

Shipston-on-Stour Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 Representations: By Contributor

Rep. No.	Policy/Topic	Representation
SNP1	EC1, EC2, EC3, EC4, EC5, EC6, EC7, INF2, INF3, FLD1, FLD2, FLD3, ENV1, ENV2, ENV4, EMV5, HSG1, HSG2, HSG5	Support (no further comment provided)
	HSG7, HSG8	Object (no further comment provided)
	INF1	Support – This is a very good plan but with a serious flaw and it is telling I could not find a suitable place to make the comment There are two things missing in Shipston 1. a decent supermarket although space is shown on the development on the north side of Campden Road for retail. The town is missing out in this respect to places like Moreton in Marsh, Wellesbourne and Chipping Norton. All of which have recently opened new supermarkets. Why should Shipston people have to travel out of town to a reasonably large supermarket and 2. a petrol station the two nearest petrol stations are very expensive. So what do we do we go to the out of town petrol station and supermarket at the same time. Shipston is loosing jobs and business to these towns
	ENV3	Support – The housing needs for 2031 have been or are well on the way to being met. Further large scale housing needs should be resisted
	HSG3	Support – The resistance of the Town Council to development of accommodation for the elderly on South Lynn gardens seems to go against this policy

	HSG4 HSG6	Support – Small developments within the total housing targets Support – Within the total housing package plan I hope
SNP2	General EC1, EC2, ENV2, ENV5 ENV3, ENV4	<p>The Submission Draft of the Shipston-on-Stour Neighbourhood Plan is out for consultation, so we take the opportunity to congratulate the team that put it together on a sturdy, perceptive and thoroughly comprehensive piece of work.</p> <p>Evidently, Shipston-on-Stour is fully aware of the problems that it faces, principally to ensure that the commercial heart of the town, the range of traditional shops, is not lost to the larger stores at Stratford-upon-Avon and elsewhere, and the need for a town that has expanded very rapidly indeed over the past decade or so to designate open spaces, lungs to give the town breath and places where the public can exercise and relax.</p> <p>Quite clearly, Policies EC1 and EC2 are particularly important, small businesses need all the encouragement they can get, as is ENV2, which seeks to designate land on either side of the town as Local Green Spaces. Given the current pressure on land, this is absolutely essential if the town is to retain a rural ambience. Policy ENV5, which treats of parks and public open spaces, also names two Well Being Zones. The Neighbourhood Plan Team has researched this matter very extensively indeed. We very much hope that the Local Green Spaces and Well Being Zones will be designated as they appear on the relevant map in the N.D.P.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans generally contain a policy that seeks to maintain and enhance the distinctiveness of particular areas, but in practice such policies, like the ones in the Core Strategy, can remain aspirations unless they are rigorously applied. ENV3 reads well; we hope that it will be firmly and literally interpreted. ENV4 treats of designated heritage assets, including the Conservation Area. Again, it is vitally important that this policy is effectively employed.</p> <p>We wish this neighbourhood plan the success it so thoroughly deserves and would like to see the policies in this draft appear, just as they are, in the Referendum Version, without any weakening or watering down. We look forward to seeing it adopted in the New Year.</p>

SNP3	General	The plan area is not within close proximity to our network and therefore the Canal and River Trust have no comments to make.
SNP4	General	Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.
SNP5	<p>EC1, EC2, EC3, EC5, EC7, INF1, INF3, FLD1, FLD2, FLD3, ENV1, ENV3, ENV4, HSG2, HSG5, HSG6, HSG7, HSG8</p> <p>EC4</p> <p>EC6</p> <p>INF2</p> <p>ENV2</p> <p>ENV5</p> <p>HSG1</p> <p>HSG3</p> <p>HSG4</p>	<p>Support (no further comment provided)</p> <p>Support – this appears to have been superceeded</p> <p>Support – Supporting tourism initiatives as part of the local Tourism Group</p> <p>Support – I support this as long as there is a balance with the needs of the businesses in town</p> <p>Support – I am supportive of the green spaces policy as long as there is consideration of the needs of local farmers and their businesses</p> <p>Support – within the town this seems vital</p> <p>Support – vital need to keep local people local</p> <p>Support – Any options which allow people to remain local as they downsize</p> <p>Support – With special reference to affordable local housing</p>

plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for housing, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is also applicable to neighbourhood plans.

Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes clear that the presumption In favour has Implications for how communities engage in neighbourhood planning, stating that neighbourhoods should;

- **“Develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out In Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development;**
- **Plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan; and**
- **Identify opportunities to use Neighbourhood Development Orders to enable developments that are consistent with their neighbourhood plan to proceed.”**

Furthermore, paragraph 17 sets out that neighbourhood plans should define a succinct and positive vision for the future of the area and that neighbourhood plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. In addition, neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.

Further guidance for groups involved with the production of neighbourhood plans is specified at paragraph 184;

“Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their community. The ambition of the neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date

Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.”

This makes clear that the ambition of the neighbourhood plan should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area as confirmed in the adopted Development Plan. It is therefore important that sufficient flexibility is included within the Plan so that it is able to respond positively to changing circumstances which can arise through the preparation of any future emerging Local Plan.

Planning Practice Guidance

It is clear from the requirements in the Framework that neighbourhood plan policies should be prepared in general conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider areas, as confirmed in an adopted Development Plan. The requirements set out in the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

The PPG emphasises the role in which local communities can support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.

Indeed, it states:

“... All settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas - and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.”

The approach taken through a number of policies contained in the Plan are considered inconsistent with the approach taken in the Framework and PPG and will be discussed in greater detail throughout this response.

	ENV1	<p>that it identifies projects that the Steering Group will seek to direct CIL receipts on, this is more akin to an aspiration of the Plan and is better suited to an appendix of the SoSNP as opposed to being contained in the policy itself.</p> <p>Gladman would be opposed to the use of the definition of a built up boundary if this would preclude the delivery of sustainable development opportunities being delivered on the edge of the built up area as it would not have regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development as required by the Framework</p> <p>Gladman consider that policy ENV1 should be modified to ensure a consistent approach to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is seen as the golden thread through both plan making and decision taking. The following wording is put forward for consideration:</p> <p>‘When considering development proposals, the Shipston.vn-Stour Neighbourhood Plan will take a positive approach to new development that seeks to deliver sustainable development. Applications that accord with the policies of the Development Plan and the Shipston-on-Stour Neighbourhood Plan will be supported particularly where they provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New homes including market and affordable housing to meet identified housing needs; or - Opportunities for new business facilities through new or expanded premises; or - Opportunities to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the neighbourhood area. <p>Development adjacent to the existing built-up-area will be supported provided that any adverse impacts do not significant and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development</p>
	ENV2	<p>Gladman reiterate the concerns raised in response to the Regulation 14 consultation.</p> <p>The plan intends to designate two parcels of land as Local Green Space (IGS) to protect the countryside. In order to designate land as IGS the Town Council must ensure that It is able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet national policy requirements set out in the Framework. The Framework makes clear at §76 that the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of</p>

sustainable development for the wider area. Paragraph 76 states that:

“Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. **Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period**”

Further guidance is provided at §77 which sets out three tests that must be met for the designation of LGS and states that:

‘The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- Where the green space is reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the advice and guidance contained in the PPG.

Gladman note paragraph 007 of the PPG which states,

“Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used or in a way that undermines the aim of plan making.”

Of further note is paragraph 015 of the PPG (1037-015) which states,

“Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently, blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a ‘back door’ way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name.’

Designation of LGS should not be used as a mechanism to designate new areas of Green Belt (or similar), as the designation of Green Belt is inherently different and must meet a set of stringent tests for its allocation (paragraphs 82 to 85 of the Framework).

The issue of whether LGS meets the criteria for designation has also been explored in a number of Examiner’s Reports across the country and highlight the following decisions:

The Blackwell Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s Report recommended the deletion of two LGS designations measuring approximately 19ha and 32ha respectively and found both designations did not have regard to national policy which states that LGS should only be used where the area concerned ‘is not an extensive tract of land.’

- The Seldlescombe Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s Report recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately 4.5ha as it was found to be an extensive tract of land.
- The Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s Report recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately 5ha and also found this area not to be local in character. Thereby failing to meet 2 of the 3 tests for LGS designation.
- The Airewas Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s Report identifies that both sites proposed as LGS in the neighbourhood plan ‘in relation to the overall size of Airewas Village’ to be extensive tracts of land. The Examiner in this instance recommended the deletion of the proposed LGSs which measured approximately 2.4ha and 3.1ha.

