

Bearley Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 Representations: By Contributor and Response from Bearley Parish Council

Name	Policy/Section	Representation	Response
Severn Trent	Policy H3	<p>We are supportive of your policy and would encourage the inclusion of the following wording to ensure that redevelopment of Brownfield land is used as an opportunity to provide betterment to the existing sewerage network by reducing surface water flows into the combined sewer network.</p> <p><i>'All development of previously developed land shall undertake a surface water outfall assessment to determine if there are any viable alternatives to the existing connection to the combined sewer network'</i></p>	<p>Agreed. Suggest additional criteria f) added to read:</p> <p>"A satisfactory surface water outfall assessment to determine if there are any viable alternatives to the existing connection to the combined sewer network"</p>
Severn Trent	Para 5.1.22	<p>It is recognised that land at the 'Old Play Area' and 'Orbit owned garages' is a likely development location as registered in the SHLAA Review 2012. From a desktop assessment, providing that surface water is managed sustainably through use of infiltration, SuDS or discharge into the adjacent watercourse the impact on the foul sewer network is expected to be low risk.</p>	<p>Noted and the current planning application is proceeding on these lines.</p>
Severn Trent	Policy BNE1	<p>We are supportive of this policy, especially sub-section h) do not increase the risk of flooding.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Severn Trent	Policy BNE4	<p>We would encourage the inclusion of the following policy working to encourage new developments to design water efficient buildings.</p> <p><i>'Development proposals should demonstrate that they are water efficient, where possible incorporating innovative water efficiency and water reuse measures. They should demonstrate that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator and should not exceed 110 litres/person/day'</i></p> <p>We are supportive of the use of water efficient fittings and appliances within new properties and encourage the optional high water efficiency target of 110 Litres per person per day within part G of building regulations. Delivering against the higher target or better provides wider benefits to the water cycle and environment as a whole.</p>	<p>Agreed. Suggest additional criteria l) added to read:</p> <p>"Development proposals should demonstrate that they are water efficient, where possible incorporating innovative water efficiency and water reuse measures. They should demonstrate that the</p>

			estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator and should not exceed 110 litres/person/day”
Severn Trent	Policy IN1	Severn Trent is supportive of this policy especially subsections a) and d). It is recommended that developers contact Severn Trent early in the planning process to agree drainage plans and to ensure there is sufficient time to conduct more detailed assessment of the network where required to determine if any capacity improvements may be required.	Noted.
Severn Trent	Policy IN2	Severn Trent is supportive of this policy especially appropriate use of SuDS and reuse and recycling of water within developments. We would encourage the inclusion of the following wording to reduce the risk of future sewer flooding. <i>'All applications for new development shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, in such that a discharge to the public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible.'</i>	Agreed. Suggest this wording will be added to the bottom of the policy.
Severn Trent	General	For your information we have set out some general guidelines below that may be useful to you. Position Statement As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue, we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills. Sewage Strategy	Guidelines noted. Suggest no change necessary.

		<p>Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works.</p> <p>Surface Water and Sewer Flooding</p> <p>We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government’s Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer.</p> <p>We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers. To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. More details can be found on our website https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-andguidance/infrastructure-charges/</p> <p>Water Quality</p> <p>Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of good quality drinking water. We work closely with the Environment Agency and local farmers to ensure that water quality of supplies are not impacted by our or others operations. The Environment Agency’s Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit as prepared by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Water Supply</p> <p>When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts.</p> <p>We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands.</p> <p>Water Efficiency</p> <p>Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day. We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations.</p> <p>We recommend that in all cases you consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres.• Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute.• Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres or less.• Water butts for external use in properties with gardens. <p>To further encourage developers to act sustainably Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. More details can be found on our website.</p> <p>https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-andguidance/infrastructure-charges/ We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day.</p>	
--	--	--	--

National Grid	General	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has <u>no record</u> of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>About National Grid National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales and National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) operates the electricity transmission network across the UK. The energy is then distributed to the eight electricity distribution network operators across England, Wales and Scotland.</p> <p>National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK’s four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use. National Grid previously owned part of the gas distribution system known as ‘National Grid Gas Distribution limited (NGGDL). Since May 2018, NGGDL is now a separate entity called ‘Cadent Gas’.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect National Grid’s assets.</p> <p>Electricity Distribution The electricity distribution operator in Stratford on Avon District Council is Western Power Distribution. Information regarding the transmission and distribution network can be found at: www.energynetworks.org.uk</p> <p>Appendices - National Grid Assets Please find attached in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 1 provides a map of the National Grid network across the UK. 	Noted.
Canal & River Trust	General	The canal network is located outside the plan area, therefore the Trust has no comments to make.	Noted.

Sport England	General	<p>Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England’s playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document. http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy</p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the</p>	Guidance previously provided at the Pre-submission Consultation was noted and applied.
---------------	---------	---	--

		<p>current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work. http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</p> <p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</p>	<p>Facilities are maintained and progressively improved. Refer to Policy AFC3.</p> <p>Given the limited number of new dwellings expected in the Neighbourhood Area over the plan period, it is considered that the existing facilities will be able to accommodate the additional demand without the need for new facilities.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<i>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England’s planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</i>	
Natural England	General	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this neighbourhood plan.	Noted.
Coal Authority	General	Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.	Noted.
Historic England	General	<p>We are pleased to note that our comments on the earlier draft of the Plan have now been addressed. Therefore, our positive comments on the Regulation 14 Plan remain entirely relevant, that is:</p> <p><i>"Historic England is supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it.</i></p> <p><i>We are pleased to note that the Plan evidence base is well informed by reference to the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record and includes extensive analysis of the historic landscape of the Parish. Very commendably this includes a bespoke Character Appraisal of the settlement defining individual character zones in order to better define local distinctiveness. All of this provides a context and a sound evidence base for well thought out Plan policies.</i></p> <p><i>The emphasis in the Plan policies on the conservation of rural character and local distinctiveness through good design and the protection of heritage assets, archaeology, local green space and important views, along with landscape character is to be applauded".</i></p> <p>In conclusion, the plan reads overall as a well written, well-considered and fit for purpose document. We consider that a very commendable approach is taken to the historic environment of the Parish and that the Plan constitutes a very good example of community led planning.</p>	Noted.
WCC Flood Risk	General	<p>The County Council welcomes communities proposing Neighbourhood Plans that shape and direct future development. The main responsibilities of the County Council are highways and public transport, education, social services, libraries and museums, recycling/ waste sites and environment. The County Council’s role is to deliver the services and facilities efficiently.</p> <p>Financial implications of Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>We would like to state at that the County Council cannot commit to any financial implications from any proposals emanating from Neighbourhood Plans. Therefore, Neighbourhood Plans should not identify capital or revenue schemes that rely of funding</p>	Comments noted. A good relationship exists with WCC towards identifying the risks and the work required to address the needs.

