

## Snitterfield Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation (Neighbourhood Planning (General)

#### Regulations, 2012

#### Appendix 1 - Comments from Stratford-on-Avon District Council

**Policy related comments:**

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment
<b>Section 2 – The Neighbourhood Development Plan</b>	Paragraph 5 (p.4)	This paragraph requires updating to take account of the recent adoption of the Core Strategy.
<b>Section 3 – History and Future</b>	Paragraph 2 (p.6)	Third line – ‘before’ should read ‘after’.
<b>Section 5 – Vision Statement</b>	Third bullet point (p.14)	It is not appropriate for development to be restricted to meeting local requirements.
<b>Section 5 – Vision Statement</b>	Strategic Objectives – Housing (p.14)	It is not appropriate for development to be restricted to meeting the needs of the neighbourhood area only.
<b>Section 6 - Housing</b>	Figure 3 – Village Boundary (p.15)	<p>Amend of the proposed village boundary as follows in accordance with guidance set out in Annexe 3 of Local Plan Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include the most westerly dwelling on the Bearley Road and its residential curtilage within the boundary</li> <li>• Include the rear gardens associated with dwellings on White Horse Hill</li> <li>• Include the remainder of the rear gardens of dwellings to the north of Church Lane</li> <li>• Include the residential garden of the last property to the south of The Green as you exit the village in a southwest direction</li> </ul> <p>It would be helpful to show boundary in a thicker red line to make it clearer.</p>
<b>Section 6 - Housing</b>	Policy H1 (p.16)	The policy could usefully refer to possible exceptions under Policy H4 of the Plan.
<b>Section 6 - Housing</b>	Policy H1: Explanation (p.16)	Second paragraph - NPPF identifies other forms of development that are not inappropriate (see para. 89) such as replacement buildings and partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites. Also, amend ‘location’ in 2nd line to read ‘locations’.

<b>Section 6 - Housing</b>	Policy H2 (p.16)	Criterion (c) seeks an enhancement to the character and appearance of the site but should be expanded to include the NPPF's recognition that sometimes such land will have a high environmental value. Add at the end of criterion c) ..."would not result in the loss of any land of high environmental value."
<b>Section 6 - Housing</b>	Policy H2: Explanation (p.16)	Second paragraph – there is not a general presumption against development of greenfield land in national policy. The 'exceptional circumstances' test relates to Green Belt not greenfield land. Wording should be amended on both counts.
<b>Section 6 - Housing</b>	Policy H3 (p.17)	Replace 'permitted' with 'supported' in first line of the policy.
<b>Section 6 - Housing</b>	Policy H4 (p.17)	<p>The high-level support is noted for "small-scale affordable housing" schemes on sites outside but adjacent to the defined Village Boundary by virtue of Policy H4. This broadly aligns with counterpart policies in the Core Strategy: although the latter is more flexible in that it also allows for identified needs for local market housing to be met. This is important, because recent experience in other villages within the District indicates the importance of local market homes in generating the necessary level of cross-subsidy to make the delivery of affordable homes viable. Whilst the policy is supported in principle, it is recommended its scope be extended to encompass local market housing.</p> <p>Nevertheless, due to allocated sites SSA1 and SSA2 being of insufficient size to trigger a requirement for on-site affordable housing provision (although the Sports Club site may trigger a requirement for a financial contribution), it is apparent that in practice this Policy will provide the only pathway for delivery of new affordable housing schemes. Given this point and the fact that it does not go so far as to identify specific preferred sites, it is strongly recommended further consideration is given to how this Policy will be delivered in practice.</p> <p>For example, successful delivery will require a pro-active approach towards site canvassing and the use of an objective assessment methodology to identify one or more preferred sites for promotion through an appropriate process of public consultation. The Rural Housing Enabler may be able to assist in this process. Nevertheless, it would be very useful for the explanatory text to outline how such a process might be expected to operate in practice.</p>
<b>Section 6 - Housing</b>	Policy H5 (p.18)	The principles of Policy H5 (mix of market housing) are understood and supported. However, given the 5-unit threshold for the application of this Policy coupled with the background discussed above in relation to Policy H4, it does seem unlikely that it will be frequently applied. This makes it all the more important that the scope of Policy H4 is widened, as discussed above.
<b>Section 7 - Economy</b>	Policy ECON1 (p.19)	<p>Replace 'permitted' with 'supported' in first paragraph of the policy.</p> <p>This policy strikes an appropriate balance between flexibility and support for employment with its four criteria providing applicants with an opportunity to demonstrate why there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for employment purposes in line with the NPPF.</p>

