



DECISION STATEMENT

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM

1. Ilmington Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 1.1 I confirm that the Ilmington Neighbourhood Development Plan (INDP), 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. Given current circumstances, it is not currently possible to estimate when a referendum could be held.
- 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 Ilmington Parish Council is the "Qualifying Body" for their area.
- 2.2 In February 2016, Ilmington Parish Council requested that, in accordance with section 5(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ("The Regulations"), the Parish of Ilmington 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 17 March 2016 and 15 April 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 Ilmington Neighbourhood Area by way of approval of The Cabinet on 26 April 2016.
- 2.5 In accordance with Regulation 7 of The Regulations, the decision to designate the Ilmington 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 3 May 2018 and 14 June 2018 fulfilling all the obligations set out in Regulation 14 of The Regulations.
- 2.7 The Parish Council submitted their Neighbourhood Development Plan to Stratford-on-Avon District Council in April 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 16th May 2019 and 28th June 2019, in accordance with Regulation 16 of The Regulations.
- 2.9 Nigel McGurk was appointed by the District Council to independently examine the Plan in June 2019, and the Examination took place between October 2019 and February 2020, with the final Examiner's report being issued on 24 February 2020.
- 2.10 The Examiner concluded he was satisfied that the Ilmington 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
Page 8, Para 2.4 (p.16)			
Add "The Plan is <i>in general conformity</i> with the Core..."	Introductory Section (p.8)	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>The wording as currently written does not fully reflect the requirements of the Basic Conditions, which require Neighbourhood Plans to be in 'general conformity' with the adopted strategic policies contained with the development plan for the area of the authority, rather than full conformity. The modification is therefore required to reflect the Basic Conditions and the nature of the Plan.</p>	<p>Amend Paragraph 2.4 to read:</p> <p>"The Plan is in <u>general conformity</u> with the Core Strategy (2016) and follows its strategic policies."</p>
Page 8, Para 2.5 (p. 16)			
Change last sentence of Para 2.5 to "As at 1st January 2020, 24 dwellings have been built or received planning permission in the Neighbourhood Area."	Introductory Section (p.8)	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>This modification is not considered to affect the Basic Conditions, but is considered appropriate for the sake of factual clarity so that it is</p>	<p>Amend Paragraph 2.5 to read:</p> <p>"The Core Strategy states that the 10 villages such as Ilmington (known as Category 3 Local Service Villages within the Core Strategy) should accommodate approximately 450 new houses of which no more than around 13% should be</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
		clear which time period the dwelling completions relate to.	provided in any individual settlement. <u>As at 1st January 2020, To date, within the Parish of Ilmington, 24 dwellings have been built or received have planning permission in the Neighbourhood Area.</u>
Page 8, Para 2.6 (p.16)			
Delete "(NPPF 2018)"	Introductory Section (p.8)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> The modification corrects a factual error, as the text refers to the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, not 2018. The modification is therefore required for factual accuracy.	Modify Paragraph 2.6 to read: "Stratford-on-Avon District Council must be able to demonstrate a sufficient 5 year housing land supply. If this cannot be demonstrated, i.e. that sufficient houses are not being built, then relevant policies in the Core Strategy and the Neighbourhood Plan will be deemed 'out-of-date' and under the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF 2018) paragraph 11, the presumption in favour of sustainable development would apply."
Page 8, Paras 2.11 and 2.12, (p.16)			
Delete Paras 2.11 and 2.12, which do not reflect the requirements of the basic conditions, set out earlier in this Report.	Introductory Section (p.8)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> The paragraphs do not reflect the requirements of the Basic Conditions, and the modification is therefore necessary in order for the Plan to meet the Basic	Delete Paragraphs 2.11 and 2.12, as follows: 2.11 All Plan policies have been formed having regard to the adopted Core Strategy which has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and a Habitat Regulations Assessment.

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
		Conditions.	
Page 11, Para 3.2.1, line 2 (p 16)			
Change to "...Council <i>which considers</i> the core area <i>to be</i> one of..."	Introductory Section (p.11)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> SDC agrees that the modification is necessary for factual precision.	Amend Para 3.2.1 line 2 as follows: "The historic importance of the village of Ilmington is recognised by Stratford-on-Avon District Council who have made <u>which considers</u> the core area <u>to be</u> one of historic high sensitivity."
Page 18, Photograph St Mary's Church			
The wrong photograph is included on page 18 of the Neighbourhood Plan and should be changed, as per representations.	Village Character Appraisal (p.18)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> An incorrect photograph was inserted on page 18. The modification is required for factual accuracy and SDC therefore agree with the recommended modification.	Replace photograph on Page 18.
Reference Document section below each Policy			

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
Delete "Reference Documents" section below each Policy in the Policy section of the Neighbourhood Plan and list the reference documents in an Appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan.	Policy section	<i>Modification Agreed</i> The Examiner considered that the list of reference documents beneath each policy appeared somewhat subjective and limited, and detracted from the clarity of each policy. As such, SDC agree that these should be contained within a separate Appendix to the Plan, rather than listed beneath each policy, as this would improve the clarity of the Plan.	Deleted Reference Documents section below each Policy in the Policy section of the Neighbourhood Plan and list the reference documents in an Appendix 5 to the Neighbourhood Plan.
Policy HG.1 – Housing Allocation (p.17)			
Policy HG.1.1, delete "in accordance...DC.1" Policy HG1.2, delete (subject to...access)."	Section 6.1: Future Housing and Growth (p. 20)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> The Examiner noted that the policies of the development plan should be considered as a whole. As such, it was considered that there is no need for cross referencing between policies, as this can detract from their precision. SDC agree with this decision, which is necessary in order	Amend wording for Policy HG.1 as follows: "The following sites as shown on Figure 5 are allocated for residential development: HG.1.1 Site 1 (1.25ha): Land at Mabel's Farm for approximately 20 dwellings in accordance Policy HG.3, HG.4 and the density parameters set out in Policy DC.1. HG.1.2 Site 2 (0.2ha): Land off Featherbed Lane for approximately 3 dwellings.