		<p>from the Council. We ask the Public Examiner to note this comment during the Public examination.</p> <p>However, we will assist communities in delivering infrastructure providing they receive any funding that may arise from S106 agreements, Community Infrastructure Levy or any other sources.</p>	
WCC Flood Risk	Paragraph 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 3.1.3 and 5.1.2	We support the protection of open spaces and river corridors – this could be developed to mention the benefits of open space as flood risk management to retain water. Above ground sustainable drainage systems could be utilised in open spaces.	Noted see Paras 5.5.9 and 5.5.10.
WCC Flood Risk	Policy H3	You could add to your objective a specific point about new developments needing to consider their flood risk and sustainable drainage systems when building on Greenfield and brownfield sites.	Policy IN1 deals with drainage matters in all new developments adequately.
WCC Flood Risk	Policy H4	You could develop this to consider the use of sustainable drainage systems when building on garden land.	<p>Agreed. Suggest additional criteria added to read:</p> <p>f) Include sustainable drainage systems to ensure that surface water flood risk is minimised.</p>
WCC Flood Risk	Policy ECON2	<p>You could add to your objective a specific point about new developments needing to consider their flood risk and sustainable drainage systems when building on Greenfield and brownfield sites.</p> <p>We support the protection of open spaces and river corridors – this could be developed to mention the benefits of open space as flood risk management to retain water. Above ground SuDS could be utilised in open spaces.</p> <p>You could include an additional point that encourages new developments to open up any existing culverts on a site providing more open space/green infrastructure for</p>	<p>Agreed. Suggest additional criteria added to read:</p> <p>d) Do not put the development at risk of pluvial or fluvial flooding and do not exacerbate the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

		greater amenity and biodiversity; and the creation of new culverts should be kept to a minimum. New culverts will need consent from the LLFA and should be kept to the minimum length.	
WCC Flood Risk	Paragraph 5.5.1	<p>All developments will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems when building on Greenfield and brownfield sites and need to consider their flood risk.</p> <p>You could develop this point to include the SuDS hierarchy. The hierarchy is a list of preferred drainage options that the LLFA refer to when reviewing planning applications. The preferred options are (in order of preference): infiltration (water into the ground), discharging into an existing water body and discharging into a surface water sewer. Connecting to a combined sewer system is not suitable and not favourable.</p>	Noted – See Policy IN2.
WCC Flood Risk	Para 5.5.3	SDC do not have powers to undertake works on Ordinary Watercourses. Any works on ordinary watercourses will require Ordinary Watercourse Land Drainage Consent which can be obtained from WCC as the LLFA in Warwickshire.	<p>Agreed. Suggest delete sentence starting “SDC as a risk... ending ...on main rivers” and change wording to:</p> <p>“Any works on ordinary watercourses will require Ordinary Watercourse Land Drainage Consent which can be obtained from WCC as the LLFA in Warwickshire.”</p>
WCC Flood Risk	Policy IN2	<p>This is a well written policy; further details could be added if you wish.</p> <p>With regards to Greenfield discharge rate, please be aware that 5 l/s is NOT the minimum possible discharge rate achievable. In relation to this, the requirements set out in the following documents should also be adhered to in all cases: The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 030 - 032 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) DEFRA’s Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage. On smaller development sites where the discharge rate is below 5 l/s, these rates are achievable through water reuse, protected orifices, and better design.</p> <p>All developments will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems. The adoption and maintenance of all drainage features is a key consideration to ensure the long-term operation and efficiency of SuDS. As part of the planning procedure the LLFA</p>	Further detail will be specified as part of planning conditions so there is no need for the policy to go into this intricate detail.

		<p>will expect to see a maintenance schedule, at detailed design stages. All SuDS features should be monitored and cleaned regularly as a matter of importance.</p> <p>The final sentence refers to maintenance contributions. The LLFA do not undertake any routine maintenance works to watercourses and therefore we do not seek contributions for such works through the planning process. The responsibility of such works lies with the riparian owner as highlighted elsewhere in the NDP.</p>	<p>Suggest delete last sentence and replace with:</p> <p>“The Parish Council will continue to seek financial support when necessary from SDC and WCC towards the future maintenance of the Bearley Brook”.</p>
Highways England	General	<p>Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the submission version of the Bearley Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period from 2019 to 2031. We note that the document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth.</p> <p>In relation to the Bearley Neighbourhood Plan, our principal interest is in safeguarding the operation of the A46 which routes approximately 3km to the southeast from the Plan area. We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for Bearley Parish is required to conform to the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy (2011-2031), which is acknowledged within the document.</p> <p>We note that no specific housing or employment sites have been allocated in the Core Strategy for the Parish, although the Neighbourhood Plan will support small scale housing and employments within the main built-up areas of the village.</p>	Noted.

		Considering the limited level of growth proposed across the Neighbourhood Plan area, we do not expect that there will be any impacts on the operation of the SRN. We therefore have no further comments to provide	
Alf Rajkowski	Policy H1	<p>Object - raises objection to the extent of the BUAB proposed in the draft document. Mr Rajkowski seeks amendment of the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB), as proposed within the Submission Draft of the Bearley Neighbourhood Development Plan, to include his land within the defined boundary.</p> <p><u>Justification</u> The Government is currently seeking to deliver a step-change in the delivery of housing in order to address the chronic shortage of housing within the country. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) therefore sets out the objective for the planning system of <i>"significantly boosting the supply of homes"</i>, including within rural areas, with paragraph 78 of the Framework advising that:</p> <p><i>"to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby"</i></p> <p>In addition, paragraph 68 of the NPPF requires local authorities to:</p> <p><i>"support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving greater weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes"</i>.</p> <p>The Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) accepts the objective of increasing housing supply by setting out the following Strategic Objective on page 38 of the document:</p> <p><i>"To promote new homes of high quality, in appropriate sustainable locations that meet the established needs of the Neighbourhood Area, without compromising the distinctive and attractive setting of the village or the natural environment"</i>.</p> <p>One of the ways in which new housing is to be delivered is by supporting <i>"limited infilling within villages"</i> within the Green Belt, as set out in paragraph 145 e) of the NPPF. Reflecting the NPPF provisions, paragraph 5.1.4 of the Draft NDP confirms that Policy H1 of the Plan:</p>	<p>The PC has previously considered the inclusion of this land in the NDP and has decided again not to amend the current BUAB because this would result in including undeveloped Greenfield land within the BUAB. If the PC did this for this site it would need to be consistent and do it for many others. The site is not part of the Built-up Area of the Village and therefore its inclusion in the BUAB is not appropriate. SDC supports the PC's position on this matter. Should the Examiner decide to expand the BUAB then the undeveloped greenfield areas should not be included within it.</p>