		<p>However, the first and second criteria of the policy are interdependent and this would lead to the potential stagnation of some sites based on an overall supply requirement. For that reason the "and" at the end of the first criterion should become an "or" and criterion b) modified to bring it in line with the NPPF by adding the words "or where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment uses" at the end of criterion b) before the "or".</p> <p>Consider adding at the end of the policy as a new paragraph "Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, planning applications for alternative uses will be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities."</p>
<b>Section 7 - Economy</b>	Policy ECON2 (p.20)	<p>Replace 'support' with 'encourage' and 'encouraged' with 'supported' in first paragraph of the policy; replace 'encouraged' with 'supported' in second paragraph of the policy.</p> <p>Criterion c) - Suggest replacing 'on traffic' with 'due to traffic generation'.</p>
<b>Section 7 - Economy</b>	Policy ECON2: Explanation (p.20)	Second paragraph - suggest amending 2nd line to read 'whilst protecting the character and Green Belt status of the area.'
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE1 (p.21)	<p>Criterion c) - amend to read 'Conservation Area'</p> <p>In order to bring the policy in line with existing legislation in relation to Conservation Areas and national policy and guidance, the following amendments are suggested:</p> <p>Change the phrase "preserve and enhance heritage assets..." to "preserve or enhance heritage assets..." in criterion c)</p> <p>Change the phrase "protect and enhance landscape and biodiversity..." to "protect or enhance landscape and biodiversity..." in criterion d)</p> <p>Change criterion f) to read "Key features of views to and from higher slopes, skylines and across the wider landscape can continue to be enjoyed;"</p>
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE2 (p.22)	This policy has some overlap with Policy H2. In relation to density, subject of criterion a) of the policy, the second paragraph of Explanatory text seems to introduce a density range whereas the policy itself and Policy H2 focus on the context of the site. As well as being inconsistent, it is inappropriate to introduce what might reasonably be construed as policy in the supporting text. In addition it is unclear to me what "commensurate with a viable scheme and infrastructure capacity" means in relation to density. The policy and explanatory text will need to be re-drafted.
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE2: Explanation (p.22)	Delete the sentence "Densities would not normally be above 25 – 30 dwellings per hectare." from second paragraph.

<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE3 (p.23)	Criterion (a) – the approach reverts back to that in Policy PR.2 in the District Local Plan. While its spirit is not necessarily inconsistent with national Green Belt policy (see NPPF para 89) or Policy CS.10 in the Core Strategy, it is suggested the terminology used in these are provided in the Explanation, as well as the basis for specifying 30%. It is considered that this should be used as a guide or starting point, only in order to take account of the current stance of the NPPF.
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE3 (p.23)	Criterion (b) – what views are being preserved? It is not clear or precise.
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE4 (p.24)	The first paragraph of the policy reads more like explanation and should be removed.
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE4: Explanation (p.24)	The last line suggests there are many recommendations on how to design out crime. Could examples be provided?
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE5 (p.24)	Concern that the residents may think this policy gives SDC control where no control exists. This is not a policy, but could be included as an aspiration or guidance. Delete policy.
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE6 (p.24)	<p>First paragraph – the word ‘must’ in the second line is too prescriptive and it is suggested amending with ‘should’.</p> <p>The policy seeks a minimum of two car parking spaces for dwellings of two or more bedrooms citing on-road parking as presenting significant problems for vehicular traffic in the village. There is little other evidence provided for setting the parking standard at this level and it seems that the first sentence of the policy deals with the community’s concerns, but would allow flexibility on some sites where perhaps not so much parking is required given the type of property or bearing in mind location or what a design-led solution might realise. It excludes garages from this calculation, but not car ports and it is not clear why this might be. Therefore these overly prescriptive elements should be deleted and the policy given more flexibility.</p> <p>The final paragraph of the policy requires new developments to “develop easy pedestrian and cycle routes” to the village centre and schools. This is an appropriate objective, but the wording needs to be more flexible so that it does not apply to all development which might include a minor residential extension and clearer so that “easy” does not invoke long arguments about whether a path might meet that definition.</p>
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE7 (p.25)	Delete the words “as a minimum” from the third paragraph of the policy.
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE7: Explanation (p.25)	Last sentence of third paragraph – amend to read ‘A request for Specialist pre-application Listed Building Advice can be submitted to the Conservation Team at Stratford-on-Avon District Council. Such advice attracts a fee’.

