



DECISION STATEMENT

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM

1. Loxley Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 1.1 I confirm that the Loxley Neighbourhood Development Plan (LNDP), as revised according to the modifications set out below, complies with the legal requirements and Basic Conditions set out in the Localism Act 2011, and with the provision made by or under sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Plan can therefore proceed to referendum. A referendum could be held late February 2020.
- 1.2 I also declare that I have no personal or prejudicial interest in respect of this decision.

Signed

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "JCP Careford".

John Careford,
Policy Manager (Enterprise, Housing and Planning)

1. Background

- 2.1 The District Council confirms that for the purposes of Regulation 5 (1) of The Regulations Loxley Parish Council is the "Qualifying Body" for their area.
- 2.2 On 26th October 2015, Loxley Parish Council requested that, in accordance with section 5(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ("The Regulations"), the Parish of Loxley be designated as a Neighbourhood Area, for which a Neighbourhood Development Plan will be prepared.
- 2.3 In accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, Stratford-on-Avon District Council placed on their website this application, including a Parish boundary map, for a 6 week period between 14 January and 12 February 2016. In addition, it publicised the application by issuing a press release. Similarly, the relevant application, together with details of where

representations could be sent, and by what date, was advertised within the appropriate Parish via the Parish Council.

- 2.4 The District Council designated the Loxley Neighbourhood Area by way of approval of The Leader of the Council under delegated powers on 1st March 2016.
- 2.5 In accordance with Regulation 7 of The Regulations, the decision to designate the Loxley Neighbourhood Area was advertised on the District Council website together with the name, area covered and map of the area.
- 2.6 The Parish Council consulted on a pre-submission version of their draft Neighbourhood Development Plan between 24 May and 5 July 2018 fulfilling all the obligations set out in Regulation 14 of The Regulations. Following the Regulation 14 comments, the Plan was revised with two sites withdrawn from the Plan. Given the significance of the changes involved, a further consultation period was held on the revised Plan. This period ran from 15th November 2018 to 10th January 2019.
- 2.7 The Parish Council submitted their Neighbourhood Development Plan to Stratford-on-Avon District Council on 7th June 2019 in accordance with Regulation 15 of The Regulations.
- 2.8 The District Council publicised the submitted Plan and its supporting documents for 6 weeks between 27 June and 9th August 2019 in accordance with Regulation 16 of The Regulations.
- 2.9 Christopher Collison was appointed by the District Council to independently examine the Plan, and the Examination took place during October and November 2019, with the final Examiner's report being issued on 13th November 2019.
- 2.10 The Examiner concluded he was satisfied that the Loxley Neighbourhood Development Plan was capable of meeting the legal requirements set out in the Localism Act 2011, including meeting the Basic Conditions, subject to the modifications set out in his report, as set out in the table below.
- 2.11 Schedule 4B s.12 to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as inserted by the Localism Act 2011, requires that a Local Authority must consider each of the recommendations made in the Examiner's report and decide what action to take in response to each recommendation. If the Local Authority is satisfied that, subject to the modifications made, the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the legal requirements and Basic Conditions as set out in legislation, a referendum must be held on the 'making' (adoption) of the Plan by the Local Authority. If the Local Authority is not satisfied that the plan meets the basic conditions and legal requirements then it must refuse the proposal. Should a referendum take place, a majority of residents who turn out to vote must vote in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan (50% plus one vote) before it can be 'made'.
- 2.12 The Basic Conditions are:
 1. Have regard to national policy and guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
 2. Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

3. Be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the Authority (or any part of that area).
4. Does not breach, but is otherwise compatible with EU obligations – this includes the SEA Directive of 2001/42/EC and Human Rights requirements.

Examiner’s Recommendations and Local Authority’s Response (Regulation 18(1))