Gladman contends that as LGS2 is 18.24ha it is indeed an extensive tract of land; and as such conflicts with §77 of the Framework and the designation should be removed. The Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan does not deem it

		Overall Historic England considers that the Shipston-on-Stour Neighbourhood Plan is a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document that constitutes a very good example of community led planning. Beyond those observations we have no substantive comments to make
SNP9	ENV1	Support is given to the defined built-up area boundary as it affects the land at Ridgeway, London Road, and to the allocation of that land for housing development (Policy HSG7).
	ENV2	Linfoot Country Homes Ltd are the contracted purchaser of land at Ridgeway, London Road, and, subject to securing planning permission for housing on the allocated site (Policy HSG7), are able to deliver the transfer of the land identified as a Local Green Space close to the River Stour (LSG1) to the Town Council.
	ENV5	Linfoot Country Homes Ltd are the contracted purchaser of land at Ridgeway, London Road, and, subject to securing planning permission for housing on the allocated site (Policy HSG7), are able to deliver the transfer of the land identified as a Local Green Space close to the River Stour (LGS1) to the Town Council. The transfer of this land will assist the creation of the 'southern' well-being zone, in so far as it covers the land at Ridgeway, by allowing the Town Council to give public access to the proposed Local Green Space. In addition, as a further benefit to the public, Linfoot Country Homes Ltd are able to secure, subject to the grant of planning permission for housing on the allocated site (Policy HSG7), the provision of a riverside footpath running between the Local Green Space/southern well-being zone and the Willington footbridge over the River Stour.
	HSG2	Linfoot Country Homes Ltd support the provision of low cost market homes as part of the supply of affordable housing in the Plan area. They are able to deliver six affordable homes for sale on the land allocation for housing at Ridgeway, London Road (Policy HSG7) subject to the grant of planning permission.
	HSG6	Linfoot Country Homes Ltd are the contracted purchaser of land at Ridgeway, London Road and are actively pursuing proposals which accord with Policy HSG7. A detailed planning application is presently with the Local Planning Authority. Subject to the grant of planning permission Linfoot Country Homes Ltd are able to deliver the allocated site at Ridgeway; part of the southern well-being; and a riverside footpath. In addition, subject to the grant of planning permission, they are able to secure the transfer of the land covered by the Local Green Space designation (LGS1) to the Town Council, and thereby for it to provide public accessibility to the

	HSG7	<p>designated land. The potential release of land allocated under Policy HSG6 should not be seen as an alternative to land at Ridgeway (Policy HSG7) but additional to it. Part (a) of Policy HSG6 should be deleted from the Plan, or suitably reworded.</p> <p>Linfoot Country Homes Ltd are the contracted purchaser of the land affected by Policy HSG7, and presently have a detailed planning application with the Local Planning Authority, which accords with the Policy. Linfoot Country Homes Ltd are able to deliver the proposed development; part of the southern well-being zone; and a riverside footpath. In addition, subject to the grant of planning permission, they are able to secure the transfer of land covered by the Local Green Space designation (LGS1) to the Town Council, and thereby for it to provide accessibility to the designated land. Subject to the grant of planning permission it is expected that development on the site would commence in 2018.</p>
SNP10	<p>EC1, EC3, EC4, EC6, EC7, INF3, FLD1, FLD2, FLD3, ENV2, ENV5, HSG1, HSG2, HSG3, HSG4, HSG5, HSG6, HSG7, HSG8</p> <p>EC2</p> <p>EC5</p> <p>INF1</p> <p>INF2</p>	<p>Support (no further comment provided)</p> <p>Object – There are more than sufficient empty business premises within the town.</p> <p>Object – There are more than enough residential developments in train. I support any proposals to encourage the use of existing business and industrial premises</p> <p>Support – I generally support these proposals. However I am not aware of any significant proposals to increase car parking. It is essential that any alterations to parking include wider parking spaces.</p> <p>Please see my comments to the previous proposal. I have experienced an occasion where I could not gain access to my car because 2 4 x 4 vehicles were parked on either side of me.</p>

	ENV1	Object – Further development should not be supported unless accompanied by increased local employment. Otherwise Shipston is in increased danger of becoming just a dormitory town with the result that community spirit will be diminished.
	ENV3	Support – I support this, but believe that with the developments on the Campden Road and Springhill we have already been defeated in this respect.
	ENV4	Support 2) wording should be changed to “may”.
SNP11	EC1, EC2, EC3, EC4, EC5, EC6, EC7, INF3 FLD2, FLD3, ENV4, HSG2, HSG5, HSG7	Support (no further comment provided)
	HSG8	Object (no further comment provided)
	INF1	Support – This Policy interest is too broad, covering everything from very much needed physical infrastructure to environmental conservation
	INF2	Object – too little information on what this entails. Some highways works are vital but context is lacking
	FLD1	Support – Needs strengthening "SUDS" where appropriate is weak and easily bypassed. Not enough attention is given to drainage from new developments through existing parts of the town. Shoulderway lane development having 2 drainage catchments but only 1 SUDS option is a case in point
	ENV1	Object – I agree with the principle but not the proposed boundaries.
	ENV2	Object – Agree with the principle but this should include the land adjacent to the Hawthorn way estate originally earmarked as greenspace but later dropped. This has knock-on drainage issues not accounted for by the NP or development proposals

	ENV3	Support – However developers will walk all over the terms as set out above
	ENV5	Support – define substantially. Existing developments have already left these amenities in substantial deficit
	HSG1	Support – This should be the starting point of any new developments. We have enough large detached housing and not enough affordable housing and young peoples housing - however these are not attractive to developers.
	HSG3	Support – This should be second priority behind affordable young peoples housing.
	HSG4	Support – These should focus on increasing density in brownfield area of town
	HSH6	Support – Agree with (a) but not (b). Self builders can find other areas
SNP12	General	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>
SNP13	General	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.
SNP14	General	Network Rail has no comments.
SNP15	EC1, EC2, EV3, EC4, EC5, EC6, EC7, INF3, FLD2, FLD3, ENV1, ENV2, ENV4, ENV5, HSG1, HSG3, HSG4, HSG6, HSG7, HSG8	Support (no further comment provided)

	INF1	Support – Flood mitigation should be prioritised. A severe flood damages the town far more than any other risk.
	INF2	Support – The centre of the market square should be pedestrianised with parking at the edges.
	FLD1	Strongly support.
	ENV3	Support – Para 3 (d) should specifically include impact on parking.
	HSG5	Strongly support
SNP16	General	<p>We are writing to provide our response to the Shipston-on-Stour Neighbourhood Plan Submission Draft consultation on behalf of David Wilson Homes who have an interest in land at Shoulderway Lane.</p> <p>Site Context Our client’s land is located at the south-western edge of Shipston-on-Stour and comprises some 7 ha across two parcels of land. The first parcel is a field of low ground adjoining Shoulderway Lane, whilst the second parcel is a field to the north-west that extends up a hillside behind an existing housing estate.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Planning Under the provisions of the Localism Act 2011 and the more recent changes in the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017, neighbourhood planning provides communities with direct power to develop a shared vision and shape the development and growth of their local area. As a community-led framework, it should contain overarching strategic objectives in addition to more detailed planning policies.</p> <p>A Neighbourhood Plan should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development. Forming part of the statutory development plan upon adoption, a Neighbourhood Plan should therefore be prepared with wider considerations of the local authority in which it resides, and not operate in a vacuum.</p>

In the preparation stage of a Neighbourhood Plan, a draft Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force if it is to meet the basic conditions; in this instance this is the July 2016 Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy 2011 to 2031.

In considering whether a specific policy, and indeed a Neighbourhood Plan more widely, is in general conformity with the development plan, an Examining Inspector will need to consider the following, as set out by Planning Policy Guidance:

- “whether the neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal supports and upholds the general principle that the strategic policy is concerned with;
- the degree, if any, of conflict between the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal and the strategic policy;
- whether the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal provides an additional level of detail and / or a distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policy without undermining that policy; and
- the rationale for the approach taken in the draft neighbourhood plan or Order and the evidence to justify that approach.”

EC1

We object to Policy EC1.

We consider that more evidence is required to justify the inclusion of this list of upgraded or additional local facilities or services.

The explanatory text to this policy cites “upcoming major housing developments” that will increase pressures on community infrastructure and facilities. The objective of this Draft Policy is to secure funding to “maintain, enhance and add essential infrastructure and community facilities” to support both the local area and wider catchment.