<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE8 (p.26)	The wording of this policy does not reflect the NPPF sufficiently as it adds a requirement about the need for exceptional circumstances to outweigh the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Re-word policy as follows:  “Development of the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification) will normally be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that significant development of agricultural land is necessary and no other land of a poorer agricultural quality is available.”
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE8: Explanation (p.26)	First paragraph – text conflates agricultural land with landscape sensitivity; the latter is covered in Policy NE5 and reference to the Landscape Sensitivity Study should be placed in the explanation to that policy.
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE9 (p.26)	Amend 2nd line to read ‘such as those within the Conservation Area’. In relation to criterion (a), again it is necessary to justify 30% against the NPPF definition [as per Policy BE3 criterion (a) above]. In relation to criterion (c), suggest insert ‘or beneficial’ at the end. Remove criterion e) as this is deemed to be too restrictive.
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE10 (p.27)	Replace ‘accepted’ with ‘supported’ in the first paragraph of the policy.
<b>Section 8 – Built Environment</b>	Policy BE11 (p.27)	Second paragraph – will not be able to control new uses via policy if permitted development.
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE1: map (p.30-31)	It may be beneficial for the SSSIs and LNR to be indicated on individual maps, also indicating their boundaries – for clarification purposes and aid assessment of potential harm. It may be beneficial to map the listed Ecosites for the same reasons.
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE1: Explanation (p.29)	Final line – Stratford District Council owns the land covered by Welcombe Hills/Clopton Park Local Nature Reserve.
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE1: Explanation (p.32)	Second line – suggest replace ‘selected’ with ‘designated’.
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE2 (p.32)	Replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’ in third line of first paragraph of the policy.
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE2: Explanation (p.33)	The paragraph beginning “Development will be expected to ensure...” together with associated criterion a) to c) are looking to introduce policy within explanatory text. This either requires integration into the policy, or deletion.
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE3 (p.34)	Replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’ in first and final paragraphs of the policy.  The final paragraph states development will not be supported in areas where rare species would be affected. This is a vague statement and difficult to understand the parameters of such a policy. It could be argued development in all areas have the potential for such harm, thus leading to prevention of any new development, anywhere. This needs further consideration and re-drafting.

<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE4 (p.35)	Proposed Local Green Spaces should be listed in policy itself. More extensive justification against NPPG criteria is needed for those identified as they are likely to come under detailed scrutiny.
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE5 (p.36)	Second line – the landscape setting of what should be specified. Which are the ‘prominent views...’ and ‘important vistas and skylines...’ to be maintained? Should they be indicated on a map?
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE5: Explanation (p.36)	Should refer to findings of Landscape Sensitivity Study [see comments on Policy BE8 above].
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE6 (p.36)	Replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’ in paragraph following the bullet points.  Criterion c) Is this possible in terms of existing fibre-optic infrastructure in the village?
<b>Section 9 – Natural Environment</b>	Policy NE6: Explanation (p.37)	First paragraph, 2nd line – suggest amending to read ‘should be supported with survey information’; second paragraph, 2nd line – suggest replace ‘plan’ with ‘proposal’; third paragraph, 2nd line – suggest delete ‘All’ as the BAP is unlikely to be relevant in every case.
<b>Section 10 - Infrastructure</b>	Strategic Objective (p.38)	Suggest inserting appropriate references from the NPPF to support the Strategic Objective, e.g. paragraph 39 re: transport; paragraph 42 re: communications; paragraph 100 re: flood risk.
<b>Section 10 - Infrastructure</b>	Policy IN1 (p.38)	Second line – elaborate on what is meant by ‘sustainable’ in context of this policy.  Criteria b) and d) are prescriptive and inflexible and should be deleted, although it is recognised the NPPF supports high quality communications structure and seeks to meet the challenge of climate change and flooding.
<b>Section 10 - Infrastructure</b>	Policy IN1: Explanation (p.38)	Expand to cover fibre-optics and energy efficiency.
<b>Section 10 - Infrastructure</b>	Policy IN2 (p.39)	Second paragraph – check whether there is a presumption against underground storage of water; additionally, amend last paragraph so that it reads more clearly.
<b>Section 10 - Infrastructure</b>	Policy IN2: Explanation (p.40)	First paragraph – update to show that works have now commenced; Final paragraph – update reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
<b>Section 10 - Infrastructure</b>	Policy IN3 (p.41)	Check the cross-reference to Policy BE6 to ensure it is still relevant as Policy BE6 has been recommended for modifications.  Second line of first paragraph – insert ‘and cyclists’ at the end.
<b>Section 11 – Amenities, Leisure &amp; Wellbeing</b>	Strategic Objective (p.43)	Second paragraph – suggests that the landscape affords the opportunity for various indoor activities!

