

Walton & Wellesbourne Way 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
Whole Document	Page Footer	Refers to Community Plan rather than Neighbourhood Development Plan
Whole Document	Maps and Tables	Consider all maps and tables included within the Plan are given Figure No's and listed in the table of comments for ease of reference.
Table of Contents	Contents page (p.3)	It would be helpful to list the page numbers for all individual sub-chapters as well as the main chapter headings. 7.4 – Should read 'Economy and Jobs'. Appendix C – Should read 'Assessment of Green Infrastructure Requirements'. p.119 NPPF – requires adding to contents list.
2.1 – What is a Neighbourhood Plan?	Final paragraph (p.6)	Wording needs to be amended to reflect the fact that all policies in Core Strategy are strategic and those in NP need to be consistent. Preferable to say that policies in both plans will be applied in the consideration of planning applications in the BP area.
2.2 – Progress so far	Map of the neighbourhood area (p.8)	The map used in the NDP does not fit on the page – elements of the neighbourhood area are missing. Use smaller scale map or the version produced by SDC for the area designation process.
2.3 – Next Steps	First paragraph (p.9)	The SEA screening report will be arranged by SDC, not the Neighbourhood Plan Team as described in the Plan.
2.3 – Next Steps	Second paragraph (p.9)	Amend to read '...ensure that the Plan becomes an integral part of the Development Plan for Stratford-on-Avon District.'
4.2.1 – Additional Housing	Second paragraph (p.18)	The additional units to be provided through the conversion of Equidebt House and Wellesbourne House do count towards the housing provision for Wellesbourne, contrary to the comment in the NDP. This text will need to be amended, accordingly.

4.2.3 – Landscape for Housing	Title (p.20)	Amend title to read 'Land for Housing'.
4.2.3 – Landscape for Housing	Diagrammatic Plan of Wellesbourne (p.21)	The map has been produced at a scale where details are being cut off or missed off altogether. Replace with map at a suitable scale to show all detail and text.
6 – NDP Objectives	Objective 16 (p.35)	Provision of Services and facilities could be linked to land-use planning policies.
Section 7: Policies	All Policies	Add the Policy titles listed in table at p.4 of the NDP to the policies as set out throughout Section 7 of the Plan.
7.1.1 – Protection of Local Green Space	Map of Local Green Space Designations (p.37)	The title should read: 'Local Green Space Designations in Wellesbourne'. Does the A429 need to be shaded the same colour green as the proposed areas of LGS? If this cannot be changed, can the 11 sites be made a different colour? The extent of Area 5 (Dog Close) as a Local Green Space should acknowledge the development of a medical centre on part of it, particularly given the last paragraph in Policy WW1.
7.1.1 – Protection of Local Green Space	Table of Local Green Space designations (p.38)	This assessment should state how it is based on criteria for designating Local Green Space in accordance with paragraphs 76 and 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
7.1.1 – Protection of Local Green Space	Policy WW1 (p.40)	A Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Pitch Strategy which will look at indoor and outdoor sport provision has been commissioned by SDC to undertake an audit of existing facilities and identify deficiencies in provision based on the emerging Core Strategy housing requirements. A final report will be produced next summer (2017) which may influence any future protection of sports pitches/playing fields. The designation of Local Green Space is specifically set out in paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF, which state such sites are designated through Local Plans and NDPs, not through individual planning applications. Therefore, it is not clear how the provisions of the paragraph beginning 'In addition, any new areas...' can be applied.
7.1.3 – Preservation of the Historic Built Environment	Policy WW3: Explanatory text (p.43)	What status has the Local List of Heritage Sites? Has this been carried out with the assistance of Historic England re: assessment and justification?
7.1.3 – Preservation of the Historic Built Environment	Map of Conservation Area and Listed Buildings (p.45)	Map should be produced at a scale sufficient to ensure that the whole of Conservation Area is shown on the map. Should the Conservation Area boundary be demarked by a line, for clarity? If the Conservation Area is to be shaded, does this need to be added to the key, again for clarity?