We note that there are two items that have been included on this latest version of the Plan that were not on the previous iteration of the Plan, namely “works to the Townsend Hall” and “Additional Medical Centre healthcare capacity”.

We also note the Sustainability Appraisal included in the appendices of Basic Conditions Statement (April 2017) to support this Plan. It is noted that this Draft Policy will provide broad sustainable development improvements and we support this.

We support the principle of providing contributions to support local community infrastructure, but consider that more details are needed on the costs relating to the list of facilities and services sought through the Neighbourhood Plan and further details provided on the deliverability of such infrastructure where limited development is proposed in Shipston.

Proposals for residential development on land at Shoulderway Lane proposed by David Wilson Homes could significantly contribute to proposed local infrastructure and community facilities. The site has the opportunity to provide a range of both on-site and off-site contributions to community infrastructure. Without development, it is difficult to see how the proposals for a major Local Green Space can come forward. We are aware that the District presented their Draft CIL Charging Schedule to Council committee on 11 December where it was approved by Members and will come into effect 01 February 2018. Parishes with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will receive 25% of CIL revenues arising from development that takes place within that area.

Contributions that are secured through CIL and S106 obligations can contribute to providing new infrastructure in the town. Without major development proposals such as that proposed by David Wilson Homes at Shoulderway Lane it is difficult to see where the necessary funding for new infrastructure will be secured from. We have calculated that a proposed scheme at Shoulderway Lane, comprising c106 dwellings, calculated against the Draft Charging Schedule of £150 per sqm, would provide approximately £1 million to the District Council (based on 69 open market dwellings x 100sqm per dwelling x £150 per sqm). With an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, this would provide approximately £250,000 for the Town Council to contribute towards local facilities and services detailed in this policy.

We consider that these financial contributions would help to support the delivery of the local facilities and services detailed identified in the bullet points of policy EC1.

	FLD1	<p>We support Policy FLD1.</p> <p>We recognise that this policy will be of great importance to the town given the historical flooding and proximity to the River Stour. We are aware of the work of the Shipston Area Flood Action Group (SAFAG) in collaboration with the Town Council in seeking to alleviate and minimise flood risk in the town.</p> <p>This policy requires site-specific flood risk assessments to be submitted in support of planning applications. This is in-line with national policy and with District policy, specifically Core Strategy Policies CS.4 (Water Environment and Flood Risk) and Policy CS.2 (Climate Change and Sustainable Construction).</p> <p>We consider the site at Shoulderway Lane to be eminently suitable for development. In the flood-risk context, the entirety of the site is in Flood Zone 1 and can provide housing to meet the local need without giving rise to any greater flood risk in Shipston-on-Stour.</p>
	ENV2	<p>We support Policy ENV2.</p> <p>We support the LGS2 designation of land adjacent to Hanson Track as LGS but would welcome the Town Council's recognition that for such a proposal to be delivered it will require significant investment (development).</p> <p>We also wish to understand how the Council is addressing concerns raised in the evidence base for this specific area. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report (January 2017) in its assessment of the LGS2 Hanson Track allocation found that:</p> <p><i>"... it may be noted that this is a large tract of land and as such may not be considered compliant with the NPPF Paragraph 77 ...".</i></p> <p>This assertion was echoed in stronger terms by SoADC in its consultation response to the Issues and Options Plan, who were unequivocal in stating that:</p>

“... the proposed LGS at Hanson Hill is very extensive and it is not considered the proposed LGS complies with the provisions of para 77 of the NPPF in that it is clearly an extensive tract of land”.

Whilst it is stated in the explanatory text of Policy ENV2 that the “LGS designation criteria within paragraph 77 of the Framework have been applied”, we share the Council’s concern regarding the scale of LGS.

As part of a development scheme at Shoulderway Lane there would be an opportunity to provide a LGS. However, this would be much smaller in scale than proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. Fundamentally, any LGS requires funding and development is the most likely source of this.

A series of technical studies have been undertaken by our client who own control a parcel of land that is partly in the proposed LGS2 allocation. These studies reveal that this site represents a suitable, achievable and viable location for residential development.

Such a development would be of great benefit and a positive addition to the village and the wider area going forward, and most importantly provide a delivery mechanism for the proposed Local Green Space.

Previous objections from our client were made to the wording of development on this land being resisted “other than in very special circumstances”. As previously stated, Very Special Circumstances (VSCs) is a test that relates to development proposals in the Green Belt only, and should not be confused with LGSs nor should fall under the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan.

LGS1 is allocated immediately next to housing allocation HSG7 and is proposed to provide “near to riverside amenity open space”. We understand that there is a recent landowners’ agreement with the Town Council to provide this as gift land.

ENV3

We have no “in principle” objection to this allocation of LGS1.

We note this Neighbourhood Plan has incorporated suggested re-wording for this Policy from the District Council in their representations made to the Pre-Submission version of the Plan.

	ENV5	<p>We consider that by supporting development at Shoulderway Lane, David Wilson Homes can assist the Town Council in delivering enhancements to the Town’s landscape and provide significant investment in LGS.</p> <p>We support Policy ENV5.</p> <p>David Wilson Homes support the Town Council’s aspiration to improve / add play areas, parks and public open spaces to Shipston. However, in line with our representations to the proposals for LGS we consider that new development is the most likely way for the Town Council to secure these enhancements or additions to community facilities.</p>
	HSG1	<p>At the previous Issues and Options consultation, serious concerns were raised about the scope and function of the wording of the policy. We consider that by supporting development at Shoulderway Lane, the Town Council could successfully secure a greater amount of affordable housing.</p>
	HSG2	<p>We object to Policy HSG2.</p> <p>The objective of this draft policy is to “encourage schemes that can maintain a supply of low cost homes for purchase by younger persons and those locally employed as this will help to boost the local economy and will reduce the need for travel”. The wording of the draft policy needs more clarity and detail if this objective is going to be delivered.</p> <p>As with our earlier response to draft policy HSG1, we consider that David Wilson Homes can provide low cost market housing at Shoulderway Lane and thereby the Town Council can secure a greater amount of low cost housing.</p>
	HSG3	<p>We support Policy HSG3.</p> <p>David Wilson Homes support this policy and could support the Town Council’s aspiration for delivering “other accommodation” specifically designed for older persons by providing a new housing development at Shoulderway Lane.</p>

HSG6	<p>David Wilson Homes object to this policy as it does not go far enough in seeking to meet the strategic housing requirements identified in the District. We consider that land at Shoulderway Lane has the opportunity to provide contributions to many of the community projects that are being sought in the Neighbourhood Plan. As set out in previous representations the land at Shoulderway Lane could be included as a Reserve Site to meet the District's strategic housing needs.</p> <p>As set out in our representations to Draft Policy HSG2, we strongly consider that more land needs to be allocated for housing in Shipston.</p> <p>To provide one solitary safeguarded site with a capacity of 25 to 30 dwellings does under this draft policy does not go far enough in meeting the strategic housing requirements for the District. We consider that additional land should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan to provide Reserve Sites to support the District's housing requirement.</p> <p>Housing growth will be required in the Main Rural Centres (MRCs), of which Shipston-on-Stour is identified under Core Strategy Policy CS.1 (Distribution of Development). There is a District need for at least 14,600 homes to be built over the Plan Period, and in being identified as a suitable, sustainable location through the Core Strategy, Shipston should accommodate its proportional share.</p> <p>Reference is made in the Neighbourhood Submission Plan to a 2013 Housing Needs Survey that identified an unmet need at the time of at least 24 low cost market homes. Acknowledgement is then made to the likelihood that this need will increase over the plan period.</p> <p>Flexibility is therefore required to be able to accommodate any additional housing need going forward, both in terms of local needs arising from the role of Shipston in the District hierarchy as a Main Rural Centre. To achieve this, we consider that more housing land will be needed to robustly meet housing needs.</p> <p>Furthermore, Stratford-on-Avon is within close proximity of the Coventry and Warwickshire and Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Areas (HMAs). The Council is committed to working with authorities in each HMA in accordance with the Duty to Corporate.</p>
------	--

