against the Basic Conditions and for ease of reference follow the structure and headings as adopted in the Plan. As I have set out above, subject to clarification on the part of the LPA, I find that the Plan is compliant with Basic Condition (f) and (g) and as such, the following section addresses;

- Basic Conditions (a) (Compliance with National Policy);
- Basic Conditions (d) (Delivery of Sustainable Development); and
- Basic Conditions (e) (General Conformity with the Development Plan).

5.1.2 I wish to stress that my examination has comprised a review of the policies in the context of their compliance with the Basic Conditions. It has not comprised a forensic review of the rationale behind each policy. However, where I am aware that where the evidence base is lacking or has been poorly or erroneously interpreted or indeed, if proposals have been suggested that conflict with extant statute or are ultra vires, then these are highlighted.

5.1.3 NPPG paragraph 40 advises that while there are prescribed documents that must be submitted with a neighbourhood plan, there is no specific list of evidence set out as a pre-requisite. However, proportionate, robust evidence should support the approach taken and that evidence should be used to explain the intention and rationale of any proposed policy.

5.1.4 I consider that some modifications are required in order for the Plan to address this and am suggesting changes to some proposed policies or their deletion. I wish to emphasise that wherever possible these have been made to complement the vision, tone and language of the Plan. The proposed changes have not endeavoured to replace policies but have been presented to enable them to be deemed compliant, given the remit of neighbourhood plans, as explained earlier in this Report. For the avoidance of any doubt, I consider that some amendments could be made which would result in a clearer presentation of policies or accompany text and hence better accord with the Basic Conditions while still reflecting the aspirations of the community.

5.1.5 For clarity, my recommended changes comprising '**Required Modification**' are set out in bold, while my '*Suggested Amendments*' are set out in italics within my text.

5.2 THE OVERALL PRESENTATION AND FORM OF THE PLAN

5.2.1 The NPPF advises that plans should provide a practical basis within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Furthermore, NPPG Paragraph: 041 advises that any policy should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should reflect the unique characteristics and planning context of the area for which it has been prepared.

- 5.2.2 Overall, the Welford Neighbourhood Plan is well presented. However a number of amendments could be made which would enable it to be clearer for any user and remove ambiguity.
- 5.2.3 Specifically, I consider that the plan should comprise full use of paragraph numbers and the inclusion of additional OS based maps at a scale where all elements can be read easily.
- 5.2.4 While the Plan makes some cross reference to supporting information, this is not extensive or consistent. It would assist if a summary of the evidence and supporting information is included within the Appendices.
- 5.2.5 The evidence base for the Plan includes some relatively dated documents but is supplemented by technical information which supports the emerging Core Strategy and is considered relevant and up to date. Considerable reliance is given to the community questionnaire. I accept that this has been important to shape the vision, objectives and evolved policies but overall I consider that in places the evidence is too weak to justify the policies as written. I comment on specific policies below.
- 5.2.6 I am also concerned that large tracts of the NP comprises justification in the form of bullet points that repeats much of the information in the SBC. While this does not render the Plan unacceptable in terms of the basic conditions, I consider the inclusion of 'saved' local plan policies to be potentially confusing as and when the Core Strategy is adopted. Similarly, as noted earlier in my report, references to emerging Core Strategy policies that might change, may be misleading.
- 5.2.7 One solution may be to include a summary of the saved local plan policies and emerging core strategy policies in a table annexed to the NP and remove them from the body of the Plan. Such an approach would not detract from the policies but it would need to be the subject of discussion and agreement between the QB and the LPA.
- 5.2.8 In summary, in order to present a clearer Plan, I suggest the following amendments;
- *The Plan should adopt Section and paragraph numbering for ease of referencing;*
 - *All plans should be included at a scale where relevant details can be easily read.*
 - *Relevant supporting information reflecting the evidence base should be cross references within the text and a comprehensive list of the evidence base should be included within the Appendices rather than only accessed remotely via a web site.*
 - *Consideration should be given to relocating the saved local plan and emerging core strategy policies references to an annex.*
- 5.2.9 I turn now to specific sections within the Plan.

5.3 FOREWORD

- 5.3.1 I note that the preface to the Plan comprises a statement prepared by the Chair of the Welford on Avon Parish Council. This provides a good introduction to the Plan and understandably reflects the position as at July 2015. As noted elsewhere in my report, the position with respect to the emerging Core Strategy has moved on. The LPA has advised that the extent of consented development has increased and that some sites have been included in the QB assessment erroneously.

5.3.2 Should the Plan proceed to a Referendum, given my other comments below relating to housing policies, and avoid ambiguity, the foreword should be updated to take this into account and distinguish between *consented development within the village, on the village boundary and out in open countryside*.

5.4 WELFORD on AVON – A PEN PICTURE

5.4.1 I consider that this section presents an acceptable context for the Plan.

5.5 INTRODUCTION

5.5.1 I find this section to be reasonably well presented and clear in that it explains the status of the NP and its relationship to the Local Plan. However, there are some errors in definition and phrasing. For consistency and to avoid ambiguity I recommend that the following points are considered;

Page 6, 3rd and 4th paras – A Local Plan is one document that comprises the Development Plan for an area. The introductory section confuses reference to 'Local and Development Plans' and it is suggested that a consistent approach is taken.

Page 6, last para – Basic Conditions do not stipulate that any NP needs to be in general conformity with an emerging Plan. This needs to be expressed accordingly.

I consider that a comprehensive list of the evidence base for the Plan could be included either within an additional Appendix or set out as part of the introductory sections to each of the four policy areas. At present the evidence base is only set out on the Plan web page and is not easy to follow.

5.5.2 I am aware of the work undertaken as the Plan has progressed. This has generally been well set out in the Statement of Consultation and has been substantial and of a high standard. I consider that an appropriate explanation has been given as to how the Plan has emerged and the work that has been undertaken in its preparation.

5.5.3 I also note the section regarding the future governance of the Plan and that there will be an annual report prepared by the Parish Council on its operation.