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
		to ensure the Plan is read correctly as a whole with all the policies of the development plan, and not just those mentioned specifically within the NDP policies.	HG.1.3 Site 3 (0.33ha): Land north of Armscote Road for approximately 3 dwellings (subject to alleviating flood risk: in accordance with policies in INF 1 & INF 2 and demonstrating safe pedestrian access). "
Policy HG2: Strategic Reserve Sites (p.19)			
<p>Policy HG.2, end Policy on line 3, "...in Stratford-on-Avon District." Delete rest of Policy ("and if the...HG.3")</p> <p>Delete Figure 6 on page 22 and reference to Figure 6 on line 5 on page 22</p>	<p>Section 6.1: Future Housing and Growth (p.20)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The Examiner noted that, as set out, the Policy would prevent Policy HG.2 from coming forward unless Site 1 has been "completed." This would make little sense, as the purpose of Policy HG.2 is to provide for a residential development site to be brought forward if there is an identified shortfall in housing delivery.</p> <p>Consequently, as worded, Policy HG.2 appears unclear and confusing, as it could serve to prevent</p>	<p>Amend Policy HG.2 as follows:</p> <p>"Site 1a (0.5ha): Land at Mabel's Farm is reserved for future housing allocation for approximately 8 dwellings to be released only if there is an identified shortfall in housing delivery in order to maintain a 5-year supply of housing land in Stratford-on-Avon District and if the development of Site 1 has been completed. Housing on this site will need to comply with the Site 1's site-specific design principles (see Policy HG.3)."</p> <p>Delete Figure 6 on page 22 and amend paragraph 6.1.4.1 as follows:</p> <p>"A site-by-site analysis by the Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group's Working Group applying locally established criteria</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 coming forward at a time when there is an identified shortfall in housing delivery, despite provision for any such shortfall comprising the purpose of the Policy. This would be contrary to planning guidance, which requires planning policies to be clear and unambiguous. Accordingly, SDC agree that this modification is necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>The Examiner considered that the information contained within Figure 6 is information provided in detail in the Neighbourhood Plan's evidence base and it detracts from the clarity of the Policy section, for it to be repeated in the Neighbourhood Plan itself. SDC agree that this modification is necessary for the purposes of clarity.</p>	<p>assembled from evidence gathering and community consultation. (Figure 6)."</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 HG.3 – Site 1 (p. 20)			
<p>Policy HG.3.2, change to "The design should respect and reflect heritage assets and will be expected to conserve and where possible, enhance the character of the setting of both Mabel's Farmhouse and Ilmington Conservation Area."</p> <p>Policy HG3.9, change to "Incorporate 35% affordable housing onsite." (delete rest of sentence)</p>	<p>Section 6.1: Future Housing and Growth (p.24)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>SDC agree with the Examiner's recommendation to amend HG3.2, as Site 1 is located opposite Mabel's Farmhouse, a Grade II Listed Building and is also within the setting of Ilmington Conservation Area. National policy requires heritage assets to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. As such, this modification is necessary for the policy to comply with the Basic Conditions. SDC agrees with the recommended modification to Policy HG3.9, as it is required to ensure the clarity of the Plan as all Neighbourhood Plan policies must be read as a whole with the existing development plan.</p>	<p>Amend Policy HG.3 as follows:</p> <p>"Development of Site 1 should make a positive contribution to the character of the village. In addition to Policy DP.1 Design Principles and Design Guide in Section 7 and the other policies within this Plan, the development should also:</p> <p>HG.3.1 Reflect the traditional built pattern of small groups of houses and avoid an estate style development;</p> <p>HG.3.2 The design should respect and reflect the heritage assets <u>and will be expected to conserve and where possible, enhance the character of the setting of both Mabel's Farmhouse and Ilmington Conservation Area</u> located opposite the site on Back Street;</p> <p>HG.3.3 Achieve effective highways access to avoid additional congestion in Back Street;</p> <p>HG.3.4 Avoid increasing congestion on Back Street by providing all parking for dwellings and visitor parking on-site;</p> <p>HG.3.5 Include green space and reflect the</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>balance between built and green areas in order to respect the 'open weave' character of Ilmington;</p> <p>HG.3.6 Retain and preserve the hedgerows and veteran trees along Back Street and within the development, wherever possible, which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area;</p> <p>HG.3.7 Provide footpath access from Back Street to the playing fields and assist in connecting the site to the village's network of footpaths;</p> <p>HG.3.8 To ensure hard surfaces are finished in Cotswold chippings, bonded gravel or other suitable permeable material. Tarmac should be avoided;</p> <p>HG.3.9 Incorporate 35% affordable housing on-site in accordance with SDC Core Strategy (2016) Policy CS.18; and</p> <p>HG.3.10 Where possible, move the current overhead electricity supply underground."</p>
HG.4 – Relocation of Mabel's Farm (p.28)			
Delete Policy HG.4 Delete title "Explanation" but	Section 6.1: Future Housing and Growth (p.28)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> SDC agree with the	Delete Policy HG.4 as follows: POLICY HG.4: Relocation of Mabel's Farm