	HSG7	<p>As acknowledged in Policy CS.16 (Housing Development) and paragraph 1.3.8 of the Core Strategy, SoADC has a role to play in meeting the needs arising from both HMAs.</p> <p>As a MRC within the District, we consider that Shipston-on-Stour will need to provide its proportional contribution to accommodate the Stratford District housing need, and this role may grow further in time. As stated in Core Strategy Policy CS.16 (Housing Development), there is an approximate need for 3,800 homes to be delivered over the Core Strategy period in MRCs. This equates to 475 dwellings for each MRC, when simply divided by eight. However this does not take account of any restrictions arising from any of the MRCs which may have restrictions placed on their ability to deliver growth; for example being surrounded by Green Belt, which is not supported for release in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>We have produced a table below to illustrate the suitability of Shipston-on-Stour to accommodate growth, compared to the other MRCs. Policy CS.10 (Green Belt) of the adopted Core Strategy does not support the need for Green Belt release to support site allocations. Therefore we consider it is incumbent on Shipston Town Council to recognise the role that Shipston has to play in supporting the housing requirement across the District.</p> <p>We object to Policy HSG7.</p> <p>As per our responses to HSG2 and HSG6 we object to this policy as it does not go far enough in seeking to meet local needs. We consider that local housing needs extend beyond the simple arithmetic identified by the Town Council. We consider that there is a qualitative need and choice which has not been recognised by the Town Council assessment.</p> <p>There are other local requirements which include the need for people to downsize to smaller / modern properties which require less maintenance and are more energy efficient. In providing new houses, it would potentially release some of the longer existing housing stock for families to take up.</p>
--	------	--

Main Rural Centre	Surrounded by Green Belt (Y/N)	Neighbourhood Plan Made (Y/N)	Current/Emerging Proposals for Housing	Potential Deficit against Core Strategy Requirement
Alcester	Y	N	0	475
Bidford	N	Y – Made 17/07/17	0 (no delivery number provided in Plan)	475
Henley-in-Arden	Y	N	0	475
Kineton	N	Y – Made 24/10/16	200	275
Shipston-on-Stour	N	N	43-48	427-432
Southam	N	N	0	475
Studley	Y	N	0	475
Wellesbourne	N	N (submission report consultation concluded 24/11/17)	830	+355
			1073-1078	2722-2727

From the above table, it is clear that of the eight MRCs, only Shipston-on-Stour, Southam and Wellesbourne can accommodate additional reserve sites. Alcester, Henley-in-Arden and Studley are surrounded by the Green Belt and so is unlikely to be able to support growth of approximately 475 dwellings.

Furthermore whilst Wellesbourne & Walton Parish Council's Plan is not yet "made", they are in an advanced stage of preparation in progressing their Plan towards referendum. Wellesbourne & Walton Parish state that:

"by July 2016, Wellesbourne alone had contributed 830 homes, built or with planning approvals, which is of the order of 22% of the total envisaged contribution from all eight MRCs".

Having provided more than double the anticipated requirement this impacts on its ability to provide additional reserve sites going forward.

Of the 3,800 homes that are identified in the Core Strategy, realistically there are only three MRCs that can accommodate this identified housing need. This creates a deficit of approximately 2,700 dwellings that need to be accommodated in the Main Rural Centres. This deficit if divided amongst the three least unconstrained MRCs of Shipston, Southam and Wellesbourne, would mean an additional requirements of 290 dwellings would need to be added to the Core Strategy requirement of 475 dwellings. Therefore, where MRC's are unable to deliver their full requirement of circa 475 dwellings due to Green Belt constraints this will place a greater emphasis on unconstrained MRC's such as Shipston on Stour having to meet this shortfall and deliver around 765 dwellings.

The objective of this policy is to “identify and allocate an adequate reserve provision of housing land that will assist in meeting the town’s contribution to future District-wide strategic housing requirements from 2021 onward”.

We consider that Draft Policy HSG2 does not go far enough in recognising or meeting the contribution that is necessary for Shipston-on-Stour to provide support to the requirements for MRC's. Within the above context of constraints that affect five of the other MRCs, we consider that Shipston-on-Stour will need to provide a greater share of the identified housing need than 475 dwellings.

Furthermore, the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2017 (as amended) require Neighbourhood Plans to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area. It is our assertion that this Draft Policy is not in general conformity with the District’s Core Strategy Policies CS.15 (Distribution of Development) and CS.16 (Housing Development), based on the need for the identified MRCs, of which Shipston-on-Stour is one, to accommodate its reasonable share of dwellings to meet the Core Strategy requirements.

We consider that the Neighbourhood Plan should be providing a greater contribution to meeting the District’s housing need.

We also question the scale of the proposed Development Brief Area of Consideration at Tileman’s Lane. It is stated that:

“The Tileman’s Lane business areas and adjoining undeveloped land will in 2018-19, assuming the owners and occupiers participate, be the subject of a planning project to identify by way of a development brief the most appropriate and optimal future land-uses for the locality [...] the scope of the project will include the potential for establishing a business hub or centre which could act as the first step for new home and home-based businesses into a commercial environment”.

We consider that the evidence supporting this Development Brief area to be absent, with details of how the site will be deliverable to be vague and ambiguous at this stage. Furthermore, the terminology used requiring an assumption that the “owners and occupiers participate” is not sound as it does not provide confirmation on the availability or deliverability of this land.

Therefore we consider the fragmented nature of the site, in addition to the multiple ownership of the Tileman’s Lane site, to further impact on the availability and deliverability of this land.

It is our understanding through engagement with the Town Council and detailed in Section 2.5 of the Plan that some residential use has been proposed for this site. With details still very much undecided at this time, we do not consider it to be appropriate or sound to rely on this safeguarded site to deliver the additional housing required.

Furthermore, as acknowledged in Section 2.5 of the Plan, there have previously been concerns on highways access to the site that further impact on its potential deliverability.

David Wilson Homes’ land at Shoulderway Lane is an appropriate location for development that should be considered in this Plan. Technical work has been commissioned which demonstrates the site’s deliverability and potential to provide great benefit to the town and wider area.

Having reviewed the scheme in light of a refusal of planning permission (ref. 15/01478/FUL) on various design grounds David Wilson Homes revised their scheme. They commissioned MADE design review panel to prepare a Design Review Report and recent addendum. The Review highlights this site’s potential to accommodate development and successfully overcome the design concerns raised by SoADC. This report complemented and

	General	<p>strongly supported David Wilson Homes' landscape strategy based approach to the design of the indicative layout.</p> <p>Furthermore the design panel felt it important in progressing the design of this indicative scheme to demonstrate how the development would be a positive addition to the village. It was recommended as matter of critical importance that a high quality proposal is created that had a strong resonance with the existing town. This would very much be a priority for David Wilson Homes in any proposed scheme.</p> <p>They concluded that a good start had been made and that there is "clearly scope to create a high quality and sensitive development that could be seen as a positive addition to Shipston-on-Stour"</p> <p>A further addendum was produced in November 2017 that acknowledged that the Vision Document (please find attached) prepared on behalf of David Wilson Homes had responded positively to the MADE Design Review Report, incorporating their recommendations to deliver a high quality Vision Document.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Planning – Is this Draft Submission Plan in General Conformity with Strategic Policies of the Development Plan?</p> <p>As detailed at the start of this representation, we outlined the PPG guidance on general conformity and whether we believe the Shipston-on-Stour Draft Submission Neighbourhood Plan meet this criteria. For reference this PPG criteria is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether the neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal supports and upholds the general principle that the strategic policy is concerned with;• the degree, if any, of conflict between the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal and the strategic policy;• whether the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal provides an additional level of detail and / or a distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policy without undermining that policy; and• the rationale for the approach taken in the draft neighbourhood plan or Order and the evidence to justify that approach.
--	---------	--

In responding to the proposed housing policies, specifically draft policies HSG1, HSG2, HSG6 and HSG7, we consider that these policies are not in general conformity with the development plan.

We consider that draft policy HSG6 in particular does not go far enough in seeking to meet the strategic housing requirements that are clearly identified in the District. Core Strategy Policy CS.16 requires the eight MRCs to accommodate 3,800 homes over the plan period. As we have detailed in our response, the suitability of some of these MRCs has to be called into question, given restrictions on their ability to deliver the necessary growth; this is the case for Alcester, Henley-in-Arden and Studley in that they are surrounded by Green Belt and there is no support in the Core Strategy for release. Therefore there are going to be MRCs that are unable to deliver their full requirement of circa 475 dwellings per centre.

Shipston-on-Stour does not have such a restriction, and as such needs to accommodate its proportional share in compliance with the strategic requirements of the Core Strategy. We consider the figure of 43 to maximum of 48 houses currently proposed across draft policies HSG6 & HSG7 does not meet the current approximate share of 475 dwellings per centre required under strategic policy. Furthermore as we have detailed in our assessment of the centres, in actuality this figure of 475 will need to be higher, given the restrictions on the other MRCs to deliver this necessary growth. We have calculated this figure to be an additional 290 dwellings on top of the 475 Core Strategy strategic requirement, providing a revised figure of 765 dwellings.