5.6 THE VISION AND OBJECTIVES FOR WELFORD ON AVON

5.6.1 Having regard to the nature and extent of the consultations undertaken and the evidence base, I consider the vision to be a fair reflection of the key issues. While some of the subsequent objectives can be addressed through land use based policies and hence included within the Neighbourhood Plan, I accept that the QB felt that other objectives would be better delivered through other means, by the Parish Council.

5.6.2 I have noted earlier that I consider that it is at the discretion of the QB as to what formal land use policies are presented within the NP. Hence I feel that the distinction between objectives 1 through to 7, which form the basis of the proposed NP policies, as opposed to objectives 8 through to 12, which are issues that will be addressed by the Parish Council under a different regime, are acceptable.

5.6.3 I query however Objective 12, with respect to river and surface water flooding. This has been addressed in part through policies HE9 and INF2 and so the LPA may wish to liaise with the QB so this can be acknowledged.

5.6.4 I now turn to the four Policy Areas and to specific policies grouped therein.

5.7 A - HERITAGE AND ENVIRONMENT

5.7.1 Reflecting my comments above, cross reference needs to be given to the evidence base for this policy area. Furthermore, the reference to the community survey results in 2014 need to be explained in a better context. The policies subject to consultation at that stage have since been the subject of modification and hence it is misleading to state the degree of support for the policies presented in this section.

Suggested changes;

Addition of reference to specific evidence base documents that support this policy area, that could be listed in an Appendices.

Page 11, para 1 - The reference to the extent of support for Heritage and Environment policies should be qualified by the addition of '...as presented at that time'

5.7.2 I now review the policies within this section

HE1 – Important Views

5.7.3 I have reviewed the evidence base presented by the QB, the survey results as the draft plan has proceeded to examination and the objections raised by consultees. I am aware of the assessments prepared to support the emerging Core Strategy and the very clear support to protect the character of the area.

5.7.4 However, my concern lies with the ambiguity of the policy as written. While this is assisted by a series of photographs held on the Plan website, there is potential for this policy to be interpreted very broadly, restricting any potential growth in the area.

5.7.5 While I consider that the emerging Core Strategy policies are relevant and that the policy in general reflects Section 11 of the NPPF, I consider that this policy as written cannot be considered precise. Furthermore, it needs to be **supported by the addition of a map indicating the position of the 6 views specifically highlighted and confirmation that these are public views.**

5.7.6 I note that the justification text refers to emerging Core Strategy Policy CS.5 and the requirement that any major development proposals should be accompanied by appropriate supporting assessment. While the assumption is that this policy or an equivalent policy will remain in any adopted Core Strategy, I consider that the subjective use of the word 'obtrusive' in the NP policy is unhelpful and that there should be a clearer acknowledgment that further development can be considered.

5.7.7 As presented, Policy HE1 is not precise and potentially overly restrictive and thus does not contribute the achieving sustainable growth. To enable it to more appropriately reflect other policies within the NP and the Basic Conditions, I consider it should be modified as follows;

HE1. Important Views

When considering new development proposals in or around the village of Welford on Avon, weight will be given to the protection of the views listed below, and indicated on the map at figure (.....).

Such weight will be proportionate to the need for development, that the Development Plan shows to be required.

Impact on the views identified should be addressed by any applicant in the form of appropriate landscape and visual impact assessments and, where necessary, accompanied by mitigation proposals.

- **View towards St Peter's Church and over the village from Cress Hill**
- **View downstream from Binton Bridges**
- **Views over the Glebe Lands towards St Peter's Church and the river**
- **Views north-west from the Milcote Road towards Welford and Weston villages.**
- **Views north from the public road on Rumer Hill towards Welford village**
- **View south from the crest of the public road on Rumer Hill to the southern boundary of the parish towards Long Marston and the Cotswolds**

HE2 – Important Green Space

5.7.8 The title of this policy is inconsistent in that the text and policy refers to Local Green Spaces (LGS). While the sites have been identified and brief descriptions given, no explanation has been given as to how they have been the subject of assessment further to para 77 of the NPPF. I also note that the sites LGS1, LGS2 and LGS7 are extensive areas and specifically conflict with the last element of NPPF para 77.

5.7.9 I consider that the inclusion of the registered Village Greens (LGS4) is not a pre-requisite as they are afforded their individual protection, as the accompanying text clarifies. However I agree that a comprehensive approach to green spaces, and hence their identification may be appropriate, providing that clear reference is made to those sites that are formally registered as village greens, and those that may have assumed that status but have not be registered and hence could benefit from a LGS designation.

5.7.10 LGS5 refers to land that may be required by the Highway Authority for necessary road improvements which could fall beyond the remit of the NP.

5.7.11 While the justification section refers to both saved policies of the Local Plan, emerging Core Strategy policy, these relate to general green areas and for the identification of Local Green Spaces, I consider that the most relevant element of the NPPF is para 77.

5.7.12 **As presented HE2 is not considered compliant with the Basic Conditions and should be deleted unless it can address the following;**

- **the supporting text needs to explain how the various sites have been the subject of assessment further to para 77 of the NPPF**

- **confirmation of which sites benefit from formal registration as village greens**
- **full explanation of how sites LGS1, LGS2 and LGS7 comply with NPPF para 77. Without this, these proposed Local Green Spaces should be deleted from the policy.**
- **figure 5 should be replaced by a map that is fully and accurately annotated and presented at a suitable scale to indicate proposed Local Green Spaces and not confuse these with other designations.**

HE3 – Development which impacts Local Green Spaces

- 5.7.13 As presented, this policy could relate to development on or in the vicinity of a Local Green Space. If the former, then a reference to 'very special circumstances' should be included, further to para 76 of the NPPF. If the later then the policy is constraining given other policies within the Plan which address design matters. A proactive approach is considered more appropriate,
- 5.7.14 Hence if policy HE2 is modified as indicated above and remains in the Plan, I recommend that Policy HE3 is modified as follows;

Development on any Local Green Space, as identified in Policy HE2, will only be supported in very special circumstances.