Examiner’s Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Policy H1 – Housing Growth (p.43, para 113)			
<p>Delete “in principle”</p> <p>After “as countryside” insert “Support for development proposals for”</p> <p>Replace “have been identified as potentially suitable” with “are allocated”</p> <p>Replace “Development on the above sites should” with “To be supported development proposals must”</p> <p>Add an additional note “Note: A public footpath crosses Site A”.</p>	<p>Section 4: Housing and the Built Environment (p.12)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>Clarification was sought from WCC on the location of the footpath and wording was agreed with Loxley Parish Council and the Examiner to read: Note A: A public footpath runs along the western boundary of Site A.</p> <p>The amendments to the policy text ensure that the policy is clear and robust.</p>	<p>Amend to read</p> <p>1. Village Boundary</p> <p>The built up area of Loxley is defined by the development Boundary (see Figure 2). New infill housing development within the Development Boundary will be supported in principle provided they accord with the principles and parameters set out in the Village design Statement (see Appendix 1).</p> <p>All areas of the Development Boundary are classed as countryside. <u>Support for development proposals for</u> new housing in the countryside will be limited to dwellings for rural workers, replacement dwellings, the appropriate conversion of existing buildings and new dwellings (in accordance with Policy H2), as well as dwellings of exceptional design (paragraph 79 of the NPPF and Policy AS.10 part E and J from the Core Strategy).</p> <p>2. Housing Allocations</p> <p>The following sites, as outlined in Figure 2, have</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>been identified as potentially suitable <u>are allocated</u> for small scale housing development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Site A – Land adjacent to Clematis Cottage, Stratford Road (allocated for approximately*2-3 dwellings) b) Site B – Land between Loxley Fields and Loxley House (allocated for approximately * 4-5 dwellings). c) Site C – Land adjacent to the recreation ground, Goldicote Road (allocated for approximately *4-5 dwellings). <p>Development on the above sites should <u>To be supported development proposals must have</u> regard to the Village Design Statement in Appendix 1.</p> <p>*Note: Housing numbers are indicative only. Higher densities may be appropriate (for example, in order to achieve viability).</p> <p><u>Note: A public footpath runs along the western boundary of site A.</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Policy H2 – Local Housing Needs (p.47, para 125)			
<p>Replace part b) with "The type, size and tenure of homes proposed, and their accessibility, reflect the identified local need; and</p> <p>Delete "containing inputs assessed and verified by a chartered surveyor"</p>	<p>Section 4: Housing and the Built Environment (p.16)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>The amendments to the policy text ensure that the policy is clear and robust.</p>	<p>Amend to read.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is a proven and as yet unmet local need, having regard to the most recent Housing Needs Survey; b) No other suitable and available sites exist within the Development Boundary of Loxley; and <u>The type, size and tenure of homes proposed and their accessibility, reflect the identified local need; and</u> c) Secure arrangements through Section 106 agreements exist to ensure the housing will remain affordable and available to meet the continuing needs of local people. <p>Where viability for 100% affordable housing provision cannot be achieved, an element of market housing may be included within a rural exception scheme, to provide sufficient cross subsidy to facilitate the delivery of affordable homes. In such cases, applicants will be required to provide additional supporting evidence in the form of an open book development appraisal for the proposal containing inputs assessed and verified by a chartered surveyor.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Explanation to Policy H2 – Local Housing Needs (p.48, para 113)			
Adjust explanation paragraph 4.13 in accordance with the definition of affordable housing included in Annex 2 of the Framework.	(p.16, para 4.13)	<i>Modification agreed.</i> <i>Amended text reflects both National and Strategic policy and ensures that the policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i>	Delete and amend to read. Affordable housing is defined as social rented, affordable rented and immediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. <u>Affordable housing is defined as: 'housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market (including housing that provides a subsidised route to home ownership and/or is for essential local workers); and which complies with one or more' of the definitions outlined in the NPPF, Annex 2 for affordable housing for rent, starter homes, discounted market sales housing and other affordable routes to home ownership.</u>
Replace the second sentence of paragraph 4.17 "A local connection" will be defined by reference to a standard set of criteria currently based on at least one household member satisfying any one or more of the following: Birth; Current residency; Previous residency;	(p.17, para 4.17)	<i>Modification agreed.</i> <i>Amended text reflects both National and Strategic Policy.</i>	Delete and amend to read. has lived in the Parish for a minimum of 6 months Someone who has previously lived in the Parish for 6 out of the last 12 months or 3 out of 5 years Someone who has close family connection residing in the Parish for at least 3 years Someone who has full or part time work in the Parish and has been employed for at least 6 months.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Current work; Current residency of close family members".			<p>Someone who can otherwise demonstrate a connection to the Parish</p> <p>For the purposes of local needs housing for Policy H2 this will be based on a local connection with the Parish. <u>A local connection will be defined by reference to a standard set of criteria currently based on at least one household member satisfying any one or more of the following</u></p> <p><u>Birth;</u> <u>Current residency;</u> <u>Previous residency;</u> <u>Current work;</u> <u>Current residency of close family members</u></p>