Therefore we consider that on these particular housing matters, this Plan do not sufficiently support or uphold the general principle of Core Strategy policies CS.15 and CS.16. More work needs to be done to identify additional sites for housing that can better accommodate both the housing requirements of the town and the District.

Stratford-on-Avon District Council Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation Comments Not Addressed in Submission Version

Further to the District's comments on the Pre-Submission Draft of the Plan (please find attached), we list below the comments raised by the Council that have still not been sufficiently addressed in this latest version of the Plan:

Policies EC2, EC3 & EC4

- District commented that this was an opportunity to explore links with Cherwell District Council to see if there are any common business themes where there may be potential for some form of joint approach that could add value – No such efforts appear to have been made.

Infrastructure and community facilities – Higher level policies

- District raised issue of why NPPF paras 42-45 were included as there is no broadband policy included, and why paras 93 & 95 were included with no climate change policy included – Still appears in this latest version of the Plan.

Policy INF2

- District commented that highway improvements were a function of the County Highways Authority and that an Examiner may consider this policy as more of a project/aspiration – This draft policy remains in the latest version.

Policy ENV 2 (previously ENV1 in Pre-Submission Version)

- District were concerned over the proposed LGS allocation LGS2 in that there wasn't an assessment of the sites against NPPF para 77 – whilst we support the LSG2 designation, we share the Council's concern over the scale of the allocation and do not feel this has been fully addressed.

Policy ENV5

- District questioned the “improving public access” to existing facilities in the objective to this draft policy – this terminology remains in the latest version of the Plan.
- In the policy, the wording was questioned by the District, specifically on the “recognised space standards” – this point does not appear to have been addressed.

Policy HSG1

- District were concerned that this draft policy was at odds with Core Strategy CS.16, specifically on an affordable housing requirement of 35% - this does not appear to have been addressed in the latest version of the Plan.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Furthermore, in the explanatory text there was some suggested re-wording by the Council concerning planning obligations – this has not been incorporated in this latest version. <p><u>Policy HSG2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District wished for inclusion of reference to proportion of proposed housing mix in the policy – this has not been incorporated in to the latest version of the Plan. • In explanatory text, reference is made to local housing needs surveys being conducted every 3 years from 2016 onwards. Council felt that this may not be appropriate or realistic – however this still remains in latest version. <p><u>Policy HSG3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District called for a more flexible approach in the proposed provisions made for older persons – this has not been incorporated in the latest version of the Plan. • Also questioned were the terms “eligible households” and “local connection” – whilst a definition has been provided for the latter, not definition is offered for “eligible households”. • District asked for the first bullet point in the draft policy “care homes providing personal care and/or nursing care” to be removed – yet it remains in the latest version of the Plan. <p><u>Policy HSG6 (previously HSG4 in Pre-Submission Version)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The previous policy wording under HSG4 was seen as unlikely to be deliverable in its previous guise – whilst the wording and policy number have since changed (now HSG6), we still feel that more sites will need to be allocated. <p><u>Policy HSG8 (previously HSG5 in Pre-Submission Version)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amongst other matters, the issues of an identified local demand for custom/self-build was raised – this has not been commented on in latest iteration of draft policy.
SNP17	General	Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) , identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal

recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.

It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in **protecting playing fields** and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Planning Policy Statement: 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England'.

<http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy>

Sport England provides guidance on **developing planning policy** for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/>

Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 74 of the NPPF, this takes the form of **assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities**. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.

Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations

and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.

<http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance>

If **new or improved sports facilities** are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>

Any **new housing** developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.

In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how **any new development**, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.

Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.

NPPF Section 8: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities>

		<p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</p> <p><i>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</i></p>
SNP18	<p>Contents Page</p> <p>Policy EC3</p> <p>Policy EC4</p> <p>Policy INF2</p> <p>Policy FLD1</p> <p>Policy ENV1</p> <p>Policy ENV2</p>	<p>Policy number INF3 has been missed off (page 31).</p> <p>Should this principle apply to existing businesses as well? If so, there would need to be reference to factors to consider when assessing an application that involves the loss of an existing business (see Policy CS.22 in the Core Strategy and related DMC(1)).</p> <p>It would be helpful to show the site on an inset map, since not everyone that reads the NDP will be familiar with it.</p> <p>Highway improvements are a function of the County Highways Authority. An Examiner may consider this to be more of an aspirational project than a policy</p> <p>References to Flood Zones do not appear to be consistent with national policy</p> <p>[New Policy since Reg.14 consultation] Should the policy also set out that development outside the proposed BUAB will not be supported?</p> <p>Lists 2 sites but the Policies Map does not label the 2 sites, which would be helpful for those reading the Plan who are unfamiliar with the area. The proposed LGS at Hanson Hill is very extensive and it is not considered the proposed LGS complies with the provisions of para 77 of the NPPF (see comments on LGS Evidence Documents). The proposed Hanson Hill LGS designation includes the 'open space' associated with application ref: 15/01478/FUL for 106 dwellings (refused 19 May 2016) but does not include the remainder of the application site. Is there a reason for this land being specifically excluded as 'white land'? There are also other</p>

	<p>Policy ENV2 (Explanation)</p>	<p>parcels of ‘white land’ along the western edge of the settlement, sandwiched between the proposed BUAB and the LGS – why are these parcels not included in the LGS designation? It needs to be clear what the purpose of the ‘white land’ is between LGS2 and the Built Up Area Boundary.</p> <p>States that the landowner has ‘offered public access/ownership’ of LGS1. Where is the evidence to show this? It states that area LGS2 will be ‘enjoyed as an amenity and recreational asset’. If this land is in private ownership and there is no evidence this land will be opened for public use, this statement is incorrect and misleading. It also refers to a ‘prospective permissive path’ (which is also shown on the Policies map) but there is no guarantee this will ever happen. Has WCC been contacted about the prospect of such a footpath being acceptable or deliverable? If there is no evidence to this effect, it should be explained so as not to be misleading. There are no other public footpaths within site LGS2 and as such, there would no public access for recreation or enjoyment.</p>
	<p>Box 8 (p.38)</p>	<p>– refers to Policy ENV1, but should be ENV2. Whether or not a LGS designation is appropriate is not down to ‘a sound planning case’ as set out in para 1. An LGS designation will be determined through assessment of evidence against criteria set out in paras 76 and 77 of the NPPF. The toolkit published by Cotswold District Council has not been endorsed by SDC. SDC did not give the QB permission to use this ‘tool’...permission was never requested. In fact, SDC officers fundamentally disagree with the methodology set out in this ‘toolkit’ for calculating extensive tracts of land and do not consider site LGS2 meets the assessment criteria of the NPPF. In the opinion of SDC, LGS2 does not comply with bullet points 2 and 3 of para 77 of the NPPF. The QB has not proven that the land in question is demonstrably special to the local community. There is no public right of access to any part of the land; the land does not hold a particular local significance (different to any other similar agricultural land on the edge of the settlement); the land in question does not have any intrinsic beauty; does not have historic significance; has no recreational value and given it is agricultural land, probably does not have rich or diverse wildlife within it. Additionally, the area is not deemed to be ‘local in character’ and is considered to be an extensive tract of land.</p>
	<p>Policy ENV3</p>	<p>Under (2) Responding to local character: a) is the opening paragraph and should not have a letter, the principles below should then all be ‘re-lettered’, accordingly.</p>