		<p><i>"seeks to encourage and enable the completion of limited infilling within the BUAB up to well-established physical boundaries within the village"</i></p> <p>However, we believe that the Draft NDP proposes a BUAB which unreasonably restricts the potential for suitably located and sensitively designed infill opportunities from coming forward, in contravention of the Government's and the NDP's stated aim of increasing rural housing supply.</p> <p>We consider that the BUAB for the village should be extended further to include the run of development immediately north of the Recreation Ground and along School Lane, as edged red on the plan at Appendix B. This area comprises predominantly built-up frontage and lies in a central village location and, in our view, clearly meets the NDP's stated approach of including land <i>"within the BUAB up to well-established physical boundaries within the village"</i></p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.2 of the Draft NDP states that <i>"the BUAB is based on the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2012"</i>. The relevant extracts of which are set out in Figures 1/1 and 1/ 2 of the Draft Plan. The appraisal shows the land and buildings north of the Recreation Ground as lying <i>within</i> the indicative built-up area and not forming part of the wider countryside which was the subject of assessment. This supports our contention that a common sense <i>'on the ground'</i> assessment should conclude that development lying immediately to the north of the Recreation Ground clearly does <u>not</u> read as part of the open countryside and forms part of the established built-up part of the village.</p> <p>By contrast, the former Countrywide Stores site and land on the western side of the A3400, which lie well outside the established built-up village, is shown as being within the draft BUAB, as indeed is land further to the north at Grange Road which lies almost 100m north of the Recreation Ground.</p> <p>Although part of the Conservation Area, there is no reason why modest and sensitively designed new infill could not be brought forward to Mr Rajkowski's land which would respect the surrounding area and maintain attractive viewpoints.</p> <p>We highlight that development immediately to the west of the Recreation Ground, which contains several listed buildings and also lies within the Conservation Area, is proposed to be included within the BUAB. We can see no reason why the more constrained land and buildings to the west of the Recreation Ground should be included within the BUAB but Mr Rajkowski's land should not.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>We can therefore see no sound and justifiable reason for the exclusion of Mr Rajkowski's land from the draft BUAB and request that the boundary be suitably amended.</p> <p>Appendix A and B attached.</p>	
Graham Charles Musson	Policy H1	<p>Object - Bearley over the past 10/15 years has had the threat of substantial developments on two sites Land A - bounded by Oak Tree Close, Grange Road, School Lane and Snitterfield Road Land B between Oak Tree Close and the Village Hall and Sports Field With the strong reaction from the Community neither development went to an Application for Planning. The result was it made all residents very nervous of development and unfortunately even modest development that would suit the Community is made to appear as though it would spoil the village and cause house prices to fall substantially. Without a shop, post office, public house or school there is a severe risk that the village will become a dormitory. The Stratford on District Core Strategy of up to 32 houses by 2031 is not unreasonable. The village needs growth and the Built-Up Area Boundary including the centre of the village, is nonspecific regarding how many and where houses may be built within it other than the seven houses on the old Lower Play Area. See section Policy H3. With the Built-Up Boundary including area well outside the centre - Bearley Mill and that land to the west of the A3400 any development will in this area will add little to the village. Whilst it may provide housing, they will be satellites to the main village. If, however, some Land B had been included in the Built-Up Boundary as it could have provided a very necessary contiguous link between the village and the Village Hall which includes the Sports and Social Club. As an indication of the need for development between the Village Hall and the central Village the foot path to the Village Hall is too narrow and hazardous to wheel-chair users and parents with pushchairs especially if accompanied by a young child. Whilst the Village has a conservation area and several excellent properties it is not a chocolate box village and more vision should have been used to have limited development nearer the centre of the village, Also by bringing the Village Hall and the Village together through limited development on Land B it would bring in the areas previously described as satellites above. The Plan mentions infill and examination of the Built-Up Boundary will indicate there are very few infill opportunities. Having no housing development defined other than the 7 units above appears to contradict with 5.1.7 and also with the comment on page 46 "It is reasonable to assume that the population of Bearley is falling, and increasing the population through additional housing would put the village on a more sustainable footing."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Bearley is a village washed over by the Green Belt so there is no assumption that the target of 32 dwellings will or can be achieved. This is reflected in Policy CS.16 (final sentence of Section B) of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Strategy of the NDP, in order to comply with national Green belt policy, is therefore to accept limited infilling within the village BUAB where proposals meet other policies in the NDP.</p> <p>It is not possible for the PC to allocate Green Belt land for market development as this would conflict with national policy and the Basic Conditions.</p>

Graham Charles Musson	Policy H2	Support - Affordable housing is a must and fully supported. However, a village without a shop or school is not necessarily suitable for residents of affordable housing. Transport links are at best average.	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy H3	Support - The use of Brown field sites is totally supported if the alternatives of housing versus employment have been examined and an objective view of the effect of either has been part of the consultation with residents. There is no evidence in the NP that this has taken place. The Bearley Mill has been purchased and it is understood for business use which is excellent for employment opportunities for residents of the Bearley. The Countrywide store is an excellent retail site and is unlikely to be right for housing. It is presumed that the Parish Council prefer housing to provide CIL and numbers. If housing development is allowed on these two sites they will be satellites outside of the main village. They can only become realistic options if some of Land B between the village part of the Built-Up Boundary and the Village Hall has development on it.	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy H4	Support - The NP appears to consider that there are a number of large gardens suitable for development. It is understood that SDC Planning Department historically believe that garden development is infill and therefore only one deep. The principle of which gardens and how many houses has not been delineated and therefore presume they can only be considered Windfall. Again, to the knowledge of the writer few if any residents with large gardens have been consulted. There is no evidence based data.	Support noted. All potential infill sites who expressed interest including those with garden land have been thoroughly consulted and a subsequent site assessment was carried out by SDC.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy H5	Support - there are a number of family houses within the Orbit estate where older residents are living on their own. The provision of suitable specialist accommodation for the elderly and infirm could possibly, if the residents agree, free up the houses for families	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy ECON1	Support - see H3	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy ECON2	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE1	Whilst supported it should not be restrictive.	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE2	Support	Support noted.

Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE3	Support - It could be suggested that this Policy regarding previously developed land and properties should be considered a prime opportunity. As there is no data provided in the NP the explanation is somewhat light in nature.	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE4	The last paragraph above is key to my support of BNE4. As with BNE1 this Policy should not be considered restrictive. I would however suggest any new or extended properties have a charging point for an electric car.	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE5	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE6	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE7	Support - Supported in principle however it should not be considered restrictive so as to eliminate a suitable site from development.	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE8	Object - Bearley is washed over by green belt and to achieve housing number up to 32 then some agricultural land may have to be considered. However as mentioned elsewhere it could have substantial benefit. See comments in H1 and IN2 Flooding	It is not possible for the PC to allocate Green Belt land for market development as this would conflict with national policy and the Basic Conditions.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE9	Support - Again could be considered restrictive and the last paragraph of BNE4 should apply.	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE10	Support - As previously last paragraph BNE4 should apply.	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE11	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy BNE12	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy NNE1	Support	Support noted.

Graham Charles Musson	Policy NNE2	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy NNE3	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy NNE4	Support - Bearley Park and the Play Area is neither properly protected, maintained or enhanced by the Parish Council. Note 5.7.8.	Policy support noted. The Parish Council works hand in hand with the volunteer led charity Friends of Bearley Park committing all necessary funds to ensure maintenance, development and ensuring safety to all users. Annual RoSPA safety inspection recommendations are implemented.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy NNE5	Apparently, there has been much discussion regarding Valued Landscape. Unfortunately, it can be subjective and demonstrable physical attributes may not always be agreed upon. Whilst supporting the Policy it should not be viewed as over restrictive and used to negate any development.	Comment noted. By their very nature valued landscapes are subjective. The PC has looked at these proposed valued landscapes as an 'ordinary person' would and has concluded that the ones included in the NDP meet the high standard of value expected for these important landscapes.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy NNE6	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy NNE7	Support	Support noted.