7.1.3 – Preservation of the Historic Built Environment	Policy WW3 (p.46)	National policy on Conservation Areas seeks their conservation and enhancement and indicates that the significance of harm must be identified and assessed in each case. This is not the same as the stance on 'harm' as currently set out in the NDP and it is considered Policy WW3 and will require re-drafting to bring into line with the NPPF.
7.1.4 – Landscape Preservation	Policy WW4: Explanatory text (p.47)	What are the various 'zones' sensitive to? Is this all development, or just housing/commercial? It would be helpful to make this clear.
7.1.4 – Landscape Preservation	Policy WW4 (p.50)	What is meant by the 'pattern of open spaces' in paragraph 1) and how might they be assessed in order to confirm their retention? What/where are the 'green fingers' of land referred to in the same paragraph? Have these been assessed and mapped? The policy as written seeks to protect patterns of development, views, parkland settings, field patterns and hedgerows and floodplain. There is an inherent confusion in this policy as it looks to cover so many different elements. The policy may need splitting to cover views in one and landscape character in another.
7.1.5 – Biodiversity and Historic Environment	Location of Ecosites etc. Map (p.51)	The many labels on the map cut through/hide the sites to which the map relates. The map will need re-producing with a much clearer labelling system that does not interfere with the clear mapping of the various habitat sites.
7.1.5 – Biodiversity and Historic Environment	Policy WW5 (p.54)	Suggest replace 'are encouraged' with 'will be expected to' in the first line of the policy.
7.1.? – Separation of Villages	Policy WW6: Explanatory text (p.56)	The section has not been allocated a number, as with all other sections. Should be 7.1.6?
7.1.? – Separation of Villages	Policy WW6 (p.58)	In criterion a) suggest that 'different' is replaced with 'distinctive'.
7.2 – Housing and Land Use	Settlement Boundary	There is no policy within the NDP looking to introduce a settlement boundary, within which the principle of development would be deemed acceptable. Is this being left to the SAP being produced by SDC?
7.2 – Housing and Land Use	Fourth paragraph (p.59)	Housing figures need to be revised taking account of comment above relating to section 4.2 (p.18).
7.2.1 – Location of New Housing	'Potential Areas for Housing...' map (p.60)	The heading for the map does not reflect what is being shown on the map. Area 3 does not appear to have been highlighted.

<p>7.2.1 – Location of New Housing</p>	<p>Location of new housing: table (p.61)</p>	<p><u>Area 1</u>: Given that much of the site is located within Flood zones 2 and 3 and the shape of the remainder of the site outside the flood zones, is it realistic that 50 dwellings could be constructed on this site?</p> <p><u>Area 5</u>: difficult to justify this statement for the whole site as north-western end is well-related to village centre, primary school, etc.</p> <p><u>Area 6</u>: identified as 'medium' sensitivity to housing development in the Landscape Sensitivity Study (LSS) 2011: Stratford-upon-Avon and Main Rural Centres. Has this been taken into account?</p> <p><u>Areas 7 and 8</u>: both identified as being of 'high/medium' sensitivity to housing development in the LSS 2011. Has this been taken into account?</p> <p>Need to assess land to the north of village (e.g. refer to flood risk, high/medium landscape sensitivity) and also area north of Walton Road (e.g. refer to openness of Dene Valley, setting of village etc.)</p>
<p>7.2.1 – Location of New Housing</p>	<p>Policy WW7: Explanatory text (p.59)</p>	<p>The explanatory text on page 59 is useful up to a point, and helpful in terms of indicating local priorities. However, it is not clear what will trigger the release of any of the sites listed in the Policy. This could cause considerable confusion and uncertainty. It would also be useful if separate policies could be included identifying key parameters to guide development in each location.</p>
<p>7.2.1 – Location of New Housing</p>	<p>Policy WW7 (p.62)</p>	<p>Some of the points referred to in Policy WW7 are not identified in the associated assessment on the previous page of the NDP; they should be consistent.</p>
<p>7.2.1 – Location of New Housing</p>	<p>Policy WW7 (p.62)</p>	<p>The first paragraph of the policy refers to "area 1 on the map". From the context it is evident that this is a reference to the map on the preceding page, although the titling is somewhat confusing and the exact site boundaries unclear due to the small scale. It would be preferable if this area could be named and if it could be consolidated with other information into a single, larger-scale, Proposals Map.</p>
<p>7.2.1 – Location of New Housing</p>	<p>Policy WW7 (p.62)</p>	<p>Although the Policy refers to eight separate areas, it is apparent that only Area 1 is identified for immediate release. As there is presently no need to release any additional housing land, it is especially important that the circumstances in which the release of this site will be triggered are clearly identified.</p> <p>The word 'preferable' in the first line of the policy gives the impression that other options may be considered...is this correct?</p> <p>Should Area 2 (safeguarded site) be a separate policy?</p> <p>Should the lines from 'Area 3 on the map...' to 'Area 8 on the map...' be within the Explanatory text, since they do not relate to sites allocated for development?</p> <p>The penultimate paragraph talks of small in-fill developments being supported in principle.</p>