	<p>Policy ENV5</p> <p>Policy HSG1</p> <p>Policy HSG2</p> <p>Policy HSG3</p>	<p>– the thresholds above which design codes and master planning are expected is very prescriptive and arguably set at an unreasonably low level.</p> <p>Where is the evidence to show that the land designated as ‘wellbeing zones’ will be accessible to the general public and therefore perform the function for which they are being promoted? The policy refers to accessibility to ‘public parks’ but it is not considered that the land covered by the ‘wellbeing zones’ would be classified as public parks, since the sites are made up of the High School, Leisure Centre, playing fields, cemetery and what appear to be tracts of privately owned land. There is no evidence to show this policy is achievable. The policy is to ‘meet recognised space standards’. What are these standards? How have they been calculated? What are the combined areas of the zones and where is the evidence to show how it compares to the space standards?</p> <p>The high-level objectives of this policy are laudable and supported. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) In and of itself, it is considered unlikely it will deliver any additional affordable housing over and above that which would be ordinarily be secured under existing Core Strategy policies. (2) There is no mechanism for prioritising proportions of different tenures or housing types, relative to Policies HSG2 and HSG3. This would tend to make this Policy, as well as HSG2 and HSG3, unworkable. (3) The objectives of Core Strategy housing policies are to meet assessed District-wide housing need. With this point in mind, it is unclear whether or not the effect of this policy would be restrict the occupancy of dwellings provided exclusively to households with a local connection (as defined). This would not align with the strategic policies of the Core Strategy and, additionally, might deter Registered Providers (housing associations) from undertaking development. A cascade-based approach for both affordable and market housing (reflecting current District-wide practice) prioritising households with a local connection would, however, be acceptable. <p>See comments in relation to HSG1 above.</p> <p>See comments in relation to Policy HSG1 above. In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) How will the ‘suitability’ of sites be determined? (2) We recommend the deletion of the first bullet point, as this relates to the provision of institutional
--	---	--

		residential accommodation, rather than residential accommodation that promotes independent living, in line with Part C of Core Strategy Policy CS.19.
	Policy HSG4	It is important to understand whether development under HSG4 is intended to be constrained by HSG1-3. We are concerned that this policy, in and of itself, creates no real “added value”.
	Policy HSG5	[New Policy since Reg.14 consultation] Inappropriate policy as it is necessary as a matter of course to assess the merits of revised schemes and uses on a site. Does not appear to be consistent with the NPPF. Any application for sustainable development should be approved even if it reduces or replaces existing housing commitments.
	Policy HSG6	This relates to land south of Oldbutt Road. This point could be made clearer, but is essentially a drafting issue. Otherwise, the policy and the additional flexibility it introduces, is supported. The final line appears superfluous, and its continued inclusion should be reviewed in relation to other policies.
	Policy HSG7	This relates to land east of London Road. This point could be made clearer, but is essentially a drafting issue. Additionally, it is noted this site is currently the subject of a planning application for a scheme for 18 dwellings. The explanatory text provides no justification for the tenure mix proposed. Delete final line?
	Policy HSG8	This is presumably referring to the windfall and allocated sites in the NDP? This is important because, although its aim is laudable and supported, the scope for delivery is considered very limited because (with the exception of Policy HSG7) there are unlikely to be any sites coming forward above the 20-dwellinbg threshold. The second bullet point is unrealistic. What action could be taken against a plot that was started but not completed in 3 years?
	Pages 50-51 Policies Map	The notation on the key for the proposed Wellbeing Zones appears to be wrong.

	<p>Page 59</p> <p>Figure 4 Policies Map</p> <p>Comments on associated LGS Evidence Documents</p>	<p>Development Brief for Tileman’s Lane area Last para - such a Brief could not be adopted as SPD unless it is allocated in the District Council’s Development Plan.</p> <p>When reproduced as an A4 document, creating the map in A3 over 2 pages is not satisfactory. There is a section of the map missing where one page ends and the other begins. Practically, it is difficult to read the map together when the document is stapled. The map should be A4 on one page and could also be produced as a stand-alone map separate to the NDP if it needs to be viewed as a larger document. Should the ‘reserve’ site be within the settlement boundary? as it could come forward under other policies within the NDP. Are the green hatched areas the wellbeing zones? If so, the key box needs changing from solid black to green hatching. LGS1 and LGS2 need labelling, for clarity purposes.</p> <p>The evidence document talks about the town being ‘woefully short of open space’ and refers to the ‘healthy communities’ agenda. I fear the QB are confusing LGS designation for open space provision. The allocation of large swathes of land as LGS will not help this lack of ‘general open space’ at all, since the land in question is in private ownership and will not be accessible to the general public. It appears the community require recreational open space, not LGS.</p> <p>LGS2 is an extensive tract of land and as such does not comply with para 77 of the NPPF. As already stated above, I do not consider there is evidence to prove that the land is ‘demonstrably special’ to the community. Attempting to justify public access through a possible permissive footpath is not convincing. As confirmed in the NDP itself, the land will remain in agricultural use...</p> <p>The use of the Cotswold checklist is not appropriate. The criteria for calculating ‘extent’ is based on Natural England guidance for ‘Natural Greenspaces’ and Officers do not consider the two assessments are compatible or similar in nature. Indeed, the Natural Greenspaces guidance specifically refer to public accessibility...one thing the sites at Shipston will not have.</p> <p>Document 07 – p.21 final para – states that the ‘extensive test’ should be used to demonstrate “...the space in question is a local facility and not, for example, green space in the countryside. The purpose of LGS designation is to protect local spaces. Containing urban sprawl or protecting open countryside would not appear to be</p>
--	--	---

		<p>proper use of the designation”. I concur with this view. The Shipston NDP appears to be using the policy to do just that...protect large swathes of open countryside on the edge of the town that could come under pressure in due course for further expansion of the town.</p> <p>Document 11 – p.6 (para 015) states: “...blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a ‘back door’ way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name’. This appears to be exactly what the Plan is intending to do.</p> <p>Document 21 – the Habitat Biodiversity Audit 2014 appears to indicate that land at Furze Hill Fields (LGS2) was rejected. This indicates non-compliance with para 77 of the NPPF re: ‘richness of wildlife’.</p> <p>Document 25 – refers to open space for use by the community. Access to LGS2 is not confirmed.</p> <p>Document 26 – the letter states that the site owner wants to retain the opportunity to future develop the ‘lower slopes’ (i.e. not all the land in LGS2). The lower slopes are those close to the edge of the town. Therefore, not only is this not evidence supporting the wholesale designation of LGS2, agreeing to this designation would fetter the land for possible future development opportunities, against the land-owner’s wishes, which is not appropriate</p>
SNP19	<p>EC1, EC2, EC3, EC4, EC5, EC7, INF1, INF2, INF3, FLD1, ENV2, ENV5, HSG6, HSG7, HSG8</p> <p>EC6</p> <p>FLD2</p>	<p>Support (no further comment provided)</p> <p>Object – This could be open to abuse and needs wording better</p> <p>Object – Consideration for diverting should also be taken in to account</p>

	FLD3	Object – Should be judged on a case by case basis rather than outright objection.
	ENV3	Object – Should be done on a case by case basis rather than one over-ruling.
	ENV4	Object – This should be on a case by case basis rather than one over-ruling.
	HSG1	Object – Affordable homes should not be built in areas where they would not be granted permission if they were not affordable homes or this could lead to back door planning applications. I agree that new development sites should have set percentages of affordable homes though.
	HSG2	Object – Low cost homes should not be built in areas where they would not be granted permission if they were not low cost homes or this could lead to back door planning applications. I agree that new development sites should have set percentages of low cost homes though.
	HSG3	Supported yes but only on sites that are suitable on a case by case basis.
	HSG5	Object – Should be on a case by case basis.
SNP20	General	<p>The County Council welcomes communities proposing neighbourhood Plans that shape and direct future development. The main responsibilities of the County Council are highways and public transport, education, social services, libraries and museums, recycling/ waste sites and environment. The County Council’s role is to deliver the services and facilities efficiently.</p> <p>Financial implications of Parish Plans</p> <p>We would like to state at the outset that the County Council cannot commit to any financial implications from any proposals emanating from Neighbourhood Plans. Therefore, Neighbourhood Plans should not identify capital or revenue schemes that rely of funding from the Council. However, we will assist communities in delivering infrastructure providing they receive any funding that may arise from S106 agreements, Community Infrastructure Levy or any other sources.</p>