Graham Charles Musson	Policy IN1	Support - Already mentioned is all new developments should have a recharging point for cars. With numbers of electrical cars needing charging the extra load on the electrical supply system needs to be considered and planned for.	Support noted. Planning conditions will secure charging points.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy IN2	Support - Land A in heavy rainstorms has substantial run off that often floods garages at the eastern end of Grange Road and the garages off Oak Tree Close that adjoin Land A. Additionally, there is a substantial run of water through Bearley Park from the land to the east. Many other properties in Grange Road and Oaktree Close are fearful that an extraordinary storm could cause flooding of properties. With imaginative involvement of all concerned the opportunity to minimise flooding through limited development on Land A could both enhance the village and mitigate flooding - a win-win situation. With the risk of flooding minimised through limited development a view could be house prices would be enhanced. It is understood there has been no direct communications with residents as to whether there would be any support such an opportunity.	Support noted. The Parish Council has been working closely with WCC Flood Risk staff to identify the flood risk locations carrying out the necessary work to clear gulleys and oblige other riparian owners to carry out their duties.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy IN3	Support - It is a Policy that should be supported. However, those pedestrians who try to get to the Village Hall along the footpath from the Village that for years has been reported to the Parish Council, the Policy will appear hollow. At this time, it is apposite to comment on 5.7 Managing Aspirations: 5.7.8 establishes the Parish Council with 3 Councillors cannot sustain delivering basic duties and obligations of the council and aspirations of the community. 5.7.13 states "This Plan will put all the effort and resources possible towards supporting the continuity and enhancement of community spirit and participation of all sections of the community in the governance of the village". If the Parish Council cannot perform now how will a NP suddenly perform.	Support noted. The existing three Councillors devote a lot of their time and do much better than meeting the basic needs albeit not as fast a pace as the case where the full contingency of seven councillors were in office. The paragraph alerts the community to the sustainability of governance.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy IN4	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy AFC1	Support	Support noted.
Graham Charles Musson	Policy AFC2	Support - An inspection of the public rights of way indicates that some sections are deteriorating, succumbing to weeds and narrowing.	Support noted. The PC will continue to seek assistance from WCC towards maintenance of the PROW's.

Graham Charles Musson	Policy AFC3	Support - It would appear that NNE4/LGS2 will only be sorted when CIL monies are forthcoming. CIL requires development yet, as previously, data has not been provided to ensure the residents of the Village have been given any real indication of how many houses are planned and where (windfall excluded).	Support noted. The Parish Council works hand in hand with the volunteer led charity Friends of Bearley Park committing all necessary funds from its budget to ensure maintenance, development and ensuring safety to all users. CIL contributions would be separate and additional to that which is currently being obtained.
Richard Woodman	Policy H1	Object - The BUAB as defined cuts my garden in half and should be amended to include the full garden. This is clearly residential curtilage and is pictured as such in the Neighbourhood Plan documents. In 2014 I was approached by Bearley Pariah Council who were looking for suitable in-fill sites in the village boundary. I was told that the Old Vicarage garden would be suitable, however, when I queried the decision not to include the garden in the BUAB shown in the Neighbourhood Plan earlier this year the team at SDC informed me that they had based their assessment on old photos and that I should raise this point with the Parish Council and the consultation. Hence this objection. The Parish Council had told me that the SDC team determined the BUAB - so this seems to be a somewhat circular arrangement which can hopefully be resolved by an independent view. I am not aware of any other gardens in the village proposed to be cut in half by the BUAB proposal.	The BUAB follows adopted guidance from SDC and therefore legitimately cuts through the garden. In 2014 the potential for infill was identified for possibly two dwellings between Rivendell to the west and Old Vicarage fronting on to Snitterfield Road with possible access issues. However, SDC defines limited infill development as the completion of an otherwise substantially built up frontage by the filling of a narrow gap normally capable of taking one or two

			dwellings only. The garden land does not fall within this definition.
Richard Woodman	Policy H2	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy H3	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy H4	Support - Noting that "significantly and demonstrably" is a high hurdle	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy H5	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy ECON1	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy ECON2	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE1	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE2	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE3	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE4	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE5	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE6	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE7	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE8	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE9	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE10	Object - b. Represents too low a hurdle for neighbours who simply don't want change. The wording should include "significantly and demonstrably" language.	Objection noted. Neighbours are entitled to their opinions and amenity. It is for the decision makers to decide the degree of

			harm when assessing the planning application.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE11	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy BNE12	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy NNE1	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy NNE2	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy NNE3	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy NNE4	Support - However - these spaces should also be adequately maintained, so they are not simply green wasteland and add to the attractiveness of the village.	Support noted. Maintenance of designated Local Green Spaces is a priority for the Parish Council and it is one of large budget items. Only LGS 4 is in private ownership. All others are owned or leased by the PC. LGS4 has recently been maintained by the owner.
Richard Woodman	Policy NNE5	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy NNE6	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy NNE7	Support - The restrictions on building-type should also allow for this. Development should be allowed but design should be as sensitive as possible.	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy IN1	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy IN2	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy IN3	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy IN4	Support	Support noted.

Richard Woodman	Policy AFC1	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy AFC2	Support	Support noted.
Richard Woodman	Policy AFC3	Support	Support noted.
David Hotten	Policy H1	Support	Support noted.
David Hotten	Policy BNE1	Object - In section a) the words 'Be compatible with' should be replaced with 'Not be detrimental to'. The word 'compatible' is generally interpreted as meaning that new buildings should be designed in similar styles and materials to the existing buildings. This would lead to monotony and prevents any new design thinking and innovation. There is a climate crisis which desperately needs to be addressed, with new buildings that are built using sustainable materials, using sustainable construction methods. The designs should enable the occupants to live as carbon neutral lives as possible. Basing the design of new building on the existing ones will not achieve these aims.	The PC notes the suggested rewording and whilst is satisfied with the current wording in the NDP, if the Examiner wishes to modify to 'Not be detrimental to' or similar, the PC would not object.
David Hotten	Policy BNE4	Object - There is a climate crisis and new buildings should be designed as sustainably as possible, in the materials used and in the construction methods. The aim should be for all new buildings to be carbon neutral in their construction and in their operation throughout their lifespan, with a plan to recycle the materials, at the end of their useful life. This should be given a higher priority in a design guide that trying to be designed to match the existing buildings. In c) & d) the use of brick and tiles should not be encouraged as these have a very high carbon footprint, both being required to be fired in ovens in their manufacture. Slate is not a local material, it is not quarried in this area. In h), i) & j) new buildings should not reflect traditional methods of construction, which generally are not sustainable.	The PC agrees with this sentiment but understands that planning policy cannot require all new homes to be carbon neutral. The build quality and energy efficiency of new homes is controlled under Building Regulations. Noted. However, this material is the predominant local material and therefore a balance needs to be struck between tackling climate change and ensuring new development is not at odds with the character and appearance of the

