

Long Itchington Neighbourhood Development Plan

Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation (Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, 2012)

Appendix 1 – Significant comments from Stratford-on-Avon District Council

Suggested new text underlined deleted text ~~struckthrough~~

Page number	Section	Comment
N/A	General	It is noted that by a coincidence of timing the public consultation exercise on the NDP will overlap to a considerable extent with the public consultation exercise undertaken by the District Council on its Site Allocations Plan (“the SAP”). It will be up to the Parish Council to make its own representations in respect of the SAP if they wish to do so, however it is suggested that the Parish Council will take into account the latest progress on the SAP when preparing the next version of the NDP.
N/A	General, Policies and Proposals map	It would be very useful for the NDP to incorporate a single, consolidated policies and proposals map. Currently, there are several important pieces of information spread across several different plans. This frustrates ease of understanding and use of the NDP as a whole. It would be preferable if all policy-related content could be displayed in a single plan (possibly supported by an inset map for Long Itchington village) to an appropriate scale or scales.
N/A	General, Public Sector Equality Duty	It would be useful for the NDP to include a reference, at least in general terms, to the regard that has been had to the statutory Public Sector Equality Duty when drafting the NDP. This may be particularly useful in terms of justifying the content of Policy H5.
N/A	General – omission of policy on reserve housing sites	It is noted that the NDP does not identify any ‘reserve sites’ within the framework envisaged by Policy CS.16 of the Core Strategy. It appears from the explanatory text that the Parish Council has relied on the 2019 version of the SAP (now withdrawn) as the basis for not doing so.

Page number	Section	Comment
		<p>It is also noted that the NDP does not reference the proposed self/custom-build housing proposal (SCB.5 in the SAP) on land north of Collingham Lane, Long Itchington. Although a separate proposal, it gives rise to the same practical issues discussed below.</p> <p>The position has moved on with the Preferred Option version of the SAP (as explained in that document itself) and clearly, this has significant implications in particular for Southam, together with surrounding villages including Long Itchington.</p> <p>It is recognised that the SAP will need to complete the necessary statutory processes leading to adoption. There can therefore be no certainty at this stage that the current proposals (specifically insofar as they relate to Long Itchington) will necessarily be those that end up in the adopted SAP.</p> <p>However, there is an ideal opportunity for the submission version of the NDP to take into account the proposals within the SAP and, in particular, identify any specific local issues that need to be addressed or requirements that ought to be met, in relation to the proposals currently set out in the SAP. Of course, this can be done without prejudice to the Parish Council's position in respect of the SAP.</p> <p>In purely practical terms, it would be extremely useful if the District Council and its partners can be made aware of any local issues or requirements that may affect the delivery of the two reserve sites ('LONG.A' and 'LONG.B') identified in the emerging SAP: or, indeed, any alternative site or sites the Parish Council may wish to promote via the NDP.</p>
Page 4	Introduction/vision statement	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the vision statement is at Paragraph 4.1, the introductory text is often where the vision statement should be included. Currently, the introduction is an 'opinion' on how the amount of people and housing has increased in the area and taken a toll in the 'current' residents. Although this may be true, the NDP must also convey that the statement is for the whole village including future residents and residents who have just moved into the village.</p> <p>The Framework states:</p> <p><i>Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not</i></p>

Page number	Section	Comment
		<p><i>promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies.</i></p> <p>A vision is your optimal mid to long-term goal describing what you want your neighbourhood to look like at the end of the plan period. It is often written in the future tense as a statement of what ‘will be’.</p> <p>For example, <i>In 2031, Sutton St.Nicholas will be a sustainable and thriving local community, with the distinctive local environment of the village and surrounding countryside robustly and successfully safeguarded with new development in place to meet requirements for housing, jobs, and local services.</i> (Sutton St Nicholas Neighbourhood Plan, submission document).</p> <p>The four main points/themes can then be included after the supporting text.</p>
Page 12	Vision, Paragraph 4.2	It must be acknowledged that future housing development in the NP area cannot be restricted solely to meeting the needs of the existing community – that would be inconsistent with the provisions of the Core Strategy regarding the basis of the District’s housing requirements which includes in-migration. Having said that, it is reasonable to acknowledge that the scale of recent housing development has been substantial and that further large-scale housing development in the NP area would not be appropriate during the current plan period.
Page 14	Section 5, paragraph 2.1.	The same point as for 4.2 applies. The Summary Statement is laudable but quite prescriptive in parts. It may need to be toned down, eg. replace ‘must’ with ‘should’. Under c) it’s unclear what type/location of site is covered – it is assumed that it doesn’t cover greenfield sites on the edge of Long Itchington BUAB or in open countryside but this needs to be clarified.
Page 15	Summary statement – supported new housing development	This is helpful as a summary of the proposed policy approach. However, there is concern about criterion c) which cross-references Policies H2 and BE2 and, more particularly, limits support to a “ <i>small-scale scheme i.e. for less than 10 units.</i> ” This limitation is not actually included in Policy H2, and in any case, there is no such limitation in Part D of Core Strategy CS.15. Those points aside, it should also be noted that any such restriction would (in the absence of any lower thresholds than those already specified in Core Strategy Policy CS.18) effectively preclude the ability to secure affordable housing. This, in turn, would appear to at odds with the theme set out at paragraph 4.2 of the NDP.