		<p>The County Council supports new developments providing adequate amounts of parking subject to the criteria set out in the Local Transport Plan (2011-2026) and the parking standards as set by Stratford-on-Avon's District Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Vehicle Parking Standards.</p> <p>Warwickshire supports the proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan in principle, subject to both planning and transport planning criteria being met.</p> <p>The County Council supports the proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan in principle, subject to both planning and transport planning criteria being met. This includes any impact to existing road networks, the addition of parking and the introduction of traffic management improvements.</p> <p>INF2 As stated above the parking standards are set by Stratford-on-Avon District Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Vehicle Parking Standards and therefore any additional car parking would be subject to those standards.</p> <p>INF3 Consideration has been given to cycling and walking, subject to both planning and transport planning criteria being met, and Warwickshire will continue to encourage new developments to provide these in their proposals.</p> <p>Electric Vehicle Strategy Please also note that the County Council has been adopted and is an addendum to the Warwickshire Transport Plan. Therefore, these policies should also be added to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>One way traffic system The details of the highways proposals for Shipston-on- Stour vague, we would like to highlight at the outset the following two areas which <u>could cause safety problems:</u></p> <p>The proposed town centre one way system (page 58 of the consultation document), where High Street converges with Market Place. This creates a pinch point and there would be visibility issues heading out of this junction too.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>2.4 Dealing better with flooding risks</p>	<p>2.4.2 – ‘action to introduce protection measures into the town’ further details of what is planned, even if they’re just ideas.</p> <p>How will the ‘catch up’ of surface water drainage happen? What measures will modify the river and catchment area?</p> <p>2.4.4 / Policy FLD1 – This point suggests that future development should not create or increase flood risk in the town, but doesn’t explain how. There is little mention of SuDs. We would suggest mentioning the multiple benefits of SuDs, including greater biodiversity and amenity value.</p> <p>There is no specific detail referring to greenfield Qbar rates, and we would suggest that restricting flows to less than 5 l/s is viable.</p> <p>Referring to the SUDS discharge hierarchy would be of benefit, with the preferred choice of infiltration or water discharged into an existing watercourse being the first options, before connecting to a sewer. Any new developments should be designed and built with separate systems up to the point of where they connect to the combined sewer, in line with building regulations.</p> <p>We would suggest as a minimum that you add a paragraph specifically for the need for new developments to incorporate SUDS into plans. Our preference would be for an additional policy detailing a requirement for all new developments to utilise SuDS to achieve the multi-functional benefits of good SuDS design. This policy should include a requirement for all sites to attenuate to greenfield rates and include that 5 l/s is NOT the minimum possible discharge rate achievable.</p> <p>2.4.5 / Policy FLD2 – good policy, shows awareness of the benefits of open watercourses, however it does mention that they need maintaining but doesn’t say who will be responsible. Provide information of who is responsible and what maintenance is required. Any new planning applications which incorporate SuDs features into their site will have to provide a maintenance schedule as part of the planning permission process.</p>
--	---	---

	Paragraph 2.7	The final sentence that mentions the partners who will have an input into the survey should also include Warwickshire County Council Flood Risk Management Team who work on ordinary watercourses, and the Environment Agency for main rivers.
SNP22	General	<p>We write in response to the consultation of the Shipston-on-Stour Neighbourhood Plan Submission Plan (SNP). Rosconn Strategic Land (RSL) control land to the north of Railway Crescent, Shipston-on-Stour. This site was the subject of a good level of community support, culminating in a draft allocation under Policy H7 for housing (Site A) in the Draft Policies and Plans version of the SNP in December 2015. However, the site was not subsequently carried forward in the Pre-Submission Draft SNP due to concerns regarding vehicular access. The site is outlined in red on the Location Plan enclosed.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>RSL previously made representations at the Pre-Submission Draft consultation stage in December 2016, a copy of which is also enclosed. Whilst RSL was generally supportive of the overall Draft SNP, we raised a number of issues in respect of housing. These were principally that in view of the strategic requirements of the Core Strategy under Policy CS.16, the SNP should identify a Reserve Site or Sites of an appropriate scale in view of the town's status as a Main Rural Centre.</p> <p>In order to address this strategic requirement, RSL highlighted that any perceived constraints of accessing land north of Railway Crescent could be adequately addressed through further technical work and therefore should be allocated as a Reserve Site within the SNP. Notably, the District Council made a similar comment, suggesting the lack of Reserve Site allocations in the SNP was a missed opportunity and that if this was not taken, the District Council would need to consider allocating such sites in the town through its Site Allocations Plan.</p> <p>In order to address the Town Council / Steering Group's concerns regarding vehicular access to our site, we subsequently sought pre-application advice from Warwickshire County Council Highways Authority who confirmed that in principle, they did not foresee a highway objection to residential development at the site. A copy of this response, alongside a Vision Masterplan on which the advice was based, are also enclosed.</p>

	HSG6	<p>As previously confirmed, the site remains suitable, available and achievable for residential allocation within the SNP, with further technical work demonstrating that vehicular access can be secured via Tilemans Lane, as agreed in principle with the Highway Authority. We therefore maintain that there are no technical or site-specific reasons why the site is unsuitable to be allocated for residential development. Indeed, this appears to be acknowledged as much with reference to 2.5 of the Consequent Local Projects document that accompanies the SNP, which makes reference to our site in the context of the wider lower Tileman's Lane areas.</p> <p>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. These include that a Neighbourhood Plan should be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area. This is recognised in the SNP with the objective to Policy HSG6 stating that it is to identify and allocate an adequate reserve provision of housing land that will assist in meeting the town's contribution to future District-wide housing requirements from 2021 onward.</p> <p>Policy HSG6 appears to be a direct result of the comments raised at the Pre-Submission stage, in that a Reserve Site has been identified for between 25-30 dwellings, to be released when a need is triggered under the requirements of Part D of Core Strategy CS.16. Whilst RSL raises no objection to the proposed allocation, we question whether this provides an appropriate reserve provision within a Main Rural Centre (MRC), acknowledged as being a location where both local and District-wide needs are to be met. Whilst it is accepted that there is little guidance on what an appropriate reserve provision should be for an MRC, our previous representations detailed a logical approach based on the spatial strategy and distribution of development set out within the Core Strategy, as applied to the known target of 2,920 dwellings required to be reserved for the District as a whole. This conservative approach suggested an indicative figure of circa 125 dwellings per MRC, which would highlight a potential under provision within the SNP of circa 95-100 dwellings.</p> <p>RSL therefore maintain that allocation of its land north of Railway Crescent would assist in meeting the Strategic requirement of the Core Strategy, by providing a suitable location for housing development which is unconstrained and which there is a good level of local support for within the community.</p>
--	------	--

SNP23	LGS2	<p>The following representation is made on behalf of Mr Patrick Holley, who is one of the landowners of LGS2 - Hanson Hill Local Green Space (image 1). He owns 6.09 hectares of the 18.24 hectares being designated (edged red on image 2). Objection is made to the designation of LGS2 as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Planning Policy Context</p> <p><u>NPPF paragraphs 76 to 78</u></p> <p>Paragraph 76 - states that local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them.</p> <p>Paragraph 77 states -</p> <p><i>“The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</i> • <i>where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</i> • <i>where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”</i> <p><u>Relevant Planning Practice Guidance</u></p> <p>Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 37-007-20140306 Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.</p> <p>Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 37-009-20140306. Local Green Spaces may be designated where those spaces are demonstrably special to the local community, whether in a village or in a neighbourhood in a town or city.</p>
-------	------	---

Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 37-014-20140306 The proximity of a Local Green Space to the community it serves will depend on local circumstances, including why the green area is seen as special, but it must be reasonably close. For example, if public access is a key factor, then the site would normally be within easy walking distance of the community served.

Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 37-015-20140306 Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. ...blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name.

Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 37-017-20140306 Some areas that may be considered for designation as Local Green Space may already have largely unrestricted public access, though even in places like parks there may be some restrictions. However, other land could be considered for designation even if there is no public access (e.g. green areas which are valued because of their wildlife, historic significance and/or beauty).

Designation does not in itself confer any rights of public access over what exists at present. Any additional access would be a matter for separate negotiation with land owners, whose legal rights must be respected.

LGS2 - HANSON HILL LOCAL GREEN SPACE – AN EXTENSIVE TRACT OF LAND?

LGS2 measures 18.6 hectares and constitutes a large area of open countryside and *“an extensive tract of land.”* Page 10 of the Local Planning Authority *“Stratford DC Cabinet Report”* reaches the same conclusion: *“The proposed LGS at Hanson Hill is very extensive and it is not considered the proposed LGS complies with the provisions of para 77 of the NPPF in that it is clearly an extensive tract of land.”* Its designation as LGS fails for reason of extensiveness alone.

The NP evidence base points to Section 1.2 of the Natural England publication *“Nature nearby – accessible natural greenspace guidance”* to give a 20 hectare benchmark of 'extensive'. This comparison is not apt:

- Section 1.2 does not define 20 hectares as 'extensive' or 'not extensive'. It is simply a recommendation that everyone has *“at least one accessible 20 hectare site [of accessible natural greenspace] within two*

kilometres of home”.

- LGS2 has no public access and no mechanism for creating public access. In other words, LGS2 is not accessible.

In contrast, there are several examples of Neighbourhood Plan Examiners rejecting Local Green Spaces on grounds of size; sites that are similar in area or smaller than LGS2.