		<p>However, there is no settlement boundary policy to which this would tie-in to.</p> <p>Not sure what is meant by the final sentence of the policy, since 'activities' suggests uses that may not be controlled by planning legislation and cannot be controlled though such a policy in the NDP.</p>
7.2.1 – Location of New Housing	Policy WW7 (p.62)	<p>The final paragraph of the Policy "encourages" the phasing of development over the Plan period. Given that only one site (with an estimated capacity of 50 homes) is identified for (apparently) unconditional release, it is difficult to see how this approach would work in practice or even be capable of being enforced. It also takes no account of supply from existing "committed" sites.</p>
7.2.2 – Provision of Housing Mix	Policy WW8 (p.64)	<p>The first paragraph identifies a threshold of 10 or more houses above which development "must contribute to the achievement of sustainable development". The Policy then cross-references to Core Strategy Policy CS.18. The Core Strategy policy relates to all new homes, and so the threshold in Policy WW8 does appear somewhat arbitrary, especially given the supporting text (5th paragraph, page 63) as well as imply that "unsustainable" development would be acceptable below this threshold.</p> <p>Overall, it is difficult to discern what "added value" the first two paragraphs of Policy WW8 create, over and above the Core Strategy policy.</p> <p>In respect of the third and final paragraph of the Policy, it is noted that this now only applies specifically to 2 bedroom rented affordable homes. This is a more satisfactory and proportionate approach compared to earlier drafts of this Policy on which SDC has commented informally. To the extent that it ring-fences supply of a proportion of bungalows (and such bungalows, along with all other homes, would be subject to the design standards set out in Policy WW10) with reference to local circumstances, this is an approach that can be supported. However, it is important to be realistic about the likely level of additional supply this particular policy requirement could generate: bearing in mind the threshold for on-site affordable housing provision in the Core Strategy (11 or more dwellings) and the fact that no additional housing sites are explicitly allocated.</p> <p>In conclusion, it is considered it would be better for the Policy to be re-written to focus only on the final paragraph, along the following lines:</p> <p>"The range and mix of dwelling types will be considered against the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CS.18, apart from the following derogation to reflect identified local needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 25% of 2 bedroom rented affordable homes shall be provided in the