Page number	Section	Comment
Page 15	Criterion d) ix)	This is too onerous. It may not be appropriate in some instances to insist upon planting screening. It should be on a case by case assessment.
Page 15	Criterion d x)	It is suggested that the wording is changed from 'must' to 'encourage' or 'support' as it would be difficult to enforce this.
Page 15	Criterion viii), Policy BE4 and Policy NE6	It is suggested that reference to Code Level 4 is removed as these codes have been abolished Reference could be made solely to Building Regulations, however given new developments are required to do this anyway it may be useful to make reference to the recently adopted Climate Change SPD which encourages developers to go above and beyond the Building Regulations minimum requirements and also provides a range of options for improving energy efficiency.
Page 17	Section 5.1, Housing	There needs to be a general acknowledgement of the requirement to provide reserve housing sites in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.16. If such sites aren't to be identified in the NDP then the District Council has to consider doing so through the Site Allocations Plan.
Page 17	Policy H1	Delete ' main ' Reword first para "...within the built-up area boundary of Long Itchington, as defined..." to recognise there is only one BUAB in the NDP.
Page 17	Para 5 & 6, Policy H1	The final para – is more restrictive than CS Policy AS.10, which lists other uses which are acceptable in countryside locations. There needs to be a general acknowledgement of the requirement to provide reserve housing sites in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.16. If such sites aren't to be identified in the NDP then the District Council has to consider doing so through the Site Allocations Plan.
Page 17	Policy H1	Consideration is needed in respect of the Council's Local Needs Schemes (i.e. Policy CS.15) where proposals can be supported adjacent to the built-up-area boundaries.
Page 19	Policy H2	There is concern that local need is too restrictive and does not take account of District wide housing need. There is no mention of 'market' dwellings being acceptable?
Page 19	Policy H2	Local Needs Schemes, including Self-Build/Custom Build dwellings, should not be restricted to previously developed sites within the Built-Up Area Boundary. CS.15 of the Core Strategy does not require housing needs schemes to be 'solely' incorporated on previously developed land. Para 2 in the explanation acknowledges this.

Page number	Section	Comment
Page 20	Policy H3	<p>It is appreciated that the Policy refers to a local housing needs survey. However, it is suggested that the Policy makes reference to the set requirements within the SPD to reinforce the requirement for affordable housing.</p> <p>It should also be made clear as to what is deemed as small-scale affordable housing – is it the same as the Core Strategy requirement for 6 dwellings or more than 1000sq.m? If so, reference should be made to the Core Strategy, CS.18.</p>
Page 20	Policy H3	<p>The inclusion of Policy H3 (Affordable Housing) is noted and welcomed. However, the following issues should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) In and of itself, it is unclear how this Policy will ‘add value’ to the existing framework for promoting ‘Local Need’ schemes provided by the Core Strategy. (2) Specifically in relation to sites <i>within</i> the proposed Built Up Area Boundary, it would be wrong in itself and in relation to other policies to restrict its scope purely to the ‘<i>redevelopment of previously developed sites</i>’. (3) The explanatory references (and indeed reproduces in full as an appendix) the 2016 survey report, but fails to discuss the extent to which any of the need identified in that survey may already have been met by recent developments in and around the village (whilst acknowledging those developments would have contributed towards meeting District-wide needs). <p>For the above reasons, it may be of greater practical benefit for the NDP to identify and allocate any one of more sites that it may consider suitable for a Local Need scheme. The Rural Housing Enabler would be able to assist in this process.</p>
Page 21	Policy H5, Stock mix	<p>The inclusion of Policy H5 (Housing Stock Diversity) is noted. This comprises three elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Paragraph (a), which seeks to ensure the delivery of “<i>Housing development that adds to the choice of type and tenure of housing, including self-build, custom-build and live/work units available to meet the identified needs of local people</i>”.