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>retain Paras 6.1.17 and 6.1.18. These Paras would then simply follow on from the preceding Paras supporting Policy HG.3</p> <p>NB retain Figure 9, which is (further to deletion of Policy HG.4) now simply included for information purposes</p>		<p>Examiner's consideration that this policy does not meet the Basic Conditions, as Policy HG.4 appears vague and ambiguous. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Thus, any application for development that meets development plan requirements should be determined favourably, regardless of whether or not it is "supported in principle. Accordingly, SDC agree that the policy should be deleted, and the explanatory text be moved to follow on from HG.3 to reflect plan-makers support for the relocation of Mabel's Farm.</p>	<p>The relocation of Mabel's Farm including a new farmhouse and modern farm buildings will be supported in principle subject to compliance with other policies in this Plan.</p> <p>Move explanation paragraphs to follow on from Policy HG.3:</p> <p>"Explanation 6.1.17. In accordance with Warwickshire County Council's current policy of sustaining their tenanted small holdings, Mabel's Farm could be re-located within the immediate local area. 6.1.18. Warwickshire County Council's 'County Farms and Small Holdings Strategy 2015-2025' includes a policy of replacing land sold for development. The Strategy also includes a policy of considering the construction of modern buildings to replace traditional buildings that have potential to be redeveloped and disposed of. The policy notes that there are a number of farm buildings across the Estate that require substantial refurbishment and are uneconomic to repair for farming purposes but may have future development potential. As part of its consultation response on the Pre-submission Plan, Warwickshire County Council has provided details of a potential site for development of replacement Mabel's Farm buildings within the</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
			Neighbourhood Area (See Figure 9)."
Policy HG.5 Sites 2 and 3 (p.22)			
<p>Delete Policy HG.5</p> <p>Delete box on page 29 and replace text within a new Para 6.1.19, to follow on directly from Para 6.1.18</p>	<p>Section 6.1: Future Housing and Growth (p.29)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>SDC agrees with the Examiner's conclusion that Policy HG.5 simply cross-references other development plan policies. It is unnecessary and detracts from the concise nature of the Neighbourhood Plan. As such, the modification is necessary to ensure the clarity of the Plan.</p> <p>The Examiner considers that the box entitled "Community Infrastructure Levy" sets out general information. However, its presentation leads it to appear as though it has some Policy-type status over and above that of supporting text, which is not the case. SDC agree with the recommendation to reassign the wording to an</p>	<p>Delete Policy HG.5:</p> <p>POLICY HG.5: Sites 2 and 3 Development of Sites 2 and 3 should follow the policies of this plan and be consistent with Policy DP.1 Design Principles and the Design Guide.</p> <p>Replace wording in box on page 29 in new paragraph 6.1.19:</p> <p>COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) <u>6.1.19</u> A development at Site 1 of Mabel's Farm of this size should attract a significant amount of Community Infrastructure Levy a proportion of which will go directly to the Neighbourhood Area. CIL is a planning charge on developments used to help deliver infrastructure support in the Neighbourhood Area. Depending on the amount of funds made available from the CIL for the benefit of the Neighbourhood Area, this would be administered and/or allocated by the Parish Council in consultation with the community. Out of the parish-wide survey 2017, some projects were suggested. The Parish Council will wish to reviews these when the funds become available.</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
		explanatory paragraph, to ensure the clarity of the Plan.	
Policy DC.1 - Development within the Neighbourhood Area (p. 24)			
Delete Policy DC.1 and supporting text on pages 30, 31 and 32	Section 6.2: Development Criteria (p. 30)	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The Examiner considered that the policy was unnecessary, as it repeats many parts of the other design policy, Policy DP.1. It also contradicts some aspects of Policy DP.1, which would make the Plan as whole problematic to implement.</p> <p>Additionally, the policy sets out a general density limit on new development of 16 dwellings per hectare and recommends that development should be in the range of 10 to 16 dwellings per hectare. The Examiner agrees with SDC's consideration that this represents a very low density in modern times and has not been appropriately justified.</p>	Delete Policy DC.1 and supporting text.