		<p>The requirement in i) for new buildings to have working brick chimneys, should absolutely be removed from this document. We do not live in the Victorian era. We should not be burning fossil fuels to heat buildings and if we did, they should not be burnt in inefficient open fires. Stratford-on-Avon District Council website says that the Council has declared a 'Climate Emergency' with councilors pledging to take local action to contribute to national carbon neutral targets. The policies here do not comply with this commitment.</p>	<p>local area. Brick slip cladding proposed for a recent planning application represents a solution which is supported.</p> <p>Working chimneys can be used to burn solid wood fuel which is a sustainable source of heating. Additionally, they can be used to hide shroud unsightly flues. One of the purposes behind this policy was to discourage the use of plastic bolt on /fake chimneys which volume house builders tend to use and use poorly.</p>
Anonymous	Policy H1	<p>Object - Any village needs to grow and the growth needs to be near the centre of the Village where in can make it a more cohesive Community. The need to grow is recognised in the Stratford District Core Strategy with the need in Bearley for no more than 32 houses by 2031. The Village Boundary is drawn in such a manner that in the proximity of the centre of the Village there is virtually no space for houses. The boundary includes to areas to the west of the village. The old mill will be a difficult site for housing as will have a massive bill for removing asbestos and that on the west of the A3400 cannot be considered as having any benefit to the village of Bearley. Land that could be considered as potential sites are categorised as Open Spaces.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Bearley can only grow from development which accords with the NPPF having regard to the Green Belt status of the village. The Plan recognises this and therefore there is no allocation for market homes in the village.</p> <p>The purchasers of the old mill have declared that it will be used for business purposes.</p>
Anonymous	Policy H2	Support	Support noted.

Anonymous	Policy H3	Support - The brownfield site is right to be considered for development. However, it is well away from the centre of the village and will add little to the central community. Countrywide is likely to remain as retail. The Mill is highly contaminated with asbestos and to assume it can be made free of contaminants and suitable for residential properties has not been proven.	Support noted. The purchasers of the old mill have declared that it will be used for business purposes. Any contaminants will need to be remediated and evidenced through the planning application.
Anonymous	Policy H4	Support - This is confusing in that a) through d) above is reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan. e) above is excluded. In the Neighbourhood Plan e) flood risk is a good clause. The clause f) The buildings and roads in the pastel shaded area [Figure 7] more visible, is unclear. Support for the Use of Garden Land is supported within normal Planning Regulations. 5.1.26 in the Neighbourhood Plan may be able to overrule Planning Regulations in the built-up area, however outside the built-up area normal criteria should comply. Again, use of Garden Land is likely to be Windfall and the potential garden land available for development is minimal other land should be considered for development.	Support noted. Only developments permitted by NPPF can be progressed by the Neighbourhood Plan. Figure 7 could be made bigger if this assists the reader.
Anonymous	Policy H5	Support - There is a requirement for bungalows by those single occupants of 3/4 bedroom affordable houses. This opportunity to free up a number of 3/4 bedroom affordable houses appears not to have been investigated.	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy ECON1	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy ECON2	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE1	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE2	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE3	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE4	Object - The design principles must reduce the risk of inappropriate development. However, the above list looks too restrictive and could be used to make any building project uneconomic. However, a possible consideration is that any new building must have a charging point for electric cars.	Objection noted. Inappropriate development is defined in national Green belt policy and is not usually a design issue. It is not considered that the criteria in this policy is too restrictive and this is reflected in the policy preamble.

			The policy reflects the wishes of the community. Charging points will be installed through planning conditions.
Anonymous	Policy BNE5	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE6	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE7	Object - Bearley has had no new development other than knock down and rebuild for 35 years plus. Well over half the residences in the village - Grange Road and Oaktree Close - have insufficient parking provision and a hazard for lack of access for fire engines. Having any house of 2 or more bedrooms providing two off-road car parking spaces should be considered in the light of the road it is situated otherwise it could be considered restrictive.	Objection noted. The policy applies to new development. It cannot be applied retrospectively.
Anonymous	Policy BNE8	The land within bounded by Snitterfield Road, Oak Tree Close, Grange Road and School Lane is not of the best and most versatile. It is excluded for development within the Plan. Currently the land has substantial run off in heavy rain. With limited development and flood control it would enhance the community and minimise flash runoff that affects a number of houses along Grange Road.	Comment noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE9	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE10	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE11	Support - As previously investigation should be undertaken to provide bungalows for elderly residents and so free up larger houses suitable for families. Obviously only if the move is beneficial and has the full agreement of the resident.	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy BNE12	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy NNE1	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy NNE2	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy NNE3	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy NNE4	Support - These areas should be well maintained and proper access provided for all ages including disabled.	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy NNE5	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy NNE6	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy NNE7	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy IN1	Support	Support noted.
Anonymous	Policy IN2	Support - Currently it is considered run-off from the fields bounded by Snitterfield Road, Oak Tree Close, Grange Road and School Lane is much greater than Bearley Brook.	Support noted.
Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC)	Contents Page	Drafting changes throughout the Plan has impacted upon some page numbering, which has not been reflected on p.5. Policies NNE6 and NNE7 are now on p.63. The title to	Accepted and changes will need to be applied.

		Appendix 4 has been changed to 'Acronyms and Abbreviations' but this has not been reflected on the contents page. Policy MA2 – delete 'the' between 'and' and 'capability' for consistency with Policy title in the main body of the Plan.	
SDC	Policy H1	It was pointed out the PC had incorrectly quoted a para number from the NPPF. The correct para was suggested and has been included within the submission NDP. However, it was pointed out that the provisions of para 79 of the NPPF do not apply to the Green Belt [i.e. they aren't listed as exceptions to inappropriate development in paragraph 145 in the NPPF or Policy CS.10 in the Core Strategy]. This matter has not been considered.	Correction will need to be applied.
SDC	Policy H1	At Reg.14 it was commented that "Policy CS.10 Green Belt is arguably more relevant to be mentioned within the second paragraph of the policy text than Policy AS.10". This was not a request to change the original reference of Policy AS.10 to CS.10, but a suggestion that Policy CS.10 should also be included, given its relevance to the subject matter of the policy. However, in para 2 of the policy, the PC has simply replaced AS.10 with CS.10 but retained the remainder of the text, which now does not make sense since it refers to a different policy. Additionally, there is no Criterion (i) of Policy CS.10. The reference to Policy AS.10 should be reinstated for correctness, but reference should also be made to Policy CS.10.	Noted. Suggest policy be amended to include Policy CS.10 and Policy AS.10 of the Core Strategy.
SDC	Policy H1	In the 2nd paragraph, the various provisions for new dwellings should relate to Policy AS.10 in the Core Strategy. In this respect (d) – (j) are relevant, not just (i).	Noted. Suggest policy be amended to include AS.10 (d) – (j).
SDC	Policy H1	A typographical error has made in the second paragraph – "strictly cotrolled" should be "strictly controlled"	Noted. Amendment needed.
SDC	Para 5.1.2	The paragraph states that the BUAB at Figure 7 is based on the 2012 Landscape Sensitivity Study. However, it is understood that the proposed BUAB is based on the draft settlement boundary drawn up by SDC for the Site Allocations Plan (SAP) consultation together with two further 'islands' made up of the site of Countrywide Stores and also residential properties at Bearley Cross. This should be amended for accuracy and clarity.	Noted. Add the words "... and the draft settlement boundary drawn up by SDC for the Site Allocations Plan (SAP)."
SDC	Figure 7 [BUAB]	Concern is raised regarding the inclusion of the 'island' of residential properties at Bearley Cross within the BUAB, as it does not clearly relate to the main settlement of Bearley, consisting of a small number of dwellings physically detached from the main settlement. It also differs to the BUAB proposed within the Site Allocations Plan, which proceeded to formal consultation prior to the NDP undertaking Reg.16 consultation. It is considered that local justification/evidence is required to support the inclusion of the small number of dwellings at Bearley Cross within the BUAB.	The residents of the properties at Bearley Cross regard themselves very much as part of Bearley Village and regularly attend Parish Council