Page number	Section	Comment
		<p>(2) Paragraph (b), which seeks to ensure “..... sustainable and flexible living into house design to meet the requirements of people throughout their lives. In particular, accommodation that can be easily adapted to suit changing household needs and circumstances, including to cater for home working, people with disabilities and older residents who may need care and support.”</p> <p>(3) Paragraph (c), which in essence seeks to retain existing bungalows as such in order to “..... ensure that the choice of single storey living remains available for older people or people with restricted mobility within the Neighbourhood Area.”</p> <p>The high-level objectives of the above policy are laudable, but the following issues should be considered:</p> <p>(1) It is unclear as to what ‘added value’ paragraph (a) generates relative to Core Strategy Policy CS19. Indeed, it is unclear whether it is intended to sit alongside Parts A and B of Policy CS.19 or replace them: if the latter, criterion (a) is considered to be too vague to apply in practice.</p> <p>(2) Similarly, paragraph (b) appears to largely duplicate Part D of Core Strategy Policy CS.19, without generating any real ‘added value’ – for example in terms of requiring specific standards to be achieved. This ambiguity is unhelpful.</p> <p>(3) The intent of paragraph (c) is understood. However, it would be wrong to assume that just because bungalow accommodation is retained, it would be automatically accessible too.</p>
Page 21	Policy H5	<p>Part c) is too restrictive. A policy cannot put a blanket ban on a certain type of development. It may be demonstrated that this is the only viable solution for the dwelling, especially if the bungalow has been neglected and redundant.</p> <p>Significant evidence would be required as to why it is essential that ‘no’ bungalows will not be converted to two storey dwellings. Furthermore, it must be noted that you would be stopping all householders in the settlement from developing/expanding their home where it might very well be in keeping with the area and conveys to all other policy requirements.....this would be exceptionally hard to defend at appeal.</p>

Page number	Section	Comment
		Part c) could be used as part of the Community Aspiration Policy as set out on page 24.
Page 21	Policy H5	criterion c) Whilst the sentiment is understood, it is not clear as to how this could be controlled by policy whilst not being more stringent than CS policies and NPPF and PD Rights.
Page 25	Policy BE1	<p>The policy does not need to refer to the<i>permitted under the NPPF 'current at that time'</i>.</p> <p>The NPPF is a material consideration and development will always have to conform (unless material considerations deem otherwise) to the most recent NPPF. Furthermore, the NPPF may significantly change which could conflict with any of the NDP policies in the future. At that time, an assessment would have to be made on which is the most up to date policy and/or requirement (Remember the NPPF stipulates that development must accord with an Area's Development Plan) and therefore by stipulating in Policy that development will be supported in principle with the most up to date Framework 'could' immediately override all other policy stipulations; namely, H2 and H3.</p>
Page 29	Policy BE3	<p>This policy is too onerous and far too broad.</p> <p>"Any proposal for development should provide evidence of its impact on the Neighbourhood Area as a whole" – this would have to include householders and small-scale schemes. This is unreasonably onerous, and unclear as to what evidence the policy is requiring to be submitted.</p> <p>As set out in the Planning Practice Guidance and the Development Management Procedure Order, not all applications require this level of information to be supported and/or validated. Furthermore, the Council's Local Planning List does not require this level of information and scrutiny.</p> <p>As worded, 'every' application would require evidence of its impact on the 'whole' neighbourhood plan area. Small developments (i.e. one dwelling, annexes, extensions, drop kerbs) do not require this level of scrutiny.</p> <p>Paragraph 31 of the Framework states :</p>

Page number	Section	Comment
		<i>'The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals'.</i>
Page 30	Policy BE4	<p>There are a number of policies in respect of design. This creates a number of duplications and a varying degree of policy requirements. It is recommended doing 'one' detailed design policy which is concise and precise, which would ensure that there is no duplication or confusion over the specified requirements.</p> <p>It may not be practical that all new dwellings can secure cycle storage (i.e. apartments). Furthermore, this wouldn't be a sufficient refusal for an application, alone. It is recommended that the policy is reworded in a positive way; i.e. new dwellings without secured cycling storage facilities will only be supported with sufficient justification and evidence.</p> <p>It is important to be clear if all the criteria apply or if they should be considered as alternatives. This can be clarified by linking the criteria with either "and" or "or" depending on whether they all apply or should be considered as alternatives. This is a frequent omission and led to the Examiner of the Lynton and Lynmouth Plan expressing doubt about the clarity and precision of the policies.</p>
Page 30	Policy BE4(d)	The wording of this bullet point is too restrictive. "Existing trees must be protected" What if the tree(s) is in poor health or is a non-native species and proposed for replacement by a native species which would offer more in terms of biodiversity gain?
Page 30	Policy BE4 (f)	It is noted that the car parking standards are different to those which are in Part O of the adopted Development Requirements SPD. If these are to be different there should be adequate and sufficient evidence to support this.
Page 30	Policy BE4(f)	Parking being screened from view will be unrealistic in most cases.
Page 30	Policy BE3, Evidence, paragraph 2.	This paragraph will need to be deleted as the text is no longer correct in relation to Southam College. Alternative text can be found in the most up to date version of the SAP Preferred Options document 2020, after Policy SAP.4.
Page 34	Policy EB1 and EB3	The two policies could be brought into one overall policy for business and employment uses. This will ensure that there is no duplication, contradictions and/or confusion (as above).
Page 34	Policy EB2	Suggest 2 nd para refers to small-scale sites only.