Development in the immediate vicinity of any designated Local Green Space will be encouraged to show how it enhances the character or setting of that Local Green Space.

HE4 – The Conservation Area and other Heritage Assets

- 5.7.15 The intent of this policy is understood although the bullet points do not fully accord with the title and are not fully supported by the accompanying text which is confusing and refers to matters such as trees and design that are not covered in the text of the policy. In any event, these are covered by national policy and statute.
- 5.7.16 There is inconsistency in terms of referring to heritage assets and listed buildings. As written, there is no explanation as to whether the listed buildings highlighted in Fig 6 are statutorily listed or benefit from any form of local listing. Furthermore, the policy doesn't appear to apply to development that directly involves a heritage asset.
- 5.7.17 The policy as written adds very little over and above statutory requirements for development within or adjacent Conservations Area or affecting heritage assets. As such I am unsure of the value of the policy as presented, other than having reference to local guidance.
- 5.7.18 On this matter, the reference to the Stratford in Avon District Design Guide needs to be qualified. It is not a statutory document but a material consideration in the determination of any planning application. The reference to 'consultation with beneficial owners' has no basis in local or national policy.
- 5.7.19 Figure 6 is difficult to read at the scale presented and needs to be modified so individual property or structures can be clearly located. It would be helpful to list out property of heritage value within the accompanying text or within the Appendices.
- 5.7.20 Given the above, I recommend that the policy is modified as follows;

Development within or adjacent to the Welford on Avon Conservation Area, and/or comprising a heritage asset or within the setting of a heritage asset, will be supported providing it conserves or enhances the Conservation Area or heritage asset.

New development proposals will need to accord with national guidance and statutory regulations but is also encouraged to reflect the Stratford on Avon Design Guide, or equivalent superseding document.

5.7.21 I consider that the supporting text could be clearer and suggest the following;

National policy guiding development within a Conservation Area or affecting a heritage asset is covered in NPPF Para 126-135. Development proposals should conserve and enhance the character of a Conservation Area, and sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets.

Development proposals are encouraged to achieve the highest design standards as reflected in Core Strategy policies, the Welford Plan Housing and Land Use (HLU) policies and the Stratford on Avon District Design Guide or equivalent superseding document.

Fig 6 illustrates the extent of the Welford on Avon Conservation Area and heritage assets within and in the immediate vicinity of the village. These include a number of statutorily listed buildings.

Policy HE5 – Open Countryside

5.7.22 The intent of this policy is understood and the justification through reference to the emerging Core Strategy policies and indeed the saved Local Plan policies that still reflect the NPPF is appropriate. However, as written the policy is inconsistent and introduces an intent of protection which I consider to be overly restrictive.

5.7.23 Much of the policy could have been included within Section D of the Plan addressing Housing and Land Use but appropriate cross reference has been included in Policy HLU1. I comment on this below.

5.7.23 I acknowledge the difficulty in pursuing the Welford NP in the context of an elderly Local Plan and an emerging Core Strategy but accept that this can take place, providing the NP acknowledges that circumstances may change in the light of the Core Strategy and any subsequent Site Allocations Plan prepared by the LPA. The accompanying text to Policy HE5 notes, at the end, that this is the case.

5.7.24 This is important and is a fundamental reason why I consider the NP can proceed. As such it needs to be highlighted clearly.

5.7.25 Fig 8 is however understood to be out of date and is misleading. As presented it is unclear and poorly reproduced and hence could confuse any reader. Hence I recommend that an improved plan indicating the built form of the village is included that accurately indicates the extant built form of the village plus all development sites that have the benefit of permission and could be developed. These have been used to justify the approach taken by the QB in the NP in not specifically allocating additional housing land.

5.7.26 The reference to Scheduled Monuments, sites of archaeological interest and sites of ecological value, reflect national policy and statute and hence is not needed to be repeated.

5.7.27 The reference to support for 'a single dwelling of exceptional quality and design making a positive contribution ...' is covered in para 55 of the NPPF but has not been included within the justification text bullet points. *This should be corrected.*

5.7.28 Hence, I recommend that the policy is modified as follows ;

Development in the open countryside, lying beyond the Welford on Avon Built Up Area Boundary, is encouraged to recognise and respect the character and beauty of the area.

Subject to landscape quality considerations, development will be supported if it;

(... bullet point list as currently presented)

An OS based map needs to be presented at **an appropriate scale to accurately indicate the built extent of the village and include all known consented development sites.** I consider Fig 8 to be too confusing and not appropriate to allow Policy HE5 to be read and understood easily.

Policy HE6 – Gap between Welford and Weston

5.7.28 The intent of this policy is understood and the consultation comments reflect the strong local feeling on this matter, however, my concern is that as written it is vague and introduces an extreme protection. No clear indication of the area in question has been presented.

5.7.29 While reference to its existence is made in Policy HE5, the supporting text and justification has not clarified whether it will be enforced regardless of Policy HE5.

5.7.30 I note that a recent appeal decision has endorsed the value of the land in question in terms of its character but consider that this should not necessarily undermine the pursuit of other forms or extent of development in this location which may be able to appropriately preserve the identity of the two villages.

5.7.31 **As such, I do not consider that this policy, as currently presented, contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. As such it should be deleted unless it is modified as follows and supported by a clear OS based map clearly indicating the area in question;**

Development beyond the built up boundary of Welford on Avon which results in the reduction of the gap with Weston on Avon, as indicated on the map at Fig (...) will be resisted, unless the proposals comply with Policy HE5 and specifically allow for the preservation of the identity and integrity of the two settlements.

Policy HE7 – Landscape Design

5.7.33 The intent of this Policy is clear but as presented, it is overly prescriptive and does not reflect current permitted development rights. As such the second bullet point is too restrictive.

5.7.34 The accompanying supporting text is also rigid and addresses matters that would normally be covered through standard conditions attached to planning permission for relevant forms of development. Furthermore, there is no reference to relevant sections of the evidence base.