			<p>meetings and village events.</p> <p>This matter has been discussed at length with SDC on a number of occasions. Para 5.1.3 describes the rationale for the inclusion of this land in the BUAB. There are a number of other Neighbourhood Development Plans where villages have multiple BUAB's not next to each other. These include Wootton Wawen, Kineton, Stratford Upon Avon and Balsall Common. All of these plans have passed Examination. Tysoe is currently under examination.</p> <p>The NDP is perfectly entitled to deviate from the SDC SAP and on a number of occasions Neighbourhood Plans have and do.</p>
SDC	Policy H2 – Criterion (b)	Details of how this criterion will be assessed need to be included in the policy.	<p>The onus is on the applicant to prove as part of the planning application that no other sites are available through a type of sequential test. It is not considered that this needs to be in the policy</p>

			but it could be included in the explanatory text to assist applicants.
SDC	Policy H3	The NPPF definition of Previously Developed Land includes gardens outside of Built-up Area Boundaries. Will this policy allow for housing outside of BUABs?	This policy only applies to gardens within the BUAB so the policy needs to make this expressly clear that this is the case. Suggest the following wording: "This policy only applies to gardens within BUAB as shown on Figure 7."
SDC	Policy H3	Suggest rewording of first sentence to ""The redevelopment of previously developed (brownfield) land will be supported subject to <i>meeting</i> all <i>of</i> the following criteria:" for clarity.	Accepted.
SDC	Policy H3 [Explanatory Text]	The Explanatory text associated with Policy H3 refers to two specific sites: 'the old garage site' off Oaktree Close and the 'Countrywide/Bearley Mill site' on the outskirts of the village. It is surprising that the Plan doesn't include specific, individual policies for allocating these two sites for appropriate reuse/redevelopment. The NDP would be the perfect vehicle for outlining the community's aspirations and requirements for the two sites and ensuring the community has an influence on any future development of the sites.	Comments noted. On balance, the PC has decided not to pursue an allocation but simply recognise that this brownfield site has potential for redevelopment in line with NDP policies. There is a current planning application pending for the redevelopment of this site which the PC have supported.
SDC	Policy H4	Will this policy include garden land outside of the BUAB (see comment on Policy H3)?	This policy only applies to gardens within the BUAB so the policy needs to make this

			<p>expressly clear that this is the case. Suggest the following wording:</p> <p>“This policy only applies to gardens within BUAB as shown on Figure 7.”</p>
SDC	Policy H4	Suggest rewording of first sentence to “Development on garden land <u>will be supported provided</u> that it can be demonstrated that proposals will:” to make the policy more positively worded.	Accepted. Suggest the policy is changed in line with SDC comments.
SDC	Policy H5	The policy asks that housing developments of 5 or more units should meet the housing requirements identified by the SHMA or Housing Needs Survey. Where is the justification for this figure? How does this policy comply with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CS.19 [Housing Mix and Type]? Is it possible for these smaller sites to achieve the requirements of this policy?	Policy H5 introduces a threshold for when market mix is applicable. The Core Strategy does not have a threshold. There are clear and obvious difficulties of providing a prescribed housing mix (as per CS.19) on small developments (less than 5 dwellings). The NDP is simply trying to establish parameters for when housing mix applies. The figure of 5 has been chosen as it represents a threshold which is likely to be applicable to modest schemes which are most likely to come forward in the village. In other words, a threshold of 10 is

			unlikely to be met in a village like Bearley.
SDC	Policy ECON1	It needs to be clarified that all proposals in the remit of this policy must meet the requirements of Criterion e), in addition to at least one of Criteria a) to d).	Noted. Suggest adding the word "and" after criterion d)
SDC	Policy ECON1 – Criterion (c)	This criterion may benefit from elaboration on what would be a 'better use of the site'.	Suggest deleting the words "better use of the site" and replace with "...and enhance or improve the amenity of the local area"
SDC	Policy ECON2	Given that the whole of the NP area is in the Green Belt, it would seem appropriate to make it clear that a scheme involving new buildings on greenfield land would not be consistent with Green Belt policy in the NPPF and Policy CS.10 in the Core Strategy.	Agreed. Suggest adding text in the explanation along the lines of: "All proposals must have regard to Green Belt policy."
SDC	Policy BNE1	This policy uses the word 'demonstrate' several times but it is not clear what this means – will proposals need an accompanying statement to accord with this policy?	The word 'demonstrate' has only been used twice in the policy... The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate through the planning submission compliance with policy.
SDC	Policy BNE1 – Criterion (f)	Should this criterion also reference the Valued Landscapes, Vistas and Skylines identified in Policy NNE5 of the NDP?	Agreed. Suggest changing the wording in criterion f) to: "Ensure that valued landscapes Vistas and skylines are protected in line with Policy NNE5 of this plan."

SDC	Policy BNE1 – Criterion (i)	This may not be applicable in every case so it is suggested to insert the following wording: “ <i>where appropriate</i> ” to the beginning of the sentence.	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion
SDC	Policy BNE1 - References	References should include policies CS.4, CS.5, CS.6, CS.8 and CS.9 as the policy refers to heritage, flood risk and landscape.	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion
SDC	Policy BNE2	The third bullet point – “proposals that may cause substantial harm”, is vague. Suggest this should be rewritten to “proposals that <u>will</u> cause substantial harm”.	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion
SDC	Policy BNE2	The policy does not make reference to archaeology, it is considered that this should be included.	Accepted. Include the words “including archaeological assets” after heritage assets in the first sentence of the last paragraph of the policy.
SDC	Policy BNE3	If proposals have to meet all of the criteria listed to be supported, this seems like an onerous amount of criteria for proposals to meet. Suggest the proposal should be reworded to: Proposals which achieve the effective and efficient use of land; are of an appropriate density; reuse previously developed land and/or bring properties back into use will be supported in principle.”	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Policy BNE4	Does adequately addressed mean that all of the Design Principles need to be met in new proposals? This needs to be clarified.	Suggest change ‘Adequately addressed’ to “met”
SDC	Policy BNE4 – Criterion (f)	It is considered the local justification for the 30% volume limit stated within this criterion should be made clear. This volumetric ‘cap’ is not in conformity with the Core Strategy or NPPF which refer to development being appropriate if extensions do not result in ‘disproportionate additions’ over and above the original dwelling, thus having a less restrictive and more flexible interpretation to the Policy in the NDP.	This is not a strategic issue and therefore the NDP can legitimately devise its own interpretation of proportionate extensions to existing houses in the Green Belt. The figure was derived from/taken forward from the figure used in the Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan which was deemed acceptable at the time