		form of bungalows, unless a specific case for not doing so with reference to site-specific circumstances is demonstrated.”
7.2.3 – Provision of Affordable Housing	Policy WW9: Explanatory text (p.65)	The explanatory text (page 65) includes the statement “... a requirement for giving initial priority to meet the affordable housing needs of local people should be introduced.” This implies that there are no existing requirements to this effect which, as a point of fact, is incorrect. It also gives no consideration to market housing, which is expected to make up the majority of supply during the Plan period.
7.2.3 – Provision of Affordable Housing	Policy WW9 (p.66)	<p>It has been the long-standing practice of the District Council to prioritise the allocation of those affordable homes over which it has control to households with a qualifying local connection. This is achieved through the application of a “cascade” system, giving priority to households with a qualifying connection to the host parish in the first instance. This is in order to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development by fostering the development of balanced, sustainable and cohesive communities. This approach is normally given effect through the imposition of occupancy restrictions under the terms of planning obligations (Section 106 Agreements). Generally, such controls can only be applied in the case of new build homes – not existing properties. It is therefore wrong for the Policy to purport to apply to “vacated existing” affordable homes as (generally) there is no way such an approach would be legally enforceable or justifiable in planning terms.</p> <p>Additionally, there are practical issues that should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, the proposed Policy appears to be based on a misunderstanding of how the nominations and allocations process works. It would probably be inappropriate for the Plan to attempt to explain this process in detail; not least because there is always the possibility that such arrangements could change over the Plan period, making such references obsolete and misleading. However, briefly, the process of identifying tenants or purchasers of new affordable homes is based on bidding cycles, during which preference is given to households with a qualifying local connection on the basis of the “cascade” principle mentioned above. • Secondly, the definitions of qualifying local connection set out in the Policy differ (in detail) from those used in the Council’s current model planning obligation clauses. It could create considerable practical difficulties to use non-standard arrangements. <p>Finally, whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed Policy does reflect the principles of the “cascade” approach, there is also a danger that housing associations (“Registered Providers”) could simply decide not to develop schemes within the Plan area. For the above reasons, it is strongly recommended that the proposed Policy is deleted in its entirety.</p>

<p>7.2.4 – Design Standards in New Housing</p>	<p>Policy WW10: Explanatory text (p.67)</p>	<p>The explanatory text (page 67) references the Warwickshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy, but does not explain the reasoning behind the adoption of the optional Building Regulations Part M4(2) standard; nor the policy justification for doing so or the means by which it would be enforced. It would be good practice for the Plan to do so, as that standard is not referenced in the relevant adopted Core Strategy policy.</p> <p>Are the photos included the best examples to indicate preferred site layout design for new developments referred to in para 2? The ones included do not appear to show walled gardens, small green areas or trees, all features listed in paragraph 2...</p>
<p>7.2.4 – Design Standards in New Housing</p>	<p>Policy WW10 (p.68)</p>	<p>Reference to SDC Design Guide in first paragraph of WW10 would not be consistent with such examples as set out in the above point.</p> <p>Suggest replace 'dictated by' with 'in accordance with' in first paragraph of policy.</p> <p>In criterion d) it would not seem appropriate to incorporate innovative use of materials in all/most schemes; it is probably better to use materials that are traditional to the area in most cases.</p>
<p>7.2.4 – Design Standards in New Housing</p>	<p>Policy WW10 (p.68)</p>	<p>The intention behind this Policy is supported. However, there is a general concern that criteria (a) to (h) conflate several distinct issues; some of which may overlap with other policies in the adopted Core Strategy. It is therefore recommend that the relationship with those policies is carefully reviewed, for the avoidance of any confusion. Also, the District Design Guide was adopted in 2001, and so pre-dates current Core Strategy policies.</p> <p>The application of the optional "accessible and adaptable dwellings" standard is welcomed in principle. However, there appears to be a conflation between an optional standard made mandatory and a wish to seek an additional (unspecified, but higher) standard. This could create unwelcome uncertainty. In addition, the Policy should be aimed at improving the accessibility and adaptability of homes for the whole population – not just older people.</p> <p>Note that the relevant Core Strategy policy has been modified in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations and now states:</p> <p>"D. Flexible Design and Space Standards</p> <p><i>All residential development will be designed and built to encourage sustainable and flexible living. In particular, it will provide accommodation that can be easily adapted to suit changing household needs and circumstances, including to cater for home working and to benefit household members with disabilities or older residents who may need care and support. All dwellings will therefore incorporate sufficient storage space and floor layouts will provide practical usable space and a good standard of amenity".</i></p>