Delete paragraph 4.18.	(p.17, para 4.18)	<p><i>Modification agreed.</i></p> <p><i>This paragraph is not required due to amended text.</i></p>	<p>To satisfy the local connection criteria an applicant only has to meet one of the above points. The Parish Council will work closely with the District Council to ensure local housing is available to local people, where applicable. Hence, should no one come forward that meets the specified requirements consideration will then be given to people in the vicinity of the Parish.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Policy H3 – Design and Character (p.49 & 50, para 130)			
<p>Commence the first and second paragraphs with "To be supported".</p> <p>Delete "will be required to" and insert "must".</p> <p>Delete "should" and insert "must".</p> <p>Delete "taken from the previous" and insert "based on".</p> <p>After "Statement" insert "presented in Appendix 1"</p> <p>Replace part b) before "the open" with "retain gaps between buildings and spaces behind buildings where they contribute to"</p> <p>Delete "look to"</p> <p>Delete part g)</p> <p>Replace points i) and j) with "i) not exacerbate foul drainage</p>	(p.17&18, policy H3)	<p><i>Modification agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The revised text ensures that the Policy and Neighbourhood Development Plan as a whole is clearly written & unambiguous so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals.</i></p>	<p>Amend to read.</p> <p><u>To be supported</u>, the scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials of all development proposals, including alterations to existing buildings will be required to <u>must</u> sustain and enhance the distinctive character of the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p><u>To be supported</u>, development proposals should <u>must</u> comply with the following guiding principles taken from the previous based on Loxley Village Design Statement: <u>presented in Appendix 1</u>.</p> <p>a) Be compatible with the distinctive character of the area, respecting the local settlement pattern which is predominantly ribbon development, building styles and materials whilst taking a positive approach to innovative, contemporary designs that are sensitive to their setting;</p> <p>b) The detrimental erosion of space between and behind buildings will be resisted in order to preserve the open aspect of the village and retain links with the countryside beyond;</p> <p>b) <u>Retain gaps between buildings and spaces</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>capacity problems"</p> <p>Delete the final sentence.</p>			<p><u>behind buildings where they contribute to the open aspect of the village and retain links with the countryside beyond;</u></p> <p>c) Retain existing open green spaces within Loxley where they make an important contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the area and/or contribute to reducing the likelihood of surface water flooding;</p> <p>d) Be of a density and scale that is in keeping with the character of the surrounding development and landscape;</p> <p>e) Look to conserve or enhance heritage assets including listed buildings and their settings, balancing the significance of the asset and extent of any harm vis-à-vis any other public benefits of developments</p> <p>f) Protect, or enhance landscape and biodiversity by incorporating landscaping consistent with Warwickshire County Council Landscape Guidelines;</p> <p>g) Conserve and not obstruct the enjoyment of views to and from higher slopes or skylines, or panoramic views across the landscape;</p> <p>h) have regard to the impact on tranquillity, including dark skies; and</p> <p>i) not increase the likelihood of surface water flooding within the village or exacerbate foul drainage capacity problems; and</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>i) <u>not exacerbate foul drainage capacity problems.</u></p> <p>j) have due regard to drainage and flood management issues</p> <p>Development that is not sustainable and/or does not positively contribute to local character will not be supported.</p>
Policy H4 – Re-use of Rural Buildings (p.50-51, para 134)			
In Policy H4 in parts a) and b) replace "an unacceptable" with "significant adverse"	(p.19, Policy H4)	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>To ensure that the Policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i></p>	<p>The conversion of redundant buildings built of traditional materials or of historical or architectural merit to housing, permanent business space or residential tourist accommodation will be supported provided development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not have an unacceptable <u>significant adverse</u> impact on the visual and landscape amenity of the area; b) does not have an unacceptable <u>significant adverse</u> impact on neighbours amenity; c) does not cause harm to nature conservation interests; d) benefits from a safe and convenient access to the site or a satisfactory access can be created; and e) ancillary and/or outbuildings and boundary treatments are in keeping with the character and setting of the original