			the Plan was Examined by the Inspector.
SDC	Policy BNE4 – Criterion (k)	The requirement for “sensitive siting of PV and solar panels where they are not seen from the road. Particular importance should be given to the proximity to listed buildings or the effect on views in and out of the conservation area” is more restrictive than Permitted Development requirements in areas outside of the CA. Therefore, this Criterion as it stands is too onerous to apply to every property in the Neighbourhood Area.	The Policy needs to recognise that PD rights exist. Suggest pre-empting the Policy with: “where planning permission is required.”
SDC	Policy BNE4	Suggest that “modernistic designs’ should be changed to “contemporary designs”, and “future architectural projects” be changed to “development proposals”. ‘Modern’ refers to a specific time period (early to mid-20 th century).	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Policy BNE4 References	Since this policy relates to extensions in the Green Belt, Core Strategy Policy CS.10 should be added to the list.	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Policy BNE4 Explanation [para 5.3.4]	This text refers to ‘disproportionate additions’ as set out in the NPPF. How does this then tie in with criterion (f) of the policy referring to 30% volumetric ‘cap’ on extensions? There seems to be disconnect between the policy stance and the justification for its inclusion in terms of calculating ‘appropriate development’ in this regard.	Suggest paragraph 5.3.4 concludes with the sentence “In this respect disproportionate extensions’ means anything over 30%”.
SDC	Policy BNE7	“SDC adopted standards” should explicitly reference the SPD document they are contained in so that people can easily locate these standards.	Accepted. Suggest adding the words “...as set out in the Development Requirements – Supplementary Planning Document” after “standards”.
SDC	Policy BNE7	SDC parking standards contained in Part O of the Development Requirements SPD require 4+ bed units to have at least 3 parking spaces, the NDP only requires 2. This needs local evidence to justify the deviation from the SDC adopted parking standards.	Noted. Suggest the policy is amended to require at least 3 parking spaces for 4+ bed units to align with SDC standards.
SDC	Policy BNE7 - References	Needs to include Core Strategy Policy CS.26 (Transport and Communications)	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Policy BNE9 – Criterion (a)	See comment for Policy BNE4 Criterion (f). Para 4.1.9 of the Core Strategy states that ‘a specific maximum figure is in many cases arbitrary...’ What evidence exists to support and justify this percentage?	Again, this is not a strategic issue and therefore the NDP can

			legitimately devise its own interpretation of proportionate replacement dwellings in the Green Belt. The figure of 30% was derived from/taken forward from the figure used in the Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan which was deemed acceptable at the time the Plan was Examined by the Inspector.
SDC	Policy BNE9 – Criterion (b)	The requirements of this seems excessive as it seems to suggest all replacement dwellings must have garages. There is no requirement for new dwellings to provide garaging under BNE7, BNE4 or BNE1. What happens if the existing dwelling does not have garaging?	This policy in intended to avoid the situation where new replacement dwellings which include a proportionate increase (up to 30%) in volume are not approved without adequate garaging and storage facilities which then subsequently come back in with applications for garaging on top of the 30% increased volume. This has happened in the past and can erode the openness of the Green Belt. New detached buildings for garaging/storage in the Green Belt are

			inappropriate development so should be planned for adequately at the replacement dwelling stage. Suggest the criterion is retained.
SDC	Policy BNE9 – Criterion (e)	Together with Explanatory text para 5.3.14 – concern is raised that the neighbourhood plan is attempting to have undue influence over people’s ‘freedom of choice’ to do what they wish with their property [subject to all necessary approvals].	There is a balance to be struck between people’s freedom of choice and sustainable development. In an age of climate crisis, it is inherently unsustainable to demolish a perfectly good and habitable dwelling just because a developer would like a new/different house when adaption, extension and refurbishment should be preferred. The South Worcestershire Development Plan (adopted 2016) contains an identical policy requirement so it is clearly an acceptable policy to have. Suggest the criterion is retained.
SDC	Para 5.3.16	Mention is made of a ‘Village Design Statement’ but no further mention of such a document can be found within the Plan itself. What is the document, and where is it? Does it actually refer to the ‘Village Design Guidelines’ as set out in Appendix 1M to the Plan? If so, this paragraph needs amending, accordingly. If not, the VDS will	Noted. Suggest changing “Statement” to “Guidelines”.

		either need to be included as an Appendix, or mention of it removed from the explanatory text.	
SDC	Policy BNE10	The policy does not provide a requirement for vacant buildings or provide opportunity for unviable uses to change to a more suitable use.	Noted. Suggest adding the words "and vacant" after "redundant"
SDC	Policy BNE11	Does the first sentence of this policy apply to any use, or just residential use? This needs to be clarified as at the moment the policy seems to suggest that any proposed use would be acceptable as long as it utilises an empty home. Core Strategy Policy CS.20 is clear that existing housing stock in the District will be safeguarded unless there is specific and overriding justification for its change of use.	Suggest adding the words "Alternative uses to residential reuse will be considered on a case by case basis" at the end of the first sentence in a new sentence.
SDC	Policy BNE12	<p>The first paragraph does not actually relate to the policy heading. How would you assess whether a structure is 'highly visible' and what is the difference between 'visible' and 'highly visible'? This could cause difficulty in utilising the policy to evaluate whether a structure would be acceptable, or not since it is open to individual interpretation.</p> <p>The second paragraph relates to an unusual topic and its purpose is not covered in the explanation. Some structures [such as construction equipment] do not require planning consent due their temporary and transient nature and could not therefore be controlled via planning condition. Additionally, structures such as electricity pylons do not need consent. Concern is raised that this part of the policy is not justified or reasonable for the reasons stated here. Even if the paragraph were deemed acceptable, it would need to be clarified what is meant by 'reasonable time limit' as this would mean different things to different people and would be open to different interpretation. Would this meet the 6 tests for planning conditions?</p>	<p>Noted. Suggest deleting the second paragraph in the policy box. It is clear that the policy is intended to protect existing skylines. Communication masts and wind turbines have the greatest potential to be harmful to skylines because they tend to be tall structures. Highly visible to a layperson means dominantly visible in the landscape whereas visible would mean simply that you can see it.</p> <p>Suggest adding the word "tall" before "structures" in the policy box.</p>

SDC	Policy BNE12 Explanation [para 5.3.20]	Concern is raised that this paragraph reads more like policy and merely repeats what is stated within the policy – it does not add any further reasoning or justification for the policy itself. Additionally, it reads more as a 'Natural Environment' type issue, rather than a 'Built Environment' issue. Is it in the correct chapter of the Plan?	Suggest rewording this paragraph to read: "Tall structures such as communications masts and wind turbines have the greatest potential to be harmful to skylines. Such structures should have regard to skyline views and be appropriately sited so that these important views are not adversely affected."
SDC	Figure 11	The map is quite 'squashed' at the bottom of the page and the parameters of the sites are not provided. The map should be more akin to a LGS map, indicating the parameters of each site referenced.	Noted. The figure can be made larger in the final print of the NDP. The full details and parameters of the sites are included in Appendix 1K Rural Environment. Last sentence of paragraph 5.4.9 indicates this. Details of each site are on very many maps dealing with different ecological aspects of the site are the Appendix 4 of the Ecological and Geological Study 2012 document which is referenced throughout Section 5.4 and in Appendix 1K.