7.2.5 – Footpath...and Cycle Path Availability	Policy WW11 (p.70)	<p>Policy WW11 is not going to be readily applicable to small-scale infilling which is the focus of development during the remainder of plan period according to Policy WW7.</p> <p>Criterion d) is looking to secure provision of bike storage outside the site earmarked for development. This could only be monetary contribution secured through a S.106 legal agreement, since the storage area would be outside land in the control of the applicant.</p>
7.2.6 – Preservation and Improvement to Landscape	Policy WW12: Explanatory text (p.71)	<p>Second paragraph: The felling of most trees will not need permission from SDC or anyone else. The only trees which have some form of statutory protection are those located within a Conservation Area and/or those with a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). This text will need to be amended accordingly.</p>
7.2.6 – Preservation and Improvement to Landscape	Policy WW12 (p.72)	<p>The planting of trees as specified in WW12 will not be applicable to all developments.</p>
7.2.7 – Flood Risk Management	Policy WW13: Explanatory text (p.74)	<p>Third paragraph: Should refer to Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p>
7.2.7 – Flood Risk Management	Flood Risk: Map (p.75)	<p>Are the flood zones accurately mapped and based on up-to-date data from the Environment Agency?</p>
7.2.7 – Flood Risk Management	Policy WW13 (p.76)	<p>Why would development require a further 8 metre 'buffer' from the edge of the flood plain? Is this based on advice from the Environment Agency?</p> <p>Not sure how criterion a) to c) can be insisted upon, since they are not material planning matters.</p>

<p>7.3.1 – Investment in Infrastructure</p>	<p>Policy WW14: Explanatory text (p.77)</p>	<p>Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW) - Wellesbourne is at its permit level after an additional 454 dwellings and therefore requires further upgrading investment.</p> <p>Infrastructure will be secured through planning agreements such as s106 and s278 for site specific items of infrastructure such as a junction improvement/specific cycle/pedestrian links to a new housing estate/traffic calming measure such as a speed table that directly relate to a specific development. Most small scale development will be liable to contribute toward towards generic – ‘district-wide’ infrastructure through a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) when it is adopted later in 2016. These contributions will be spent on more strategic items of infrastructure such as primary school provision, a major road scheme, a country park or sports facilities.</p> <p>All new housing development with a net gain of 1 dwelling or an extension of 100sqm or above to a dwelling house will be liable to pay a Community Infrastructure Levy towards the provision of new or improved community amenities within the Parish of Salford Priors in accordance with Regulation 123 of the CIL regulations 2010 (as amended). S106 agreements will only be used, where required, for on-site provision of infrastructure to make the development acceptable in planning terms in accordance with regulation 122 of the CIL regulations 2010 (as amended).</p>
<p>7.3.2 – Contribution to Community Facilities</p>	<p>Policy WW15: Explanatory text (p.79)</p>	<p>Further work will be commissioned in the future to assess other open space infrastructure such as allotment provision however, the council currently relies on the 2014 ARUP Open Space Sports and Recreation Study which are based on slightly lower (pre Core Strategy adoption) housing requirement figures to assess the following typologies:</p> <p>Natural & Semi-natural Green Space – 4.39ha of additional accessible natural and semi-natural greenspace is required to address an existing shortfall and demands of the population increase.</p> <p>Provision for Children and Young people - 1.28ha of space for children and young people is required to address the demand of the population increase and the existing shortfall.</p> <p>Outdoor Sport Provision - 1ha of additional outdoor sports space to be provided to address the existing deficit and demand from predicted population increase however, the future assessment currently underway may change this.</p> <p>Indoor Sport Provision - Additional indoor sports provision is recommended for this area of the District to serve Wellesbourne although through the GLH proposals this provision could be met.</p> <p>The Arup Open Space Study is not listed in Appendix 5. It is unclear where the figures for the level of shortfall given for playing pitches, children’s play areas and natural accessible green</p>