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
		It is considered that the deletion of this Policy is required to meet the Basic Conditions, so that the Plan accords with the NPPFs requirement for "effective use of land in meeting the need for homes..." (Paragraph 117).	
Policy DC.2: Built-up Area Boundary (p.25)			
<p>Policy DC.2, change first sentence to "...in Figure 11 will be supported." (delete rest of sentence)</p> <p>Policy DC.2, change from line 5, "...dwellings and dwellings that are essential for rural workers, development that would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets, the re-use of redundant or disused buildings which enhances immediate setting, the subdivision of an existing dwelling, or a new dwelling, the design of which is of exceptional</p>	Section 6.2: Development Criteria (p. 30)	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>SDC agree with the Examiner's consideration that the restrictive nature of the Policy, which appears to prevent some forms of new housing in the countryside deemed appropriate by national policy, is unjustified; and the Policy's incorrect interpretation of the national policy approach to new housing where the design is of exceptional quality, results in unnecessary confusion. Accordingly, SDC agree that the modification is necessary to meet the Basic Conditions.</p>	<p>Amend Policy DC.2 as follows:</p> <p>"Proposals for new dwellings within the built-up area boundary, as defined in Figure 11 will be supported in principle, subject to being in accordance with other policies in this Plan. All areas outside the built-up area boundary are classed as countryside. New dwellings within the countryside should be strictly controlled and limited to Rural Exception Sites, replacement dwellings and dwellings <u>that are essential for rural workers, development that would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets, the re-use of redundant or disused buildings which enhances immediate setting, the subdivision of an existing dwelling, or a new dwelling, the design of which is of exceptional quality.</u> for rural workers, the conversion of existing buildings 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
quality.”			dwellings of exceptional quality or innovative nature of design.”
Policy DC.3: Infill within the Built-up Area Boundary (p.26)			
<p>Change first sentence of Policy DC.3 to “Limited infilling within the Built-up Area Boundary will be supported where development:”</p> <p>Delete Policy DC3.3 and delete “with regard to Policy DC.7 of this Plan” from Policy DC3.5</p>	<p>Section 6.2: Development Criteria (p.33)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>SDC agrees with the Examiner’s recommendation to remove the vague reference to “supported in principle,” as well as cross-references to other Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, to ensure the clarity of the Policy as all Policies should be read as a whole with the development plan.</p>	<p>Amend policy DC.3 as follows:</p> <p>“Limited infilling within the Built-up-Area Boundary <u>will be supported where development</u> (see Policy DC.2) will only be supported in principle, provided that the development:</p> <p>DC.3.1 Contributes positively to the character of the village.</p> <p>DC.3.2 Is modest and in proportion to the size of the site and designed to respect the context and amenity of neighbouring properties as well as the wider village.</p> <p>DC.3.3 Conforms with Policy DP.1 Design Principles and the Design Guide as set out in Section 7 of this Plan.</p> <p>DC.3.4 DC.3.3 Provides a suitable and safe means of access and egress to the highway</p> <p>DC.3.5 DC.3.4 Provides parking provision within its curtilage with regard to Policy DC.7 of this plan</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 DC.5: Valued Landscapes, Vistas and Skylines (P.28)			
<p>Policy DC.5, change first sentence to "Development proposals impacting on landscape setting must demonstrate..."</p> <p>Policy DC.5, change second sentence to "Development proposals should ensure that they respect all valued landscapes, as shown in Figure 13, as well as important vistas and skylines, particularly where they relate to heritage..."</p>	<p>Section 6.2: Development Criteria (p.34)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The Examiner considers that the policy, as written, would apply to all development proposals regardless of scale. However, the requirements of Policy DC.5 may not be material to all forms of development. As such, SDC agree with the Examiner's recommended modification to include clarification that the policy should only apply to development proposals which impact on landscape setting.</p> <p>SDC also agree with the Examiner's recommended modification to the second paragraph of the policy, as "maintained and safeguarded" would suggest that no development would be permitted in any of the identified areas. It is not clear how such an approach</p>	<p>Modify Policy DC.5 to read:</p> <p>"Development proposals <u>impacting on landscape setting</u> must demonstrate how they are appropriate to, and integrate with, the character of the landscape setting whilst conserving, and where appropriate, enhancing the character of the landscape.</p> <p>Development proposals should ensure that <u>they respect</u> all valued landscapes, as shown in Figure 13, and as well as important vistas and skylines are maintained and safeguarded, particularly where they relate to heritage assets, rising land, village approaches and settlement boundaries."</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
		would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, or on what national or local strategic policy basis the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to prevent any form of development taking place in these locations. As such, this modification is required to ensure the Policy meets the Basic Conditions.	
Policy DC.6 – Environmental Sustainability (p.30)			
Change wording of Policy DC.6 to "Development should, where possible and appropriate, incorporate the recycling of grey water and captured rainwater, and integration with SuDS systems. Renewable energy development requiring planning permission will be supported, subject to it conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; and to it conserving and enhancing the AONB. Resource efficient design, including the use of local materials, energy	Section 6.2: Development Criteria (p. 41)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> SDC agrees with the Examiner's consideration that the policy, as written, could conflict with the NPPFs aims for sustainability, and is vague in its requirements. As such, the proposed wording is required in order for the policy to meet the Basic Conditions, so that the policy is in general conformity with the development plan and can be consistently applied to development proposals.	Replace wording of Policy DC.6 as follows: <u>Development should, where possible and appropriate, incorporate the recycling of grey water and captured rainwater, and integration with SuDS systems. Renewable energy development requiring planning permission will be supported, subject to it conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; and to it conserving and enhancing the AONB. Resource efficient design, including the use of local materials, energy efficient technologies and sustainable construction techniques, will be supported. All development in the Neighbourhood Area should respect local character and residential amenity.</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>efficient technologies and sustainable construction techniques, will be supported. All development in the Neighbourhood Area should respect local character and residential amenity.”</p>			<p>All development should be designed to be environmentally sustainable. This includes:</p> <p>DC.6.1 Plans that include the recycling of grey water and captured rainwater and, where possible, integration into SuDS systems will be supported.</p> <p>DC.6.2 Plans for renewable technology will be supported provided that proposals, including solar panels and heat pumps, are situated so as to minimise any harm to the conservation area, the AONB and the appearance of buildings and the street scene.</p> <p>DC.6.3 Any new buildings should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development in reducing the environmental impact through resource efficient design, the use of suitable, 'eco-friendly' forms of construction and where appropriate, locally sourced building materials.</p> <p>DC.6.4 New or renovated buildings should also be energy efficient to accord with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) to ensure new building is sustainable and to reduce or mitigate the effects of climate change.</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 DC.7 – Parking Standards (p.31)			
<p>Policy DC.7 delete DC.7.4 and DC.7.5 and replace with "Cycle storage facilities should be provided within the curtilage of each dwelling and the provision of electric vehicle charging points will be supported."</p> <p>The Stratford-on-Avon Development Requirements SPD (Supplementary Planning Document) has been adopted since the publication of the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan and the word "Draft" should be removed from the reference to the document on page 42 of the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>Section 6.2: Development Criteria (p.42)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>SDC agrees that it is not necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to refer to Supplementary Planning Documents, therefore we agree with the Examiner's recommended modification.</p>	<p>Amend Policy DC.7 to read:</p> <p>"All new dwellings shall ensure by design that:</p> <p>DC.7.1 Provision for the parking of motor vehicles, including garages and carports, at a ratio of one space per bedroom, is available within the curtilage of the development.</p> <p>DC.7.2 Within the curtilage of developments of 5 dwellings or more, visitor parking should be provided at an additional 10% of total parking provision rounded up to the nearest whole number: i.e. a development of 6 dwellings that totals 18 bedrooms should provide 2 additional visitor parking spaces. Visitor parking is defined as a space that is unallocated to a house that visitors or the general public can use.</p> <p>DC.7.3 Parking areas should be carefully designed and discretely sited to avoid detracting from the village street scene. They should not be visually dominant or disruptive to residential amenity.</p> <p>DC.7.4 <u>Cycle storage facilities should be provided</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><u>within the curtilage of each dwelling and the provision of electric vehicle charging points will be supported.</u></p> <p>DC.7.4 Appropriate cycle storage facilities should be provided within the curtilage of each dwelling in accordance with the draft SDC Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>DC.7.5 Electric Vehicle Charging Points should be provided in accordance with the draft SDC Development Requirements SPD.</p> <p>Amend sentence 2 of paragraph 6.2.18 to read:</p> <p>"The SDC Development Requirements Draft SPD does this on a district wide basis and is applicable in some areas but a locally identified need means that a different non-strategic parking allocation policy is required."</p>
Policy HA.1 – Heritage and Archaeological Assets (p.32)			
Policy HA.1, change to "Development should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The enhancement of heritage assets will be supported." Delete	Section 6.2: Heritage and Archaeological Assets (p.45)	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> The Examiner concluded that the Policy, as written, did not have sufficient regard to the NPPF. Accordingly, SDC	Amend title of Policy HA.1 as follows: "Heritage and Archaeological Assets" Amend wording of Policy HA.1 as follows:

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>rest of Policy</p> <p>Change title of Policy HA.1 to "Heritage Assets"</p>		<p>agree that the Examiner's recommended modifications are necessary to ensure the Policy accords with the Basic Conditions.</p>	<p><u>"Development should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The enhancement of heritage assets will be supported.</u></p> <p>Proposals should demonstrate how they will conserve or enhance the Neighbourhood Area's historic environment including archaeological assets. The impact of any development on any heritage asset will be judged against the degree of harm and the significance of the heritage asset affected and weighed against any public benefits."</p>
<p>Policy LGS.1: Local Green Space (p.33)</p>			
<p>Change first sentence of Policy LGS.1 to "...as defined on Figure 17 and subsequent plans, at the following..."</p> <p>Delete last sentence of Policy LGS.1 and replace with "The management of development within areas of Local Green Space will be consistent with that for development within Green Belts."</p> <p>Provide additional plans</p>	<p>Section 6.4 Local Green Spaces (p.48)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The Examiner considered that the policy, as written, did not conform with the requirements of the NPPF and therefore would conflict with the Basic Conditions. Furthermore, the map provided of the Local Green Spaces was not clear enough for readers of the Plan to understand the boundaries of the Local Green Spaces. As</p>	<p>Amend Policy LGS.1 as follows:</p> <p>"This Plan designates the following areas of Local Green Space as defined on Figure 17 <u>and subsequent plans</u>, at the following locations in the village of Ilmington:</p> <p>LGS 1: Ilmington Playing Fields and playground, Mickleton Road</p> <p>LGS 2: Kyte Hill / Windmill Hill (Western Portion adjoining Front Street Only)</p> <p>LGS 3: Middle Meadow Garden, Front</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>following Figure 17, clearly identifying the precise boundaries of each area of Local Green Space</p> <p>Delete "PROJECT" box on page 50. Instead, a Projects section can be included in an Appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan</p>		<p>such, SDC agree that the proposed modifications are necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions.</p>	<p>Street/Middle Street</p> <p>LGS 4: Berry Orchard / Fish Ponds (Between Back Street and Middle Street)</p> <p>LGS 5: Field on Back St (between Dower House and the two cottages: Mary's Cottage and The Glen)</p> <p>LGS 6: Clifford's Orchard (bordering Back Street, Front Street and Peggy's Lane)</p> <p>LGS 7: Allotments, Valenders Lane</p> <p>LGS 8: Land south east of Grump Street and Crab Mill Cottage</p> <p>LGS 9: Land and Balancing Pond at Wilkins Way</p> <p>LGS 10: Clifford's Allotments, Campden Hill</p> <p>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 supported unless there are very special circumstances which outweigh the harm to the Local Green Space.</p> <p><u>The management of development within areas of Local Green Space will be consistent with that for development within Green Belts."</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>Provide additional plans following Figure 17, clearly identifying the precise boundaries of each area of Local Green Space.</p> <p>Delete "PROJECT" box on page 50 and include in Appendix 4 to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Policy INF.1: Flooding (p.36)			
<p>Policy INF.1.2, delete last sentence ("Discharge...per second.")</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy INF.1.4, delete "in accordance with...2017." • Policy INF.1.5, delete "in accordance with...2017." • Policy INF.1.9, change to "...should minimise the length of such." <p>(delete rest of sentence)</p>	<p>Section 6.5: Infrastructure (p.51)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>The Examiner noted that part of the Policy is reliant upon other policies not part of the development plan and not within the control of the Neighbourhood Plan. SDC therefore agree with the Examiner's recommended modifications, as they are necessary to ensure the Policy accords with the Basic Conditions.</p>	<p>Amend Policy INF.1 to read:</p> <p>"INF.1.1 Proposals will only be supported if they satisfactorily identify and address the risk of fluvial and pluvial flooding, do not increase the risk of flooding, and where existing flood risks are identified, are supported by a site specific flood risk assessment.</p> <p>INF.1.2 Appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) will be proportionally incorporated in all scales of development to accord with Core Strategy (2016) policy CS.4 and designed to control run-off generated on-site to the greenfield run-off rate (Q_{bar46}) for all return periods up to and including the 1 in 100 years plus climate change critical storm event criteria. Discharge rates should be below 5 litres per second.</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>INF.1.3 SuDS features must be located outside areas of identified flood risk.</p> <p>INF.1.4 Proposals on sites crossed by a watercourse must include a site specific flood risk assessment that includes modelling of the watercourse with SuDS features located outside areas of risk in accordance with Warwickshire County Council Flood Risk & Drainage Standing Advice as revised in August 2017.</p> <p>INF.1.5 SuDS should allow for 'urban creep' in accordance with Warwickshire County Council Flood Risk & Drainage Standing Advice as received in August 2017</p> <p>INF.1.6 Infiltration and above ground SuDS attenuation, such as swales, ponds and other water- based ecological systems, should be used.</p> <p>INF.1.7 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>INF.1.8 Proposals should include opening up any existing culverts for greater amenity 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>biodiversity benefits where practicable.</p> <p>INF.1.9 Proposals including new culverts should minimize the length <u>of such</u> and be built in accordance with Warwickshire County Council Guidance and have appropriate approvals."</p>
Policy INF.2: Foul Water Drainage Mitigation (p. 37)			
<p>Policy INF.2.1, change first sentence to "Development requiring foul drainage must demonstrate adequate means..."</p> <p>Delete Policy INF.2.2 and INF.2.5</p>	<p>Section 6.5: Infrastructure (p.52)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The Examiner considered that demonstrating adequate means of foul drainage, as required by the Policy, may not be relevant to all new development and consequently, Policy INF.2 fails to have regard to Paragraph 44 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Policy INF.2.2 fails to take into account the fact that developers have the right to connect to the public foul water sewer as a matter of law. The Examiner also considered the deletion of INF.2.5 necessary as it is not clear why connections into combined systems must remain separate on site up to</p>	<p>Amend Policy INF.2 to read:</p> <p>INF.2.1 All new development must demonstrate <u>Development requiring foul drainage must demonstrate</u> adequate means of foul drainage and evidence submitted to demonstrate sufficient capacity exists within the system to drain and process sewage during and subsequent to episodes of heavy rainfall.</p> <p>INF.2.2 Proposals to erect new dwellings should include measures to: a. Store discharges of foul water from the development and prevent its discharge into the public foul water sewer unless capacity is available to accept it without contributing to existing overload "down stream". b. Prevent pressurised foul water from back feeding from the public sewer into the property or its curtilage.</p> <p>INF.2.3 Suitable techniques for "domestic grey water recycling" should be adopted where it will</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>the point of connection.</p> <p>SDC agrees with the Examiner's consideration that the modifications are necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions.</p>	<p>reduce the volume of "buffer" storage required above.</p> <p>INF.2.4 Developers shall ensure that foul and surface water from new development and redevelopment are kept separate. Where sites which are currently connected to combined sewers are redeveloped, the opportunity to disconnect surface water and highway drainage from combined sewers shall be taken.</p> <p>INF.2.5 Should any connections into combined systems be unavoidable, the system should remain separate on site up to the point of connection."</p>
<p>Policy NE.1: Biodiversity, Wildlife, Habitat Conservation and Protection (p. 38)</p>			
<p>Policy NE.1.1 delete "and encouraged"</p> <p>Policy NE.1.2, change to "The improvement of landscape quality, scenic beauty and tranquility will be supported."</p>	<p>Section 6.6: Natural Environment (p.57)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>The Examiner agreed with SDC's representation that the use of the term 'encouraged' lacked clarity as it is unclear how such ecological habitats would or could be 'encouraged'. Accordingly, SDC agree that the recommended modifications</p>	<p>Amend Policy NE.1 as follows:</p> <p>"NE.1.1 Existing ecological networks should be retained and new ecological habitats and networks will be supported and encouraged.</p> <p>NE.1.2 Measures to improve <u>The improvement of</u> landscape quality, scenic beauty and tranquility are encouraged <u>will be supported.</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
		are necessary in order for the policy to meet the Basic Conditions.	
Policy NE.2: Aquatic Habitats (p.39)			
<p>Policy NE.2.1, change to "...enhance the natural environment by encouraging biodiversity." (delete rest of sentence)</p> <p>Delete "Project" box on page 61</p>	<p>Section 6.6: Natural Environment (p.60)</p>	<p><i>Modification partly agreed.</i></p> <p>SDC agree with the Examiner's proposed modification to the wording, as the Examiner considered that the phrase "with an emphasis on encouraging" fails to provide a decision maker with a clear indication of how to react to a development proposal, having regard to Paragraph 16 of the Framework. Further, it is not clear, in the absence of any detailed information, how the creation of sustainable habitats might be prioritised ahead of visual considerations, or why this should, in all circumstances, be the case. Accordingly, SDC agree that this modification is necessary for the Plan to meet the Basic</p>	<p>Modify Policy NE.2.1 as follows:</p> <p>NE.2.1 Where possible, developments that include and / or are adjacent to existing aquatic habitats (such as attenuation ponds, springs, ditches or streams) should be designed in such a way as to enhance the natural environment <u>by encouraging biodiversity</u>; with an emphasis on encouraging biodiversity and creating sustainable habitats for local wildlife being supported over visual considerations.</p> <p>Move Project box on page 61 to additional Project Appendix 4 to Plan.</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>Conditions.</p> <p>In regards to the Examiner's recommendation to delete Project box on 61, SDC instead consider this should be moved to a separate 'Projects' Appendix, along with the Project on page 50 which the Examiner has recommended to move into a separate Appendix. It is considered that this would correct an error in the Examiner's Report, as in relation to Project Box on page 50 the Examiner has stated "Delete "PROJECT" box on page 50. Instead, a Projects section can be included in an Appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan". As such, it is considered that this instruction should be read as to include both Projects within the Plan within this separate Appendix, not just the Project from Page 50. It is considered that this modification to the</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
		Examiner's recommendations would not affect the Basic Conditions but is required for the purpose of correcting an error, and can therefore be a decision taken without the need to undertake further consultation.	
Policy NE.3: Boundary Treatments and Landscaping (p.40)			
Change Policy NE.3 to "Development should conserve mature hedgerows. Where hedgerow removal is necessary and unavoidable, new native hedgerow replacements should be provided as an integral part of the development. The planting and maintenance of features, such as native species trees, hedgerows and grassy margins, to provide connectivity and shelter for ground-dwelling and other wildlife, will be supported as will the provision of hedgehog holes at the base of solid boundary treatments."	Section 6.6: Natural Environment (p.63)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> SDC agrees with the Examiner's consideration that The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set planning application requirements, nor impose requirements upon the Local Planning Authority, as is proposed in the first part of Policy NE.3. The proposed modification is therefore required in order to meet the Basic Conditions. It is also not clear how the policy will 'encourage' various things, and SDC therefore agree with the proposed modified wording recommend by the Examiner	Amend Policy NE.3 as follows: "NE.3.1 Where relevant, details of boundary treatments and landscaping will be encouraged to accompany planning applications for new development and support traditional Parish and village style and characteristics as set out in Policy DP.1 Design Principles and the Design Guide in Section 7. NE.3.2 Boundaries and barriers will be encouraged to be made permeable with 13x13cm hedgehog holes at the base. NE.3.3 Connectivity and shelter for ground-dwelling wildlife will be encouraged through the planting and maintenance of features such as native species hedgerows and grassy margins. NE.3.4 Development that affects mature