Backwell Neighbourhood Plan - Examiners Report dated October 2014. The Examiner stated:

“In the case of Farleigh Fields, it is my view that 19 hectares also comprises an extensive tract of land. To provide some perspective, at least twenty-three full size football pitches would easily fit in to an area of this size. Given that the Framework is not ambiguous in stating that a Local Green Space designation is not appropriate for most green areas or open space, it is entirely reasonable to expect compelling evidence to demonstrate that any such allocation meets national policy requirements. Specific to demonstrating that Farleigh Fields, and Moor Lane Fields are not extensive tracts of land, no substantive or compelling evidence has been presented.”

Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan - Examiner’s Report dated August 2015. The Examiner removed the proposed LGS designations affecting two sites of 2.5 and 3.9 hectares respectively, having found these to constitute extensive tracts of land by virtue of their size and there being no compelling evidence to demonstrate why the sites were demonstrably special to the local community.

Sedlescombe Neighbourhood Plan - Examiner’s Report dated January 2015. The Examiner found a proposed LGS of 4.6 hectares at Street Farm to be extensive in size and therefore contrary to national planning policy.

Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan - Examiner’s Report dated November 2015. The Examiner considered that at 9.2 and 4.3 hectares respectively, LGS sites to the north and south of Branston Road constituted extensive tracts of land and instructed their removal from the draft NP.

Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan - Examiner's Report dated December 2015. The Examiner considered a LGS site of just over 5 hectares: *"I note that B5 is some considerable distance from, rather than within reasonably close proximity to, the community it serves. Furthermore, it comprises an extensive tract of land. On further assessment of B5, I note that large areas of farmland are included in the proposed designation, as well as a cricket ground..... The designation of B5 as Local Green Space does not meet the basic conditions."*

NPPF PARAGRAPH 77 – OTHER MATTERS

According to government policy (NPPF), designation of a Local Green Space should only be used where it is demonstrably special to a local community AND holds a particular local significance AND is local in character. As will be argued next, the proposed designation fails all three requirements, even though only one failure is sufficient for the land not to be designated as LGS.

Page 37 of the draft NP states: *"This requires the conservation of the most sensitive and valued as-yet-undeveloped upper slopes and tops to the west to retain the landscape setting 'bowl' effect.....LGS2 will ensure the upper slopes and tops remain open....."* Thus ENV2 is simply being used as a tool to prevent development. However, existing policies in the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy (CS.5, CS.6, CS.15, AS.10) will protect the upper slopes and tops from development.

The Draft NP states proposals for *"any development on this land will be resisted other than in very special circumstances."* The phrase "very special circumstances" is taken from Green Belt policy, which is a particularly restrictive policy to which the government attaches "great importance" (paragraph 79 of the NPPF). Local Green Space designation does not merit such a high level of restriction. The draft NP Policy ENV2 goes even further than Green Belt policy by restricting any type of development, including types that are appropriate in Green Belt, namely agricultural and forestry buildings, replacement buildings, sport and recreation buildings and engineering operations. This high level of restriction sought by Policy ENV2 is unacceptable, outside the purpose of Local Green Space designation and will result in a *"'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name"* (PPG Reference ID: 37-015-201403).

ENV2: *".....there to be viewed and enjoyed as an amenity and recreational asset."* Conversely, ENV2 also states *"Note that public access will remain only along public rights of way, consistent with the designated land remaining in agricultural use"* and Box 8 states *"Importantly there will not for LGS2 be public access other than along existing public rights of way and subject to landowner agreement, a new permissive public right of way to complete a circular walk."* This "important" point lends weight to the non-designation of LGS2. There is no public access to LGS2. It has no role as a public amenity or recreational asset. References to "public rights of way" in the plural is misleading. A single public footpath bisects (albeit outside) LGS2, NE/SW along a track leading to the top of Hanson Hill. However, LGS designation makes no difference to the level of public access to any part of Hanson Hill or the wider countryside.

ENV2: *"more and better use will be possible of existing public rights of way..."* There is only one public footpath through the LGS to link the top of Hanson Hill with Shipston on Stour. LGS designation will make no difference to the frequency of use of this footpath.

ENV2: *"A prospective permissive path to complete a circular route..."* The "Prospective Permissive Footpath" is an aspiration and no explanation or timetable for its delivery is given by the NP. Moreover, the aspirational path lies outside LGS2.

Box 8 states *"Also of significance is the written acceptance of the land owners.....For LGS2 the land owner has recognised the landscape value of the upper slopes and tops, and agrees with the conservation objective."* This is misleading. LGS2 has more than one landowner. The landowner of one-third (6.09 hectares) of LGS2 (Mr Patrick Holley) objects in this statement to LGS designation, as he did in December 2016 when the previous Draft Submission NP was published for consultation.

The landowner mentioned in Box 8 (singular and not plural - Mr Caton) owns less land than Mr Holley within LGS2. He makes no commitment to greater public access. Mr Caton also points out the flaw of LGS2 as an extensive tract of land. Furthermore, Mr Caton's support is conditional upon being able to develop part of LGS2: *"...that part of parcel no 102 could be further developed to increase the capacity of this allocation whilst respecting the objectives within policy ENV1"*.

The Local Planning Authority has the same concern about lack of public access. The “Stratford DC Cabinet Report” states: *“It states that area LGS2 will be ‘enjoyed as an amenity and recreational asset’. If this land is in private ownership and there is no evidence this land will be opened for public use, this statement is incorrect and misleading.”*

Although lack of public access does not preclude its designation as LGS, it serves to weaken its alleged role as a space valuable to the local community.

With reference to NPPF paragraph 77, the draft NP text itself does not explain why LGS2 is particularly special in terms of its wildlife, historic significance or beauty. This is a failing. Instead, the draft NP relies upon the evidence base to support the policy, specifically “the Environment Audit and Issues Report”. Yet the evidence base does not support the designation of LGS2 (discussed later).

Box 8 states:

“In the absence of available guidance from the District Council about making such designations a toolkit published by Cotswold District Council has been used with their permission.” Guidance about LGS designation is given by the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance. This national guidance should be mentioned in Box 8 and not left to the evidence base. Similarly, Page 10 of the Local Planning Authority “Stratford DC Cabinet Report” states *“It states the LGS designation criteria as set out in para 77 of NPPF have been applied, but does not explain how. It is not considered the criteria have been met.”*

LGS2 has no historic buildings and does not lie within or adjacent to the Conservation Area. There are no above-ground historic features of interest and no demonstrable reason for the site to be a Local Green Space on the grounds of its historic significance.

In the “Stratford-on-Avon District – Landscape Sensitivity Assessment”, LGS2 lies within landscape parcel SH09 of Shipston on Stour. Parcel SH09 has been identified by the LSA as:

- Medium sensitivity to housing development. This is the lowest category of any parcel of land around the edge of Shipston on Stour.
- High/High medium sensitivity to commercial development. This is the joint lowest category of any

parcel of land around the edge of Shipton on Stour.

This independent landscape character assessment does not support the identification of LGS2 as LGS due to its particular beauty, sensitivity or local significance. On the contrary, by scoring the lowest in terms of its sensitivity to residential or commercial development, the assessment makes a good case for LGS designation to be removed from this land.

The evidence base refers to the response to a household questionnaire. However, Q1 “To what extent do you value the landscape and setting of Shipston” is a general question and not specific to the slopes of Hanson Hill and the particular field parcels (whole fields and parts of fields) that make up LGS2. Furthermore, the LGS2 tract of land is not coherent or self-contained. The boundary of LGS2 in some places is an arbitrary line drawn across a field, rather than following field boundaries.

A Habitat Biodiversity Audit 2014 does not demonstrate a particularly special level of habitat diversity at LGS2. None of the fields have a national or local ecological or habitat designation. For example, LGS2 is not a Local Nature Reserve or a Local Wildlife Site. Indeed, within LGS2 is SP23P1 – Furze Hill Fields (7.18 hectares), which is a rejected Warwickshire Local Wildlife Site.

The Submission Draft Shipston on Stour Neighbourhood Plan fails to demonstrate that LGS2 Hanson Hill Local Green Space is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance and is local in character. Stratford-on-Avon District Council’s Landscape Sensitivity Assessment demonstrably points to the opposite conclusion; that by the Framework’s and Planning Practice Guidance standards LGS2 does not qualify as a Local Green Space. The land has no special beauty or distinctive landscape features other than being ordinary fields on the slope of a small hill. It has no public access. It includes a rejected Local Wildlife Site. Landowner support for its designation is lacking. Furthermore, as an “extensive tract of land” it is too large to be LGS. LGS2 should therefore be removed as a LGS designation from the Neighbourhood Plan.