Page number	Section	Comment
Page 35	Policy EB3	Criterion b) how would this be demonstrated (i.e. 12 month marketing exercise)? This would need to set out in the policy and /or explanatory text.
Page 38	Policy EB4	<p>It is strongly recommended that the policy stipulates that the agricultural building must be demonstrated to be no longer viable and all other possible business uses must have been considered and demonstrated unviable before a C3 use is deemed acceptable, in principle. As worded, there is no requirement to demonstrate the loss of the agricultural use and any other possible alternatives. Consequently, agricultural buildings throughout the NDP area could be readily permitted to be converted.</p> <p>Furthermore, as worded in Policy AS.10, it is strongly recommended for agricultural buildings of 'traditional materials' to be deemed acceptable for conversion (if the loss and all other uses can be substantiated). Otherwise, large steel clad barns (less than 10 years old) could also be converted in principle.</p>
Page 38	Policy EB4	The policy cannot be more restrictive than CS Policy AS.10 (see Residential criterion (d) and Business criterion (k) for example).
Page 38	Policy EB4	The explanation should refer to Class Q of the GDPO.
Page 38	Policy EB5	This policy is looking to support infrastructure (such as drainage, roads, footpaths etc) but only if they meet the 4 purposes set out in the policy. However, these types of infrastructure are the responsibility of other service providers and cannot be controlled via 'traditional' planning policies since they have their own specific regimes for gaining consent for such works.
Page 40	Policy NE1	<p>The site which is the subject of the LONG.B proposal in the SAP is identified as one of those sites subject to Policy NE1 – Valued Landscape and Views – by virtue of Figure 9.</p> <p>Policy NE1 does not necessarily absolutely preclude development as proposed in SAP Proposal LONG.B. It would be open to the Parish Council to challenge the proposed identification of the site as a 'reserve site' in the emerging SAP via the normal consultation processes associated with the preparation of the SAP itself. Nevertheless, in the absence of any challenge to LONG.B at the present time, it would be</p>

Page number	Section	Comment
		helpful for the Parish Council – when addressing the issues raised in Section 3 above – to clarify how to envisage Policy NE1 operating in relation to the development of the LONG.B site.
Page 44	Green Space	<p>Careful consideration is needed to the stipulations of Para 99-101 of the Framework (2019), which sets the requirements for designating local green space(s).</p> <p>The Plan needs to make sure that allocating local green space corresponds to national policy and is capable of enduring beyond the end of the Plan period (NPPF)</p> <p>An appeal against the Blackwell NDP Hearing specified, it is essential, when allocating Local Green Space, plan-makers can clearly demonstrate that the requirements for its allocation are met in full. (Sufficient evidence is needed for all allocations)</p> <p>The Policy may need to be considered as Community Aspiration if sufficient evidence cannot be demonstrated.</p> <p>May be worth incorporating Policy CS.7 in the supporting text and how the two policies can complement each other.</p>
Page 44	Policy NE2	The explanation needs to be repositioned after the policy to avoid confusion.
Page 44	Policy NE2	<p>Reference LGS 11: Play area and open green space west of Leigh Crescent, Long Itchington Stratford on Avon District Council, as the owner of the land, objects to the land being designated as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>The reason for this view is that there is a need for the Council to retain its existing assets and the value they represent. However there is a commitment to retain the play area, and there are no current plans to seek to change the use of the land.</p>
Page 44	Policy NE2	LGS4 is a roadside verge – It is not clear as to how this would meet the designation criteria.
Page 44	Policy NE2	LGS6 and LGS7 . There are a number of individual parcels of land seemingly making up 2 no. LGS proposals. Which parcels are LGS6 and which are LGS7? Some land parcels appear to be highway verges and are very small (and difficult to see on the map). It is not clear how these individual parcels