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
		to ensure the clarity of the policy.	<p>hedgerows will be encouraged to aim to conserve these important natural features.</p> <p><u>Development should conserve mature hedgerows. Where hedgerow removal is necessary and unavoidable, new native hedgerow replacements should be provided as an integral part of the development. The planting and maintenance of features, such as native species trees, hedgerows and grassy margins, to provide connectivity and shelter for ground-dwelling and other wildlife, will be supported as will the provision of hedgehog holes at the base of solid boundary treatments"</u></p>
Policy NE.4: Allotments and Orchards (p.41)			
Change Policy NE.4 to "Development that would result in the loss or partial loss of orchards or remnant orchards will not be supported. Development that would result in the loss or partial loss of allotments should demonstrate that any loss would be replaced by equivalent or better replacement in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location."	Section 6.6: Natural Environment (p.65)	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The Examiner agrees with SDC's representation that greater flexibility is required in regards to the approach to the loss of allotments, to reflect the NPPF. Accordingly, SDC agree that the modification is required in order to meet the Basic Conditions.</p>	<p>Amend Policy NE.4 as follows:</p> <p>"The partial or complete loss of orchards, remnant orchards and allotments through development proposals will be resisted.</p> <p><u>Development that would result in the loss or partial loss of orchards or remnant orchards will not be supported. Development that would result in the loss or partial loss of allotments should demonstrate that any loss would be replaced by equivalent or better replacement in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location"</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 NE.5: Tranquility (p.42)			
Policy NE.5, change to "...tranquility of the environment will not be supported."	Section 6.6: Natural Environment (p.68)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> SDC agree that the Examiner's modification to the policy wording is necessary in the interests of clarity.	Amend Policy NE.5 as follows: "All new development will be expected to respect the tranquillity of the Neighbourhood Area. Any development which results in excessive noise or detriment to the tranquillity of the environment will <u>not be supported</u> be resisted ."
Policy NE.6: Dark Skies (p.43)			
Policy NE.6.1, change to "Development must respect the Neighbourhood Area's dark skies." Delete rest of Policy NE.6.1 Delete Policy NE.6.3 Delete Policy NE.6.4. Move this sentence of text to a new Para 6.6.34 and change to "The Parish Council will seek to encourage applicants to assess whether developments could take place without external lighting."	Section 6.6: Natural Environment (p.70)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> SDC agree with the consideration of the Examiner that Policy NE.6 seeks to impose criteria that go beyond the planning powers of a Neighbourhood Plan. Most forms of lighting, including many forms of external lighting, do not require planning permission. As such, the deletion of NE.6.3 and the amendment of NE.6.4 and inclusion of the wording as explanatory text, rather than Policy, is necessary in order to meet	Amend Policy NE.6 as follows: NE.6.1 Development must <u>will be expected to</u> respect the Neighbourhood Area's dark skies and will follow the guidance for exterior lighting in the Design Guide (Section 7, Design Guide, paragraph 2.4). NE.6.2 Development should aim to minimise light pollution by avoiding obtrusive external property lighting. NE.6.3 All applications for new development must demonstrate how the dark skies environment will be protected through the submission of appropriate supporting documentation, to show that they accord with current professional guidance to achieve an appropriate lighting