5.7.35 As written, all forms of development, minor or major, would be affected by this policy. This needs to be clarified or qualified.

5.7.36 While I find the policy to reflect national and emerging local policy is acceptable, if Policy HE7 is to remain within the Plan, **the following modifications are suggested to the policy to allow it to be compliant;**

Where relevant, given its scale and nature, new development will be encouraged to have regard to existing mature trees and support the planting of new trees and shrubs, further to the guidance within the Stratford on Avon District Design Guide or subsequent equivalent document. Particular encouragement is given to the use of natural hedging.

5.7.37 **I suggest that the accompanying text should also be amended to read as follows;**

Page 20, para 1,

Welford on Avon is blessed by a rich diversity of mature trees which provide a rich backdrop to the village and its street scene. The advice of the SDC Tree Office is encouraged to be sought as part of the planning application process where such trees may be affected.

The text under Tree Planting paragraph should omit the last two sentences from; 'Sufficient land.....interested parties'

*The text under the Tree Preservation paragraph is overly prescriptive and refers to technical detail that may not always be appropriate. Generally these matters would be covered by conditions attached to any formal consent and hence the text as written does not need to be set out in the NP. **Hence this paragraph should be deleted.***

Policy HE8 – Allotments

5.7.38 This policy and its justification is appropriate and considered generally to reflect national and local policy and the principles of sustainable development. However, I consider it needs minor modification to remove ambiguity and it needs to be supported by a map indicating the location of the allotments in question.

5.7.39 **Accordingly, I recommend Policy HE8 is modified as follows;**

Development that enhances the use of the allotments in Headland Rd, as indicated on the accompanying map at fig (...) will be supported.

Any other development at the site that detracts from its use as allotments, will be resisted unless;

- **it provides for suitable replacement land and/or facilities of at least equivalent quality and condition for existing and/or future plot holders, or**
- **clear and significant social, economic and or environmental community benefits would be derived from the proposal**

Agreement for any development proposal needs to be secured from the Shorthouse Bidston Allotment Trust.

Policy HE9 – Flood Plain

- 5.7.40 Given the location of the village and the relationship with the River Avon, it is understandable that flooding has been of specific concern to the community.
- 5.7.41 There appears to be an anomaly with the originally set out objectives for the Plan. Objective 12 refers to flooding and surface water – a matter also raised by a statutory consultee. I am of the view that this policy reflects Objectives 4, 5 and 12. Furthermore, it would be better placed within the Infrastructure section of the Plan.
- 5.7.42 This is not a paramount concern but simply an observation which would make the Plan easier to follow. Whichever section it lies within, as it is presented and given the title of the policy, its phrasing is confusing and could be modified without losing the essence of the approach. Fig 7 is poorly reproduced within the Plan and should be replaced by a map at an improved scale.
- 5.7.42 The intent of the policy is understood and relevant references have been included within the justification text. However, I concur with comments issued during the consultation period with respect to an amendment to its title and recommend a minor change to its drafting as follows;

Title changed to 'Fluvial Flood Risk'

Encouragement is given to proposals for fluvial management which reduce the risk of flooding in Flood Zones 2 and 3 as indicated on the map at Fig (7). Proposals are encouraged to include appropriate landscaping.

New or replacement development within these flood zones will be resisted unless it;

- **is demonstrably neutral or beneficial to the capacity of these flood zones,**
- **it does not result in any additional properties being placed at risk of flooding or increase the risk of flooding to existing properties,**
- **is consistent with other policies within the Welford Plan,**

- 5.7.43 I note the comments issued by the County Council and that in its view the Plan fails to take account of surface water. I suggest that 'surface' could be added to the text within the Plan where reference is made to 'waste water' but that this should be the subject of agreement between the LPA and the QB. It does not in my view detract from the compliance of Policy HE9 providing the above modifications and change in title are adopted.
- 5.7.44 I further note the objection to the text in Appendices B which expands upon those Objectives which are not part of the NP and specifically the reference to the lack of river dredging by the Environment Agency. As noted earlier in my report, my role is not to assess policies or objectives that fall beyond the remit of the NP. However, if Objective 12 is to be referenced under Policy HE then I suggest that the text on page 50 of the Plan, under this Objective needs to remove the last two sentences of the 3rd paragraph as this reflects a subjective opinion that has not been substantiated.

5.8 B - INFRASTRUCTURE

- 5.8.1 This section of the Plan sets out a series of bullet points which relate to services, including flood defence and water pressure and refers to two of the original Objectives of the Plan but

not to Objective 12. As indicated above, Policy HE7 could be relocated to this Section and reference made to Objective 12. This is an observation and not a formal requirement.

5.8.2 Three policies are presented and while two relate directly to the Objectives cited, the policy relating to dark skies seems to be an anomaly. While it is not entirely incongruous to include this policy within this section of the Plan, the LPA and QB might consider relocating it to sit within the previous section dealing with the environment as it is dealing with the impact of light on the character of the area.

5.8.3 I should stress again that this is an observation as opposed to a formal recommendation and the following section of my report addresses the policies as they have been presented to me;

INF1 – Dark Skies

5.8.4 I note the community's stance on this issue and the consultation comments as the Plan has progressed. However I raise the following points;

- *The requirement to achieve a specific lighting level is restrictive and has not been robustly justified.*
- *The claim that a dark location reduces the 'likelihood' of burglaries has not been explained fully and indeed has been questioned by at least one consultee. If this reference is to remain it should be substantiated.*
- *The second paragraph of supporting text refers to PIR which needs to be explained and set out in full.*
- *The reference to the Institution of Lighting Professionals' guidance needs to be qualified by the addition of 'or equivalent superseding guidance'. If the policy text is modified as below, then the need to include Table 1 is removed. If the text remains as presented, then Table 1 needs to clarify the reference to 'see plan below' in the final column and clarify why the whole of the NP area is considered to fall under Zone E1.*

5.8.5 I note that the justification text refers to the 'Gladman Inspector's Report' and the Ashford Borough Council Dark Skies SPD. As noted earlier in my report, these should be the subject of cross referencing to an Appendix setting out the evidence base for the Plan.