Page number	Section	Comment
		of land meet the designation criteria. If any were to remain, it is recommended that they are numbered a, b, c etc (similar to site 16).
Page 44	Policy NE2	LGS13 – Similar to LGS6 and LGS 7, this particular ‘site’ is made up of a large number of grass verges and very small incidental spaces which are distributed over several streets. It is not clear as to how these parcels of land would meet the designation criteria. If any were to remain, it is recommended that they are numbered a, b, c etc (similar to site 16).
Page 44	Policy NE2	Suggest new final para: “ <u>Development that would harm the openness or special character of a Local Green Space or its significance and value to the local community will not be permitted unless there are very special circumstances which outweigh the harm to the Local Green Space</u> ”.
Page 45	Figure 10 – LGS	It is very difficult to interpret all the individual parcels of land at this scale. Consideration may need to be given to a number of maps or inserts at a more appropriate scale in order to view the land parcels more clearly.
Page 46	Policy NE3 – para 2	It is not clear as to the practicalities of setting out such precise requirements for all development proposals.
Page 46	Policy NE3 – para 5	What is the ‘mitigation hierarchy’ policy referred to here? Where is it set out? How would it operate? It is not clear as drafted.
Page 47	Policy NE4	This policy is too onerous. Not all planning applications, as stipulated by the NPPF, PPG, DEFRA, CS.4 (Paragraph 1: ‘... <i>dependent on their scale, use and location</i> ’), and the Council’s Local List, require a site specific flood risk assessment (FRA) or hydrology surveys. Furthermore, SUDS systems should be ‘proportionately’ incorporated depending on the scale and type of development. As worded, developers/applicants could argue that this is an unreasonable request.
Page 47	Policy NE4	Para 6 – are the run-off rates proposed proportionate to <u>all</u> development proposals?
Page 47	Policy NE4	Final para – refers to SWMP but does not set out in the explanatory text what this is, or why it is relevant.
Page 48	Policy NE5	Is the policy suggesting that any planning application for new development should be accompanied by evidence to show how increased traffic generation would be dealt with? The policy is a bit confusing as drafted.

Page number	Section	Comment
Page 48	Policy NE6	Renewables are “encouraged” in the CS and are strongly encouraged as part of the recently adopted Part V of the Development Requirements SPD on Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation. It is too onerous to require on site renewables or low carbon producing technologies to meet at least 10% of the development’s energy demands, going far beyond the CS policy.
Page 51	Policy C2	<i>‘Proposals will be supported for the provision of a replacement community centre or alternative facilities to serve the Neighbourhood Area in a format that meets the needs of the local community if it either becomes necessary or desirable during the life of this Plan.’</i> This is an aspiration and should not be included within the context of Policy C2.
Page 54	Policy SLR2	Whilst SDC generally support this policy, it should be noted that there could be land ownership issues (i.e. the PROWs will not likely be within the application site or within the ownership of any prospective applicant) in which case any PROW improvements would only ever come about through S106 contributions associated with any legal agreement attached to a planning consent. Another complication would be the necessary involvement of WCC as the Authority responsible for PROWs. It is something to consider in ensuring that the policy would be workable.

Schedule of minor comments from Stratford-on-Avon District Council

Suggested new text underlined deleted text ~~struck through~~

Page number	Section	Comment
Page 15	Summary Statement – Supported New Housing Development	<p>Criterion b) reword “is sited within the built-up area boundary of Long Itchington or on sites...” to reflect there is only one BUAB in the NDP.</p> <p>Criterion d) iii) are the parking provisions specified in line with our SPD?</p> <p>Criterion d) vi) I am unsure why this is necessary, or how this could be insisted upon.</p> <p>Criterion d) viii) Are we comfortable with minimum Code 4 standard/does it accord with our SPD?</p>

		<p>Criterion d) ix) Too onerous. It may not be appropriate in some instances to insist upon planting screening. Should be case by case assessment</p> <p>Criterion d) x) can this be insisted upon through planning policy?</p>
Page 19	Policy H2	Criterion a) built-up area boundary (singular).
Page 19	Policy H2	Criterion d) suggest adding “... <u>and would not result in the loss of any land of high environmental value.</u> ”
Page 20	Policy H3	Refer to built-up area boundary (singular); remove “ on redevelopment of ” on 4 th line of text; add “ <u>on-Avon</u> ” to Council name in final para.
Page 34	Policy EB1	3 rd line – built-up area boundary (singular)