SDC	Policy NNE2	Suggest it would be helpful if the "mitigation hierarchy policy" is defined in the explanation. This requires explanation as to what it is and under what circumstances it would be applicable, since it is unclear at present.	Suggest deleting the paragraph starting "A mitigation hierarchy policy must be followed..."
SDC	Policy NNE2	It seems unrealistic to expect all new developments to incorporate tree and hedgerow planting – some developments may have no or little external area, or consist of very small scale developments (e.g. householder extensions). Suggest sentence should be rewritten to read "all new developments, where appropriate, should..."	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Policy NNE3	The sentence following the three criteria talks of a "mitigation hierarchy based approach". Whilst a link is provided in the references, as in Policy NNE2, this requires explanation as to what it is and under what circumstances the hierarchy would be applicable.	Suggest deleting the paragraph starting "A mitigation hierarchy policy must be followed..."
SDC	Policy NNE4	Final sentence – suggest amending to read: "...plant species are present as long as if it can be demonstrated that it will does not affect..."	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Policy NNE4	The first paragraph of the policy states that LGS will be protected to 'ensure adequate amenity is available', in keeping with 'the rural character of the village and 'green space inheritance'. None of these relate to the criteria by which LGS are assessed under paragraph 100 of the NPPF. What is meant by 'amenity space'? There is mention of areas of 'recreation value' in the NPPF, but this suggests public access. Do all the LGS have public access? Is amenity space the same as recreational area? The rural nature of a village is unimportant in this assessment. It is not clear what is meant by 'green space inheritance'. It is suggested this paragraph is re-drafted in accordance with the criteria set out within the NPPF.	Suggest deleting the words "ensure adequate amenity is available" and replacing with "preserve the local significance and importance of the green spaces..."
SDC	Policy NNE4 – Final paragraph	Replace 'permitted' with 'supported' on third line, to use consistent language throughout the Plan.	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Figure 12	The map is quite 'squashed' at the bottom of the page and it should be larger, so it is easier to interpret.	Noted. Suggest a better plan is provided
SDC	Policy NNE4 Explanation	There are no site assessments for the proposed LGS within the NDP. These should be added as a further Appendix to the Plan.	Noted. However, the assessments are considered to be background documents which once the NDP is made become somewhat superfluous

			to the document. The principle purpose of the assessments is for community consultation and the examination process. They can of course be easily appended to the plan but there are many examples of NDP's which do not include them as appendices for this reason.
SDC	Figure 13	This is a new map. The map is quite 'squashed' at the bottom of the page and it should be larger, so it easier to interpret. Whilst the sites are numbered on the map, it is not clear whether each are landscapes or vistas? The map does not make it clear which direction each 'protected' view is.	Noted. The map needs to be enlarged and the valued landscape properly plotted. The Examiner will need to see this map prior to consideration of the proposed valued landscapes. This can and will be arranged immediately upon request.
SDC	Policy NNE7	Suggest replacing "makes economic sense" with "will provide economic benefit".	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Policy IN1 – Criterion (a)	Would SuDS always be necessary for all development? Provision seems to suggest they should always be used, regardless of the type or scale of new development.	Noted. Suggest adding the words "Where necessary..." to the start of the criterion.
SDC	Policy IN1 – Criterion (b)	How would 'comprehensive energy efficiency measures' be required in planning terms? Will these differ to those required by Building Regulations?	Noted. Suggest rewording criterion b) to: "That it has taken account of best practices to achieve high levels of sustainability and

			safety" (NB this has been taken from the Made Stratford Neighbourhood Plan)
SDC	Policy IN2	This repeats the need for SuDS – the inclusion in IN1 therefore seems superfluous. It also prevents any development in flood zones 2 and 3- surely some water compatible development would be acceptable, or development accompanied by mitigation?	IN1 is a general infrastructure policy whereas IN2 is a special and more detailed policy on flooding and drainage. Suggest reference to IN2 should be made in criterion a) of Policy IN1. Suggest inserting the words "With the exception of water compatible uses, ..." at the beginning of the first sentence of Policy IN2.
SDC	Policy IN2	It is not clear what the 'Bearley Brook Flood Mitigation' is, alluded to in the final paragraph of the policy. What development would contribute toward this [scheme]? Does this mean all development (including extensions to dwellings) should contribute? If so, this seems too onerous. Contributions to such schemes would normally only be through 'major' development, which won't take place in the Neighbourhood Area due to Green Belt restrictions, except possibly in relation to the potential re-development of the Bearley Mill site, which isn't the subject of a specific policy in the NDP. The final sentence tasks SDC and WCC with seeking contributions toward future maintenance of Bearley Brook. Have both Authorities agreed to this? How/when should SDC and WCC seek contributions? This is not explained or justified at present.	Suggest adding the words "Where, appropriate,..." to the beginning of the final paragraph in the policy and suggest deleting the words "mitigation strategy" in the final sentence.
SDC	Policy IN4	It is suggested for the policy to be amended to read "Proposals that will increase the opportunity for residents of all ages to access further education, learning and life skills training, will be supported", in order to make policy more easily read.	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Policy AFC1	How will the last sentence of the policy be assessed – will it be assessed against certain criteria, e.g. that it has been marketed for the use for a certain length of time, with no interest expressed by potential occupiers?	The policy does not set out specific criteria as this could be deemed too onerous. For example, why 12 months and not 6 or 18

			<p>months?? The onus is on the applicant to put a case forward in the planning application and this will be determined by the decision maker.</p> <p>Suggest changing the title of Appendix 1C to "Community Facilities"</p> <p>Suggest sign-posting Appendix 1C in the policy by adding the words "as listed in Appendix 1C" after the word "facilities" in the first sentence.</p>
SDC	Policy AFC2	It would seem too onerous to apply the last part of the second sentence to all proposals. Suggest amending the wording to read "...or which fail, where appropriate, to incorporate new walking and cycling opportunities..."	Accepted. Change as per SDC suggestion.
SDC	Policy AFC3	The location in Appendix 1 where the existing formal and informal sport facilities are identified in the NDP should be clearly signposted within the explanatory text.	Suggest adding the words "as listed in Appendix 1C" after the word "facilities" in the first sentence.
SDC	Policies MA1 & MA2	These do not relate directly with land-use matters and need to be distinguished as such.	<p>These are clearly not policies, they are aspirations. Policies are Titled Policy xxx and are clearly in a purple box whereas the aspirations are not titled 'Policy' and are in a green box.</p> <p>There are several examples of Neighbourhood Plans where projects and</p>

			aspirations are contained within the main body of the plan provided, they are clearly distinguishable. These are clearly distinguishable. SDC and examiners have supported the principle of non-land use based projects/aspirations in the body of the plan e.g. Stratford-on-Avon.
SDC	Appendix 1B [Types of Homes]:	<p>Table 1B1 - 'Bearley Housing numbers' % column adds up to 99.8%, not 100%.</p> <p>Table 1B1 - 'Warwickshire' % column adds up to 99.9%, not 100%.</p> <p>Table 1B2 - 'Bearley Housing numbers' % column adds up to 99.9%, not 100%.</p> <p>Table 1B2 - 'Stratford District' % column adds up to 100.1%, not 100%.</p>	Noted. All figures are directly reproduced from the 2011 Census Profile issued by Warwickshire Observatory (warwickshireobservatory.org.uk) and contain small rounding errors. A note to this effect can be added if judged to be required.