5.8.6 I note the reference to saved Local Policy PR8 and relevant elements of the NPPF but that the emerging Core Strategy does not consider the issue of dark skies. I am also aware that some lighting is deemed to be permitted development under current regulations and that the County Highway Authority have powers to introduce street lighting.

5.8.7 Further to these comments, **I recommend that the supporting text as presented is deleted and replaced with the following;**

Welford is currently devoid of street lighting and has very few areas which are permanently lit overnight. New development is encouraged to adopt an environmentally sustainable approach, supporting a dark skies environment.

Applications for developments will be encouraged to assess the need for the lighting scheme and consider whether the development could take place without lighting.

Flood lighting for recreational facilities is encouraged to be onto non-reflective surfaces using directional lighting.

Local Planning Authorities are recommended to distinguish between broad areas that merit different levels of lighting control, as outlined in the Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP), Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution (2011) or equivalent superseding guidance. This is supported as it can help assess the impacts of external artificial lighting.

5.8.8 The text of Policy INF1 should be modified to read as follows;

Where requiring external lighting, new development should aim to minimise light pollution. It should demonstrate how it accords with the current professional guidance to achieve an appropriate lighting environment for the area

INF2 – Infrastructure

5.8.9 I note the intent of this policy and consider that the justification bullet points are appropriate. However, while the evidence base exists to support the policy, it has been poorly referenced and hence the supporting text should be redrafted to address this.

5.8.9 *The third paragraph on page 26, uses the word 'require'. I consider this should be replaced with 'encourage' and similarly in the 4th paragraph on page 26, the use of 'mitigation must be provided....' should be replaced with 'is encouraged to be provided....'*

5.8.10 To remove ambiguity, and to reflect the core infrastructure services highlighted at the beginning of Section B, I recommend that the wording of policy INF2 requires modification as follows;

New development should have regard to the following core infrastructure services delivered to the area ; superfast broadband, a mains water supply, flood defence measures relating to the River Avon; the control of surface and waste water and the reliable supply of electricity.

Any development proposal that could have a detrimental effect on, or would interrupt the provision of these services, will be resisted unless it is fully supported by an implementable mitigation scheme.

INF3 - Access to Primary Education

5.8.11 The supporting text to this policy is noted although references have been included which I do not consider have been fully explained.

5.8.12 The reference to 'new residential development' is all encompassing. Given its context, it is suggested that the supporting text or the policy itself should explain that the policy relates to residential development that *'has the potential for occupation that would generate a need for primary school places'*

5.8.13 Reference to a '6 miles upper limit' to a choice of school' and the subsequent 15 mile upper limit for schools chosen for religious reasons, has been included within the policy text and supporting text with reference to the DfE statutory guidance of July 2014. However, this guidance relates to the requirement of a local education authority to provide suitable travel arrangements for school children and this should be explained in the supporting text. As presented, the policy is therefore considered overly prescriptive.

5.8.15 I recommend therefore, that the policy should be modified as follows;

New residential development which could generate a need for school places, will be supported where there are adequate primary school places at local schools or where the development includes proposals to allow adequate places to be created.

This should preferably concern Welford on Avon Primary School or other local schools readily accessed by school bus or public transport.

5.9 C - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

5.9.1 While not explicitly explained, it is assumed that this section has been included within the Plan to reflect the original vision and objectives as set out at the beginning of the Plan. Objective 4 specifically refers to the support for an 'expanded range of community and business activities including a flourishing home working economy'.

5.9.2 I note that the QB suggest that the saved policies within the Local Plan are sufficient to address this and emerging Core Strategy policies in their current form are also expected to support appropriate economic activity. However, no specific reference is made to any section of the NPPF and no definitive policies are being proposed that would relate to the Welford area.

5.9.3 While it lies at the discretion of the QB as to what formal policies it brings forward, I find this omission odd given Objective 4 and the opportunity that the QB has to address this.

5.9.4 However, I note the very broad the reference to the NPPF and the assumption that the QB are content that this and any emerging Core Strategy policies will suffice in supporting appropriate economic development.

5.9.5 I question whether the section should be included within the Plan, but not to the degree that it renders the Plan overall as non-compliant.

5.10 D - HOUSING AND LAND USE

5.10.1 Given that this section addresses more than just housing issues, I consider that list of Objectives within the introduction is appropriate. However I note that Objective 5 includes reference to primary health care services which is not included in the Objective as presented in the Introductory Section of the Plan. I suggest that these need to be consistent.

5.10.2 I consider that the 'principles of housing development' would benefit from the addition of relevant references to national policy as found in the NPPF.

5.10.3 I note that the Housing Context section refers to the SDC Local Plan 2006 – 2011 and specifically on saved policies but it then explains appropriately that policies STR1, STR2 and COM1 are out of date and superseded by the NPPF.

5.10.4 I find that the subsequent explanation of the Core Strategy process, housing numbers and the distribution of development process is lengthy but the implications in terms of new housing for Welford have been appropriately expressed. My concern is that this may become dated as and when the Core Strategy is adopted and hence be confusing. As noted earlier in my report, I am aware that the progress of the Core Strategy has been delayed and additional information requested by the Inspector presiding over the Core Strategy Inquiry has only recently been compiled by the LPA and hence has not been taken into account within the Welford NP.