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>the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Policy refers to the Design Guide in the Neighbourhood Plan, However, this Design Guide does not comprise a Policy and its inclusion with the Policy is therefore inappropriate. The amendment of the wording of NE.6.1 is therefore necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions.</p>	<p>environment for the area. In particular, they should demonstrate that the luminance level and period of illumination are necessary for the lighting to perform its function and that there will be minimal light spillage beyond the property boundary.</p> <p>NE.6.4 In considering applications, parties will be encouraged to assess whether the proposed development could take place without external lighting.</p> <p>Insert additional Paragraph 6.6.34:</p> <p><u>"6.6.34: The Parish Council will seek to encourage applicants to assess whether developments could take place without external lighting"</u></p>
<p>Policy ETA.1: Encouraging Local Employment (p.44)</p>			
<p>Change Policy ETA.1 to "The growth and expansion of existing businesses and the creation of new businesses will be supported, subject to it being demonstrated that any such development respects local character, residential amenity and highway safety." (Delete rest of Policy)</p>	<p>Section 6.7: Economy, Tourism and Local Amenities (p.72)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The Examiner considers that the policy, as written, could support inappropriate forms of development, and is also, in some respects, too restrictive such that development would be refused were there to be any</p>	<p>Amend Policy ETA.1 as follows:</p> <p>"Developments that provides new, or helps sustain local employment will be supported in principle, providing they are consistent with the other policies in this Plan and:</p> <p>ETA.1.1 Are of an appropriate scale</p> <p>ETA.1.2 Do not detract from the character,</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
		harm to local character, green infrastructure or residential amenity. The policy therefore fails to pay due regard to the requirements of the NPPF. Accordingly, SDC agree that the proposed amended wording is necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions	<p>appearance or green infrastructure of the Neighbourhood Area</p> <p>ETA.1.3 Do not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity</p> <p>ETA.1.4 Do not have an unacceptable impact due to traffic generation</p> <p><u>The growth and expansion of existing businesses and the creation of new businesses will be supported, subject to it being demonstrated that any such development respects local character, residential amenity and highway safety"</u></p>
Policy ETA.2: Home-Working and Internet Connectivity (p.46)			
Delete the second bullet point of Policy ETA.2	Section 6.7: Economy, Tourism and Local Amenities (p.72)	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>SDC agrees with the Examiner's consideration that the second bullet point of Policy ETA.2 requires that all new dwellings provide connectivity to the roadside but is not supported by evidence in respect of deliverability and viability, with specific regard to third party land requirements. As such, the proposed</p>	<p>Amend Policy ETA.2 as follows:</p> <p>"Development of new dwellings should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated cabling or suitable ducting to support high speed broadband; • Connectivity from the dwelling to the roadside; and • Encourage the provision of space to support home-working, with flexible space adaptable to a home office."

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
		modification is necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions.	
Policy ETA.3: Rural Tourism (p. 47)			
Change Policy ETA.3 to "...breakfast, will be supported, providing that they have regard to local character, residential amenity and highway safety."	Section 6.7: Economy, Tourism and Local Amenities (p.72)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> SDC agree with the Examiner's consideration that the policy, as written, does not provide sufficient clarity. Additionally, it is a matter of assumption that policies in the Plan should be read as a whole with other policies in the development plan and this point does not need to be explicitly noted.	Amend Policy ETA.3 as follows: "Proposals for new and improved leisure and tourism based services and facilities within the Neighbourhood Area, including bed and breakfast, will be supported, in principle providing they do not conflict with other policies in this Plan. <u>providing that they have regard to local character, residential amenity and highway safety.</u> "
Policy ETA.5: Safe Walking and Cycling (p. 49)			
Policy ETA.5, change to "Development should provide for safe access to existing walking and/or cycling routes. The improvement of existing and/or the provision of new walking and/or cycling opportunities will be supported.	Section 6.7: Economy, Tourism and Local Amenities (p. 76)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> SDC agrees with the Examiner's consideration that the first part of Policy ETA.5, as written, appears ambiguous and does not provide a decision maker	Amend Policy ETA.5 as follows: "As appropriate, development must demonstrate how walking and cycling opportunities have been prioritised and connection made to existing routes. Proposals which either adversely affect existing walking and cycling routes or does not encourage appropriate new walking and cycling