		space come from. They should be based on Open Space Assessment Update produced by Arup dated September 2014.
7.3.2 – Contribution to Community Facilities	Policy WW15 (p.82)	Suggest criterion a) reads 'the purchase of land to provide...'
7.3.3 - Education	Policy WW16 (p.83)	Suggest the policy reads '...for children to attend the existing Wellesbourne Primary School or through the provision of an additional primary school.'
7.4.1 – Retail Business	Policy WW17 (p.85)	The final sentence of the policy cannot be insisted upon due to market forces and the existence of Permitted Development Rights.
7.4.2 – Commercial Business	Policy WW18 (p.87)	It is unclear what is meant by 'proposed reserved area'. Does it mean reserved for a specific purpose or for a future point in time or due to a particular circumstance? This should be clarified.
7.4.3 - Tourism	Policy WW19 (p.88)	How does the establishment of circular walks fit with the retention of 'local attractions'? This element is more aspirational and should be removed from the policy.
Appendix A	Non Land-Use Proposals (p.90-95)	The following seem to be sufficiently land-use based to be placed in actual policies: Page 90 – Nature Reserves (WW5) Page 92 – Additional parking provision (WW15) Page 93 – Play areas (WW15 – note that sports pitches are already identified in this policy) Page 95 – Refurbishment of Precinct area (WW15)
Appendix B	Local List of Heritage Sites	Could/should these assets be mapped? Are the 'reasons to preserve' sufficient/substantial enough to protect them, or is there more evidential work that could be referred to?
Glossary	(p.120-123)	"Affordable Housing". This definition appears to conflate the high-level definition used in the National Planning Policy Framework, with a specific tenure profile. I assume that the reference to "A new development would typically include affordable housing with a split of 75% social rental and 25% shared ownership" is intended to be purely explanatory. Nevertheless, this reflects now superseded policy. It could cause confusion as it does not align with the provisions in Part C of Core Strategy Policy CS.18. For the sake of simplicity, it is recommended that the final sentence of the definition be deleted. "Brownfield". See NPPF for more accurate definition. "Built-up-Area Boundary". Why is this being left to the SAP? Why not a policy in the NDP? "CIL". See Core Strategy Glossary for more accurate definition. "Conservation Area". See Core Strategy Glossary for more accurate definition. "Green Belt". Wellesbourne Parish is not covered by Green Belt. Remove from Glossary. "Green Space". Amend to read "Local Green Space".

		<p>"Housing Association Properties". It would be preferable to either delete reference to Orbit or preface it with the words "for example", as the current wording implies Orbit is the only provider. In fact, some homes in Wellesbourne are also provided by Bromford and, in future additional stock could be developed by other providers.</p> <p>"Housing Needs Survey (2011)". It might be useful to point out that this survey was intended purely to assess the level of unmet <i>local</i> housing need.</p> <p>"Infrastructure". See Core Strategy Glossary for more accurate definition.</p> <p>"Inspector". Amend to "Independent Examiner".</p> <p>"Listed Buildings". Not just houses... See Core Strategy Glossary for more accurate definition.</p> <p>"Local Development Plan". See Core Strategy Glossary for more accurate definition.</p> <p>"Local Plan". Duplication – remove from glossary.</p> <p>"NPPF" (First entry). Duplication – remove from glossary.</p> <p>"Neighbourhood Plan". Amend first line to read: 'A Plan prepared by the Parish Council to establish...'</p> <p>"Social Rented Housing". There are various affordable rented housing tenure products capable of development; the most common of which is Social Rented Housing. Rent levels for this particular tenure product are determined in accordance with a formula which reflects local income levels and other circumstances. Rent levels determined using this formula represent a proxy for housing which is considered genuinely "affordable", although this does not necessarily imply any level of subsidy.</p>
--	--	--