- 5.10.5 This information has not been the subject of review by the Inspector and the emerging Core Strategy policies as referred to in the Welford Plan have not been adopted. While some emerging Core Strategy policies have been adopted on an interim basis by the LPA, I understand that emerging policies CS15 to CS19 do not fall into this group. Nevertheless, in his Interim Findings, following the first Inquiry, the Inspector advised that the approach taken with regard to the allocation of new housing across the different categories of Local Service Villages, was acceptable and the quantum or share of development would stay the same.
- 5.10.6 If this is the case then Welford as a Category 2 Local Service Village would need to accommodate 84 new dwellings within the plan period 2011 to 2031. I note that the Table on page 32 of the Welford Plan sets out the consents issues since 2011. As at 29th July 2015, across the Parish, these totalled 109 with some applications awaiting determination and others on appeal.
- 5.10.7 I note that some of the permissions included within the table do not relate to sites within the village and hence the comparison with the emerging Core Strategy requirement for Welford is not accurate. The LPA have advised that as at October 2015, 88 units have been either been completed, or committed with a resolution to grant within the village boundary. Given the current context, it is understood that the new development that has taken place or is consented to take place in Welford, exceeds the numbers proposed in the emerging Core Strategy.
- 5.10.8 The village boundary is indicated at Fig 8. I have previously commented that this has been poorly reproduced and should be substituted with a clearer map at an appropriate scale that more accurately reflects the extent of existing and permitted development at Welford and remove other annotations.
- 5.10.9 The paragraph on page 33 relating to 'Approach to housing policy taken in the Welford Plan' currently refers to Policy HE6. This might be a typographical error as Policy HE5 would be more relevant. **In any event, it is important to redraft this paragraph in line with my recommendations for Policies HLU1 and HE5.** The reference to development only being supported outside the village boundary on brownfield sites does not accurately reflect policy HE5.
- 5.10.10 The rationale for not identifying additional sites within the NP as set out on page 34 of the Plan, is considered appropriate. However, it is important that the Plan very clearly acknowledges that there could be a need to review the village boundary and indeed the LPA may need to identify additional housing sites depending on the findings of the Inspector following the resumed Core Strategy Inquiry.
- 5.10.11 I note that this is acknowledged on pages 33 and 34 of the Plan but I consider it needs to be highlighted and as I have noted earlier, other proposed policies will be affected by any village boundary change and need to acknowledge this possibility.
- 5.10.12 If the overall housing need for the District is found to be higher following the adoption of the Core Strategy then Welford on Avon may need to accommodate more units. Whether this is the case or not, the LPA is to prepare a Site Allocations Plan to identify the appropriate location for new housing. This could result in land at Welford being considered and the village boundary being amended.
- 5.10.13 In the light of this, I now comment on the proposed policies within the Housing and Land Use section;

HLU1 – New Residential Development

5.10.14 Further to my comments above, I have concerns with respect to the drafting of this policy and of the restrictive tone of the supporting text. Should further development take place or be allocated to Welford, it would need to address infrastructure constraints. Existing problems would not necessarily mean that future growth should be resisted.

5.10.15 *As such I suggest that the first paragraph of text on page 35 should simply comprises the first two sentences.*

5.10.16 The premise for the second paragraph in terms of 'well exceeded any likely target in the emerging Core Strategy' is questioned, given the clarification issued by the LPA. The last clause of this paragraph does not acknowledge the potential for Welford to accommodate growth beyond the existing village boundary and hence should be amended accordingly by the addition of '*unless the LPA consider that the village needs to accommodate further development following preparation of the District's Site Allocation Plan and all necessary design, environmental and technical implications are addressed.*'

5.10.17 *The third paragraph of the supporting text and corresponding element of the policy relating to transport assessments or statements are not robustly justified in terms of the evidence base and also should be deleted. Similarly the justification text with NPPF para 32 should remove all text starting with 'Because of the existing traffic constraints.....'*

5.10.18 The policy refers to 'Approximate Upper Limit' and an explanation is given in the preceding general text but its inclusion within the policy is considered restrictive.

5.10.19 The policy refers to 'close proximity' which is ambiguous given the restrictive tone of the policy. It has not been fully justified in terms of robust evidence and no indication has been given as to how this elements will be monitored.

5.10.20 The decision to use the threshold of five units while explained in the accompanying justification text in terms of existing highway concerns in the village, appears to reflect local opinion and not based on any robust evidence other than an assumption sites would be classified as 'windfalls'. Furthermore, the justification text suggest that if impacts are identified that these would need to be addressed but this is not transferred into the wording of the policy.

5.10.21 The reference to '5 dwellings' is inconsistent with policy HE5 where no similar restriction is presented for development of land beyond the built up boundary. I have previously commented on the need for any map to accurately effect the built up boundary and **figure (8) needs to be improved accordingly.**

5.10.22 **Hence, in addition to and reflecting the above, I recommend that Policy HLU1 is modified as follows;**

New residential development will have specific regard to the role of Category 2 Local Service Villages and if proposed within the built up area boundary of Welford on Avon will be encouraged to comprise infill sites. New residential development beyond the boundary will reflect Policy HE5.

All proposals that have the potential to generate significant amounts of movement need to clarify how the existing highway network can accommodate this, or be improved to accommodate the impact.

HLU2 – Phasing of New Residential Development

5.10.23 Given the nature and size of proposed new housing as set out in the NP, this policy would appear to be overly onerous and unnecessary. No reference has been made to any relevant sections of the NPPF, no saved local plan policies have been highlighted and the emerging Core Strategy policy CS.16, or equivalent, would apply in any event.

5.10.24 Hence the policy can be deleted.

HLU3 – Design Excellence

5.10.25 Although this policy is not supported by any explanatory text and simply relies on a set of justification bullet points, these are generally considered appropriate. However the local character of the area should be highlighted to reflect NPPF para 58. As written the policy doesn't distinguish between minor or major works and simply repeats a general approach to design. While this is helpful, it would be better included as supporting text, rather than as a formal part of the policy.

5.10.26 Accordingly, I recommend that Policy HLU3 be modified as follows;

New development is encouraged to adopt high levels of design quality. Where appropriate depending on its scale and nature, it should have regard to the Stratford on Avon Design Guide and Building for Life 12 criteria, or equivalent superseding guidance.

Particular encouragement is given to proposals that demonstrate innovation and/or reflect the Welford on Avon Village Design Statement in reflecting the character and vernacular of the area.