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			building.
Policy H5 – Replacement dwellings (P.53, para 141)			
<p>Commence the policy with "To be supported"</p> <p>Replace "the locality. Particular importance is placed on sensitive sites such as those" with "their setting including being".</p> <p>Replace part a) with "not be significantly larger than the original dwelling, and retain a sufficient proportion of the plot 'not built on', so as not to significantly harm the landscape setting".</p> <p>Delete part b)</p>	(p.20, Policy H5)	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>Text to be amended to ensure that the policy is clearly written and unambiguous so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals.</i></p>	<p>To be supported proposals for replacement dwellings must respect the character and appearance of <u>their setting including being the locality</u>. Particular importance is placed on sensitive sites such as those within the Special Landscape Area or affecting the setting of listed buildings. All proposals for replacement dwellings should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not be disproportionately large relative to the size of the plot; a) <u>Not be significantly larger than the original dwelling, and retain a sufficient proportion of the plot 'not built on', so as to reflect the character of adjacent development, and so as not to significantly harm the landscape setting.</u> b) Consider the need for — and potential to provide — garages; c) Be of an appropriate scale so as not to be too dominant or adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring uses; and d) Demonstrate that protected species will not be harmed as a result of the proposals. <p>This policy will only apply to lawful dwellings and</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			does not apply to caravans or mobile homes.
Delete paragraph 4.33 of the explanation.	(p.53, para 141)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>	Delete. To address this issue and in order to ensure that replacement dwellings are not disproportionately larger, as a guideline this Plan considers that they should be no more than 40% larger in volume and footprint than the original dwelling as it currently exists, recognizing that larger dwellings may be appropriate in certain cases but these cases would need justification.
Policy NE1 – Protection of Special Landscape Area and Valued Landscapes			
Commence the first paragraph with "To be supported" Replace "which includes the majority of the village to the south of the Stratford/Wellesbourne Road" with "identified on the Figure below" Replace the final paragraph with "Development proposals will not be supported where they have a significant adverse impact on: - Views across valued	(p.55 & 56, para 149)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> <i>Text amended to provide consistency and so the policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i>	1. Special Landscape Area (SLA). <u>To be supported</u> all development must conserve or enhance the high landscape quality of the Special Landscape Area which includes the majority of the village to the south of the Stratford/Wellesbourne Road. <u>identified on the figure below.</u> Proposals which would have a harmful effect on the distinctive character and appearance of the Special Landscape Area will not be supported unless sufficient mitigation measures are put in place.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>landscapes where seen from locations to which the general public have unrestricted access (identified in Figure 3); or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Views within Loxley Village of: the Village Green and War Memorial; Loxley SSSI; The Rectory; the Church; the Manor; or along Hillside where seen from locations to which the general public have unrestricted access. 			<p>2. Valued Landscapes Proposals which have an adverse impact on valued landscapes, as shown in Figure 3 and described within the Loxley Village Design Statement (See Appendix 1), will not be supported. <u>Development proposals will not be supported where they have a significant adverse impact on:</u> <u>views across valued landscapes where seen from locations to which the general public have unrestricted access identified in figure 3; or</u> <u>views within Loxley Village of: the Village Green and War Memorial; Loxley SSSI; The Rectory; the Church, the Manor; or along Hillside where seen from locations to which the general public have unrestricted access (identified in Figure 5)</u></p>
<p>Insert a Figure below the policy that identifies the extent of Special Landscape Area in the Neighbourhood Area. (P. 22)</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i> <i>For clarification purposes.</i></p>	<p>A figure showing the Special Landscape Area has been inserted.</p>
<p>Insert a Figure below the policy that identifies the location of the Village Green and War Memorial; Loxley SSSI; The Rectory; The Church; The Manor; and Hillside.</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i> <i>For clarification purposes.</i></p>	<p>A figure showing the views within Loxley Village and of the locations identified has been inserted.</p>
<p>Any viewpoint on Figure 3 that is on private land should be</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p>	<p>No amendment made.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
moved to the nearest point where the public have free and unrestricted access.		<i>The Parish Council has confirmed that there were no changes to be made to the Valued Landscapes.</i>	
Policy NE2 – Biodiversity (p58, para 156)			
Replace the first paragraph with "To be supported, development proposals must not harm biodiversity, and must provide net gains for biodiversity through provision of new or improved green infrastructure unless it can be demonstrated this is not possible or is not viable".	(p.25)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>	Where appropriate, development should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising negative impacts on biodiversity and providing net gain in biodiversity wherever possible through new and improved green infrastructure.
In the second paragraph delete "Where appropriate"; replace "are encouraged to" with "that"; after "risk" insert "will be supported"; and replace "should be kept to a minimum" with "will not be supported unless they are demonstrated to be essential".	(P.25)	<i>The amended text has regard for national policy and ensures that the policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i>	Where appropriate, new developments that are encouraged to open up any existing culverts on a site providing more open space/green infrastructure for greater amenity, biodiversity and reduced flood risk; will be supported and the creation of new culverts should be kept to a minimum. will not be supported unless they are demonstrated to be essential.
In the third paragraph after "retained and" insert "the creation of	(p.25)		Existing ecological habitats (eg Loxley Meadow SSSI, designated Local Wildlife Sites) and networks should be retained and <u>retained and the creation of</u> new ecological habitats and networks will be encouraged <u>supported</u> . <u>To be supported, development proposals adjacent to waterbodies must incorporate buffer</u>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>In the third and fourth paragraphs replace "encouraged" with "supported"</p> <p>Insert a new penultimate paragraph as follows "To be supported development proposals adjacent to waterbodies must incorporate buffer margins to protect waterbodies from development, and to promote habitat connectivity within the wider landscape for both people and wildlife to use".</p>	<p>(P.25)</p> <p>(p.25)</p>		<p><u>margins to protect waterbodies from development, and to promote habitat connectivity within the wider landscape for both people and wildlife to use.</u></p> <p>Measures to improve landscape quality, scenic beauty and tranquillity and to reduce light pollution will be encouraged.</p>
<p>Policy NE3 – Trees and Hedgerows (p.60, para 161)</p>			
<p>Replace "Development should encourage the protection and retention of "with "To be supported, development proposals must retain and protect".</p> <p>Delete "in these circumstances".</p> <p>Replace "will be required" with "must be planted".</p> <p>Replace the final sentence with "All development proposals</p>	<p>(p.26)</p> <p>(p.26)</p> <p>(p.26)</p> <p>(p.26)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>Amended text to ensure that the policy is clearly written and is unambiguous.</i></p>	<p><u>To be supported, development proposals must retain and protect</u> Development should encourage the protection and retention of existing trees and hedgerows which are important for their historic, visual or biodiversity value unless the need for, and the benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh any loss.</p> <p>Where it is not possible or feasible to retain such trees or hedgerows, in these circumstances <u>replacement trees or hedgerows must be planted</u> will be required in an appropriate location on the site.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
must include new native hedge and tree planting as part of an integrated landscaping scheme unless it is demonstrated this is not practicable or viable".			<p><u>All development proposals must include new native hedge and tree planting as part of an integrated landscaping scheme unless it is demonstrated this is not practicable or viable.</u></p> <p>Where necessary, all new development should incorporate the planting of appropriate native trees and hedges in their plans.</p>
Policy NE4 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (p.61, para 165)			
In Policy NE4 in the first paragraph replace the text after "supported" with "where there are no significant adverse landscape or other visual impacts".	(p.27)	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>To ensure that the policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i></p>	Development proposals relating to the production of renewable energy will be supported where there are no significant adverse landscape or other visual impacts. providing they can be satisfactorily integrated into the character and appearance of the village and its environs.
Policy NE5 – Flooding			
Delete Policy NE5 and replace with Examiner's suggested wording.	(p.28)	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>Text amended to ensure that the policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i></p>	<p>Development will be expected to have regard to pluvial (Surface water) and fluvial (rivers) flood risk in the following ways:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Proposals will only be supported if they satisfactorily address the risk of fluvial and pluvial flooding. b. Appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be incorporated into all new developments and designed to control run-off generated on-site to the