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
Development which harms existing walking and/or cycling routes will not be supported."		with a clear indication of how to react to a development proposal, having regard to Paragraph 16 of the NPPF. Furthermore, in respect of the second part of the Policy, it is not clear, in the absence of any information, why it is relevant for all development proposals to encourage walking and cycling opportunities and this part of the Policy fails to have regard to Paragraph 56 of the NPPF. Accordingly, SDC considers that this modification is necessary in order for the Plan to accord with the Basic Conditions.	opportunities will not be supported. <u>Development should provide for safe access to existing walking and/or cycling routes. The improvement of existing and/or the provision of new walking and/or cycling opportunities will be supported. Development which harms existing walking and/or cycling routes will not be supported."</u>
Policy DP.1: Design Principles (p. 50)			
Policy DP.1, change to "All new development must be of high quality design. It should respect and enhance the rural character and local distinctiveness of Ilmington, having regard to the Ilmington Design Guide. Whilst innovative design will be	Section 7: Design and Layout (p. 78)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> SDC agrees with the Examiner's consideration that the reference to the Ilmington Design Guide within the Policy is inappropriate, as it	Amend Policy DP.1 as follows: <u>"All new development must be of high-quality design. It should respect and enhance the rural character and local distinctiveness of Ilmington, having regard to the Ilmington Design Guide. Whilst innovative design will be supported, all new development should appear sympathetic to</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>supported, all new development should appear sympathetic to its surroundings, making use of local building materials and reflecting local building styles. Development should take account of security by design measures, such that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion." Delete rest of Policy</p> <p>Insert new Para 7.1.4 "At the District-wide level, good design is further supported by the adopted Stratford-on-Avon Development Requirements SPD (Supplementary Planning Document) (2019) provides additional guidance on the interpretation and implementation of policies."</p> <p>Page 80, replace fourth para of text with a new single sentence "Ilmington Parish Council encourages applicants to have regard to the following design principles."</p>		<p>constitutes guidance, not planning policy. Furthermore, SDC agree that reference to 'preservation' within the policy is unduly restrictive as it suggests no degree of development would be permissible. Accordingly, SDC agree that the recommended modification is necessary to meet the Basic Conditions.</p>	<p><u>its surroundings, making use of local building materials and reflecting local building styles. Development should take account of security by design measures, such that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.</u></p> <p>DP.1.1 All new development proposals should have regard to the key guiding design principles below and the Design Guide contained within the Neighbourhood Development Plan, taking full account of the historic character of the Ilmington Conservation Area and other heritage assets within the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>DP.1.2 The key guiding design principles are:</p> <p>DP.1.2.1 The rural character of Ilmington should be preserved and urbanisation avoided</p> <p>DP.1.2.2 The landscape setting should be preserved, protecting views into, out of and within the village</p> <p>DP.1.2.3 The important balance between open and built areas should be maintained.</p> <p>DP.1.2.4 The location of new housing or other development should not compromise the open character of the village including significant views and aspects</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>DP.1.2.5 New building, including extensions, conversions and alterations, should be in sympathy with local building styles and materials</p> <p>DP.1.2.6 Innovative design, where appropriate, will be supported</p> <p>DP.1.3 All proposals will be expected to demonstrate how these principles have been incorporated into the design of the scheme. Proposals which fail to satisfactorily take into account and implement these design principles will not be supported unless there is significant justification which indicates otherwise.</p> <p>Insert new Para 7.1.4:</p> <p><u>“At the District-wide level, good design is further supported by the adopted Stratford-on-Avon Development Requirements SPD (Supplementary Planning Document) (2019) provides additional guidance on the interpretation and implementation of policies.”</u></p> <p>Page 80, replace fourth para of text as follows:</p> <p>“This guide is part of the Neighbourhood Plan. While compliance is expected, in very exceptional cases divergence from the guide may be accepted where a reasoned justification is 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
			<p>This is to allow for future flexibility but not to compromise the overall design aims and principles outlined in the document. Reasoned justifications must explain in detail how a high level of quality is maintained. Those preparing proposals for submission for planning permission are encouraged to use the section titles in this guide to structure their design statements in support of their schemes:"</p> <p><u>"Ilmington Parish Council encourages applicants to have regard to the following design principles."</u></p>
General			
Update the Contents and where necessary, Policy, paragraph and page numbering, to take into account the recommendations contained in this Report	Throughout	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The recommended modification is required for the clarity of the Plan.</p>	Update the Contents and where necessary, Policy, paragraph and page numbering, to take into account the recommendations contained in this Report.

SDC Decisions		
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>Section 6.3: Heritage and Archaeological Assets (p.45)</p>		
<p>Amend the Section heading of 6.3 to "Heritage Assets"</p>	<p>The Examiner has amended the content and heading of Policy HA.1 so that it now only refers to Heritage Assets, and not Archaeological Assets. As such, it is considered that the Section Heading should also be reflected in the interests of clarity, to reflect the content of this Section. As this modification is considered necessary to correct an error, it can be implemented without the need for further consultation.</p>	<p>Section 6.3: Heritage and Archaeological Assets</p>
<p>Section 6.6: Natural Environment Project Box (p.61)</p>		
<p>Move Project box on page 61 to additional Project Appendix to Plan.</p>	<p>In regards to the Examiner's recommendation to delete Project box on 61, SDC instead consider this should be moved to a separate 'Projects' Appendix, along with the Project on page 50 which the Examiner has recommended to move into a separate Appendix. It is considered that this would correct an error in the Examiner's Report, as in relation to Project Box on page 50 the Examiner has stated "Delete "PROJECT" box on page 50. Instead, a Projects section can be included in an Appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan". As such, it is considered that this instruction should be read as to include both Projects within the Plan within this</p>	<p>Move Project box on page 61 to additional Project Appendix 4 to Plan.</p>

	<p>separate Appendix, not just the Project from Page 50. It is considered that this modification to the Plan is required for the purpose of correcting an error, and can therefore be a decision taken without the need to undertake further consultation.</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 supporting new employment sites/opportunities, including small scale business start-ups, 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 creation and enhancement of facilities that will improve people's mental and physical health.</p> <p>The Plan supports the provision of new leisure and tourism 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 conserve and enhance 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 Ilmington 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:

www.stratford.gov.uk/ilmingtonnp

And can be viewed in paper form at:

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