5.10.27 I suggest that additional supporting text then refers to the following;

Development proposals, where appropriate, depending on their scale and nature, should demonstrate how they have respected

- *established building lines and the rhythm of the architecture including the separation between buildings, and between buildings and site boundaries,*
- *established plot widths, density, footprint and scale in the immediate vicinity*
- *the amenity of neighbouring properties,*

HLU4 – Footpaths and Cycle ways

5.10.28 It would be consistent if appropriate reference to the NPPF is included with the supporting text or justification section.

5.10.29 The first paragraph of this policy reflects policy HE7 which I have suggested should be modified to take into account permitted development rights. On the basis that Policy HE7 is amended, this element of Policy HLU4 can be deleted.

5.10.30 The third bullet point of this policy is overly prescriptive. The design of footpaths is controlled by the Highway Authority which in this case is the County Council. This element should be deleted from the policy.

5.10.31 The policy refers to development in the vicinity of the footpath and cycle network and the potential to extend and develop footpaths. If this was a pre-requisite of any formal application,

depending on its scale and nature, in the opinion of the LPA, it would be addressed through condition or legal obligation.

5.10.32 Accordingly, to enable Policy HLU4 to be compliant, I recommend it be modified to read;

Development sites that abut public rights of way, including footpaths and/or cycle ways, are encouraged to consider the use of natural hedging as a boundary treatment in order to enhance the environmental and public amenity of these paths.

Development, of an appropriate scale and nature, in the vicinity of this network, will be encouraged to include proposals that connect to existing cycle ways and footpaths and improve access and safety for all users

HLU5 - New Residential Development Mix and Type

5.10.33 I note the evidence base for this policy and the community surveys and consider the policy to be appropriate and compliant.

HLU6 – Garden and Back-Land Development

5.10.34 The third bullet point of this policy includes reference to supporting development providing it does not have the potential for loss of amenity of neighbouring properties through a list of elements. This list is acceptable with the exception of '.....visual intrusion by a building or structure.....' There is no 'right to a view' and hence this reference would introduce an element that might not be supported in law. The list also refers to the loss of mature vegetation or landscaping screening. These elements could be mitigated through conditions attached to any planning permission and hence would appear to be onerous.

5.10.35 For the avoidance of ambiguity and to enable compliance, I recommend that Policy HLU6 is modified as follows;

Development in residential gardens, back-land development and tandem development will be supported if it:

- **does not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area and neighbouring properties;**
- **does not have the potential for loss of amenity of neighbouring properties; through loss of privacy, loss of daylight or loss of car parking and**
- **is of a scale and size suitable for the plot.**

HLU7 – Development at the village edge

5.10.36 It is assumed that this policy refers to development at the edge but within village boundary. However the reference to the findings in the Gladman Inquiry (2014) within the justification text, presents some ambiguity. This needs to be explained to avoid any confusion with Policy HE5.

5.10.37 I have already expressed the need for the Plan to fully acknowledge the potential for the village boundary to be amended. It may be helpful to refer to this again though an addition to the supporting text for this policy. This would not detract from the essence of Policy HLU7 as the principles would remain in place, regardless of the position of the village boundary.

5.10.38 While the reference to mitigation of the potential of flooding at bullet point 4 of the Policy may better sit better as part of Policy HE9, in accept that policy deals with Zones 2 and 3 within the flood plain. The potential development, the subject of Policy HLU7, could sit beyond this. As such, I consider that it is appropriate to include this element within this policy.

5.10.39 I recommend that Policy HLU7 is compliant providing the second bullet point is modified to read;

- **Not reduce the impact or result in the loss of distinguishing natural features, such as tree lines, that could not otherwise be replaced or addressed through mitigation such as the planting of appropriate new vegetation.**

HLU8 – Height of Buildings

5.10.40 I consider that the rationale for this policy has not been adequately explained and while the local survey was supportive, no appropriate reference has been made to national or strategic policy. It is presumed that the basis for the policy concerns the wish to maintain the character of the area and not introduce incongruous development but this is not expressed and in any event, I consider that this is taken into account through Policy HLU3 which addresses design matters.

5.10.41 Hence I see no reason to include this policy and it can be deleted.

HLU9 – Caravan Sites

5.10.42 While I note the community's stance on this matter, I find that this policy as written is overly restrictive. No reference has been made to emerging Core Strategy policy nor regard given to sections of the NPPF which clearly supports a range of different forms of housing. I consider, however that paragraphs 17, 58, 50 and 66 of the NPPF which have been cited in the SBC, are relevant.

5.10.43 I note the reference to saved Local Plan policy CTY8 and the results of the community surveys but consider that the former does not entirely reflect the NPPF and the latter is an indication of local feeling as opposed to being based on any robust or proportionate evidence.

5.10.44 I am aware that some mobile units can be occupied for the greater part of any year and note the comments through the consultation period that the additional impact on the village should they be permanently occupied, could be nominal.

5.10.45 As presented, Policy HLU9 is not considered consistent with other proposed policies in the Plan addressing development beyond the village boundary or supported by robust evidence. It is not considered to support elements of the Basic Conditions and **hence should be deleted, unless it is modified as follows;**

Applications for new caravan sites for holiday or permanent residence, or proposals to amend extant permission for holiday caravans to allow for permanent residency, will be assessed on their individual merits.

Proposals should address how they impact upon the resources of the area, and those specifically within Welford on Avon, and where applicable, how this could be mitigated.

6.0 GLOSSARY AND APPENDICES

6.1 While my role is to assess the policies within the NP, I consider comment on the appendices and Glossary of Terms may be helpful.

6.2 Generally, the glossary as included within the NP is useful and has been well set out. There are some errors and to avoid misleading any reader, I have had regard to the LPA's suggestions and agree that the following should be considered;

Affordable Housing – This does not necessarily involve public funding

Approximate Upper Limit - The reference to the specific number of units within Welford on Avon in the second sentence is considered out of date and should be removed. The first sentence of this definition is sufficient.