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>greenfield run-off rate for all return periods up to and including the 1 in 100 years plus climate change critical storm event criteria.</p> <p>e. Infiltration and above ground SuDS attenuation, such as swales, ponds and other water based ecological systems, should be used wherever feasible and is preferred to underground storage of water.</p> <p>d. Where mitigation measures involve cut off ditches, balancing ponds and or similar, proposals should demonstrate the means by which these shall be maintained to ensure their satisfactory performance in perpetuity.</p> <p><u>Development proposals will be supported where they utilise infiltration and above ground sustainable drainage systems including swales, ponds, and other water-based ecological systems, and demonstrate they will not result in on-site or off-site flooding. Underground storage of water will only be supported where it is demonstrated this is necessary on grounds of viability or practicality.</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Policy LC1 – Community Assets (p65, para 178)			
In Policy LC1 in the first sentence replace the text after “or that the” with “community asset will be replaced with an equal or improved facility in no less convenient location for users”.	(p.29)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> <i>Amended text ensures that the policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i>	Development, which requires permission, that results in the change of use or loss of a designated community asset, as listed below and shown on Figure 4, will not be supported unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the use of the building and ancillary land is no longer viable or that the use can be satisfactorily relocated for the ongoing benefit of the local community. <u>Community asset will be replaced with an equal or improved facility in no less convenient location for users.</u>
Policy LC2 – Designated Local Green Spaces (p69, para 194)			
Delete the second paragraph commencing “The above” Replace “Where appropriate, CIL funds” with “The locally determined element of expenditure of developer contributions”	(p.31)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> <i>Amended text ensures that the policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i>	The above designations include a range of existing formal sports and recreational spaces along with informal areas of play and open space. <u>Where appropriate, CIL funds</u> The locally determined element of expenditure of developer contributions will be used to enhance designations in public ownership to ensure a suitable quantum and quality of recreational and amenity space is available for the Neighbourhood Area.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Policy LC3 – Encouraging the Use of Public Routes (p. 70, para 198)			
Delete Policy LC3 and replace with Examiner's suggested wording.	(p.33)	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>Revised text to ensure that the policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i></p>	<p><u>To be supported, development proposals must not adversely affect any pedestrian or cycle route, including those leading to the village centre and the village school. To be supported, development proposals must demonstrate that opportunities to enhance the active travel network have been taken.</u></p>
Policy TT1 – Local Parking Standard (p. 72, para 204)			
Delete Policy and replace with Examiner's wording.	(p.34)	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>The modification of Policy LC3 as recommended earlier in the report incorporates the references to pedestrian and cycle routes in paragraphs 4 and 6 of Policy TT1 within the Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Where appropriate development must include adequate and safe provision for off-roading parking and accessing arrangements.</p> <p>Dwellings will be expected to provide one space per bedroom. Additionally, dwellings must provide secure storage space for cycles.</p> <p>In the absence of any adopted standards from Warwickshire County Council, the parking provision for non-residential developments will be considered on their own merits.</p> <p>New developments should not undermine existing pedestrian and cycle routes into the village centre and to the village school.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>Development proposals which exacerbate the current on-street parking problems within the village, will not be supported unless substantial and sufficient evidence can demonstrate why this proposal is required, is effective and meets all other requirements and policy stipulations, as detailed by the area's development plan policies.</p> <p><u>To be supported, development proposals must demonstrate, through reference to the latest version of the Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document, that they will not result in on-road parking. Additionally, proposals must provide secure cycle parking facilities.</u></p>
Policy TT2 – Highways Safety (p.73, para 211)			
<p>Replace the text before the colon with "To be supported development proposals must demonstrate".</p> <p>In b) replace "demonstrable" with "severe".</p> <p>Delete the final sentence.</p>	(p. 35)	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The revised text ensures that the policy is clearly written and unambiguous.</i></p>	<p><u>To be supported development proposals must demonstrate that:</u> new development will be expected to demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The safety of all road users will not be compromised; b) There will be no <u>severe demonstrable</u> adverse impact on the capacity and operation of the local highway network; and c) There is safe access to and from the