<b>Section 11 – Amenities, Leisure &amp; Wellbeing</b>	Policy ALW2 (p.45)	<p>The first paragraph should clarify whether it is talking about all green spaces or publicly accessible ones. If it means all green spaces than it is effectively saying that there must be no new development in the village as there is virtually no brownfield land in the village. Should these spaces be mapped?</p> <p>The second paragraph seems to be covering a separate issue than this policy heading suggests. Should this be extracted and integrated in to a new/separate policy relating to safeguarding landscapes?</p>
<b>Section 11 – Amenities, Leisure &amp; Wellbeing</b>	Policy ALW2: Explanation (p.45)	<p>The second paragraph refers to 'green fingers' of land within and on the edge of the village. What and where are these 'green fingers'? Should they be mapped and included within a policy? Are these different to green open spaces referred to in policy ALW2?</p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of explanatory text seems to be more associated with policy ALW3 in that it refers to footpaths. Is it in the correct place within the NDP?</p>
<b>Section 11 – Amenities, Leisure &amp; Wellbeing</b>	Policy ALW3 (p.45)	<p>Second paragraph – it is too restrictive to expect all new development to demonstrate prioritising walking and cycling opportunities. Replace the words "All new development..." with "As appropriate, development..."</p> <p>Final paragraph – unsure what is meant by '...demonstrate an emphasis on safe, convenient and well maintained footpaths...'. </p>
<b>Section 11 – Amenities, Leisure &amp; Wellbeing</b>	Policy ALW4 (p.46)	<p>The sports and recreation facilities are listed in the Explanatory notes – would it be beneficial to have these sites mapped?</p>
<b>Section 11 – Amenities, Leisure &amp; Wellbeing</b>	Policy ALW4: Explanation (p.46)	<p>Last sentence in Explanation – potential funding of facilities for young people from CIL allocation.</p>
<b>Section 11 – Amenities, Leisure &amp; Wellbeing</b>	Policy ALW5: Explanation (p.46)	<p>Last sentence in Explanation – potential funding of water supply to allotments from CIL allocation.</p>
<b>Section 12 – Specific Site Allocations</b>	Policy SSA1 (p.47)	<p>Where will existing Sports Club building be relocated to? Site should be identified and need to consider Green Belt policy. If it is to be relocated on playing field opposite, Sport England will need to be consulted and agree this.</p> <p>The scale if development on this site is unlikely to trigger a requirement for on-site affordable housing provision, but may well trigger a requirement for an off-site financial contribution. It is unclear as to with whom responsibility will rest for the promotion of a scheme (presumably the Sports Club?). It is strongly recommend that the promoters contact The District Council's Development and Enabling Officer to discuss issues around the scale and timing of any potential contribution.</p>

<b>Section 12 – Specific Site Allocations</b>	Policy SSA2 (p.49)	Vehicular access to the site is very narrow and may not be acceptable. Depth of site itself does not seem to lend itself to a workable layout. May need to consider incorporating small amount of greenfield land to north to achieve this. It would effectively be rounding off and would have little impact on openness of the Green Belt. Is there scope to utilise the BT exchange site to provide an in/out arrangement?
---	--------------------	---