Backland Development – is misleading and could be amended to read 'Development of landlocked sites behind existing buildings, such sites often have no street frontage'

Brownfield – Park and recreation grounds need to added to the list within the second sentence

Development Plan Documents – remove the reference to 'emerging' and add 'and the travelling community' to the end of the second bullet point

Emerging Core Strategy – to avoid confusion, this should remove the reference to 'emerging' and simply concern a clear definition as opposed to subjective comment. The definition presented by the LPA is considered appropriate 'Provides the strategic context for development decisions in the District up to 2013. Its purpose is to provide a spatial vision for the District and set out a development strategy and appropriate policies to guide housing, employment, infrastructure and service provision'

Greenfield – should simply include a definition rather than comment. 'Land that has not been previously developed including land in agricultural us, private gardens, parks, playing fields and allotments'

Local Development Scheme – replace text with 'A public statement of an LPA's programme for the production of Local Development Documents. The LDS is reviewed and updated on a regular basis to reflect changes in circumstances.'

Site of Special Scientific Interest – The definition could simply concern the first two sentences with the remaining text moved to sit within the body of the Plan, potentially as part of the initial pen picture of the village.

6.3 Maps and figures throughout the Plan, together with the Appendices, need to be amended in line with my recommended modifications. As they are presented the Appendices are considered helpful but as identified within my report, additional information and summaries could be included, such as a clear list detailing the Evidence Base. The QB and LPA may also wish to consider relocating the list of saved Local Plan and emerging Core Strategy policies, which support specific policies, to an appendices, as opposed to including this within the main body of the Plan.

7.0 REFERENDUM

- 7.1 The decision to progress the NP to a referendum is at the discretion of the LPA and the QB who may wish to review elements of the Plan before proceeding.
- 7.2 However if the decision is made to proceed with the Welford Neighbourhood Plan, then I confirm that the Referendum Area should reflect the approved Neighbourhood Area and does not need to be extended beyond this, in any way.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 Further to my findings above, I conclude that, clarification of matters relating to the SEA Screening Report need to be presented, and that a number of specific modifications need to be made to the Welford Neighbourhood Plan. I have endeavoured to present my proposed changes in such a way so as not to undermine the vision or objectives of the Plan but given the nature of these modifications, I strongly suggest that they are discussed with the QB.
- 8.2 As noted above, I am aware of the imminent Core Strategy Inquiry and the potential for the housing needs across the District to result in additional residential land being required. This could impact on Welford as Category 2 Local Service Village, in the form of the emerging Site Allocations Plan which might in turn require amendment of the extant village boundary.
- 8.3 I have suggested a number of alterations to the supporting text within the Plan which I consider would acknowledge this and, if addressed, provide for a clearer and more robust document.
- 8.4 Given the extent of my suggestions and recommendations and the impact on some proposed policies, the LPA and QB may consider reviewing elements of the Plan and/or undertaking a further period of consultation.
- 8.5 However, if the Plan is to proceed to a Referendum then I consider that my recommended modifications to specific policies need to be taken into account and addressed to allow compliance with the Basic Conditions.
- 8.6 In conclusion, only subject to these modifications, do I consider that the Welford Neighbourhood Plan complies with the legal requirements set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and hence should proceed to a Referendum.

Louise Brooke-Smith, BSc(Hons), DipTP, FRICS, MRTPI

Brooke Smith Planning Consultants Ltd - November 2015

Appendix A – Documents reviewed as part of the Examination Process of the Welford-on-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan

Index of Examination Documents;

Document Number	Name of document
1	Neighbourhood Area Designation Application
2	Map of Designation Area
3	Area Designation Public Notification
4	Area Designation Cabinet Report
5	Minutes of Cabinet Meeting
6	Area Designation – letter of confirmation from SDC
7	Pre-Submission Draft of NDP
8	List of Statutory Consultees and other Organisations
9	SDC comments on pre-submission draft NDP
10	SEA Screening Document
11	Letters to Statutory Consultees
12	SEA consultation response – Environment Agency
13	SEA consultation response – Historic England
14	SEA consultation response – Natural England
15	SEA screening opinion confirmation letter – SDC
16	Formal Submission of NDP to SDC – email from PC
17	Submission draft of NDP
18	Health Check of NDP by NPIERS
19	Basic Conditions Statement
20	Consultation Statement and supporting documents as held on NP web site.
21	Public Notice of 'formal' consultation by SDC
22	SDC consultation letter and 'mail merge'
23	Letter to PC to distribute public notices advertising consultation process + copy of poster
24	Press release
25	Consultation questionnaire
26	SDC comments on submission draft NDP

27	Schedule of Regulation 16 representations
28	'Topline' results of representations made via SNAP
29	List of Evidence Base documents supplied by SDC The Evidence Base documents used in the production of the Welford-on-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan have been accessed via LPA / NP / Parish Council's websites.
30	Details on current housing numbers and settlement boundary
31	Core Strategy (as issued in Sept 2014) showing modifications June 2015, Inspectors Interim Conclusions, March 2015
32	SADC Policy Advice Note; Neighbourhood Planning June 2015 Proposed modifications to Core Strategy SADC Aug 2015
33	Saved Local Plan Policies – Consistency with NPPF

Index of Representation Documents

Document Number	Name of Representative	Rep. No.
34	Historic England	WNP01
35	Natural England	WNP02
36	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	WNP03
37	The Coal Authority	WNP04
38	Warwickshire County Council	WNP05
39	Warwickshire & West Mercia Police	WNP06
40	A.S. Planning Ltd	WNP07
41	Framptons	WNP08
42	Gladman Developments	WNP09

43	Stratford-on-Avon District Council	WNP10
44	Consolidated schedule of representations	*Includes: Coventry Airport – WNP11 Inland Waterways Association – WNP12 A. Brookes – WNP13 M. Crump – WNP14 S. Read – WNP15 H. Lord – WNP16
45	SDC Consultation Results 'top line' analysis document	Analysis document includes representations listed above