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>development with appropriate visibility at any road junctions.</p> <p>Proposals which fail to demonstrate the above will not be supported.</p>

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

Sustainable Development Role (NPPF)	Neighbourhood Development Plan's Contribution
Economic	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to support the local economy through the protection and enhancement of existing employment sites and the promotion of new employment sites/opportunities within the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>If implemented these policies will have a positive impact on the local economy, safeguarding jobs and local services.</p>
Social	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets a framework that will help to support the achievement of sustainable social development.</p> <p>The Plan promotes the retention and improvement of local community facilities.</p> <p>The Plan supports the protection, enhancement and expansion of existing formal and informal sport and recreational facilities.</p> <p>The Plan supports the provision of new leisure and sports facilities.</p> <p>The Plan looks to safeguard and promote improvements of locally important sites.</p> <p>Policies seek to promote the local distinctiveness of the area, and recognise locally important heritage assets.</p>
Environmental	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of policies that support environmental sustainability for the community.</p> <p>The Plan has policies that look to protect heritage assets, natural features, biodiversity, valued landscapes as well as designate areas of Local Green Space.</p> <p>The NDP includes policies to protect the natural environment for future generations which have a positive impact on the environmental sustainability of the plan.</p>

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

- Subject to the modifications above, the Loxley Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions set out in paragraph 2.12 above; and
- The referendum area should be coterminous with the neighbourhood area.

4. Availability of Decision Statement and Examiner's Report (Regulation 18(2))

This Decision Statement and the Examiners Report can be inspected online at:

<https://www.stratford.gov.uk/planning-building/loxley-neighbourhood-plan.cfm>

And can be viewed in paper form at:

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