

Tysoe Neighbourhood Development Plan – Reg.17A consultation (September 2021)

Proposed amendments to modifications as set out in Examiner’s Report

Original Text	Examiner’s modification	Proposed Amendments	Justification for amendments
<p><u>Natural Environment Policy 6 [Protected Strategic Gap]</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Policy wording set out on p.49 of the Reg.17A Version NDP · Explanatory text paragraph 8.7.0.3 set out on p.49 of the Reg.17A Version NDP · Map 8 (Proposals Map) set out on p.30 of the Reg.17A Version NDP including the Strategic Gap as a yellow hatched area between Middle and Lower Tysoe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Replace policy wording (as set out on p.20 of the Examiner’s report) · Replace text in paragraph 8.7.0.3 (as set out on p.21 of his report) · Replace the extent of the Strategic Gap on the Policies Map on p.30 of the NDP with that proposed on the map at Appendix 1 to his report (as set out on p.21 of his report). <p><u>Examiner’s Reasoning:</u></p> <p>The Examiner was satisfied that in general terms there remained a purpose to ensuring the continued separation of the two settlements and the inclusion of an appropriately worded policy.</p> <p>However, the Examiner was not satisfied that a geographically-defined Strategic Gap needed to incorporate the parcel of land to the west of Meadow Lane.</p> <p>He recommended that the Strategic Gap as set out at Map 8 of the NDP be reduced in extent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Policy wording amended to align with modification as recommended by the Examiner in his Examination of the Submission version NDP in 2020, <u>not</u> in accordance with the wording recommended as a modification in his Examination of the Reg.17A NDP in 2021. · Explanatory text to the policy amended as recommended by the Examiner, but with additional text proposed. · Geographical representation of a Strategic Gap removed from Map 8 [Policies Map], <u>not</u> deleted as recommended by the Examiner (see p.30 of Reg.17A consultation version NDP to view extent of revised Strategic Gap) <p><u>Parish Council’s response to Examiner’s proposed modifications set out in his report on the Reg.17A consultation:</u></p> <p>Please see reasons for proposed changes as set out by the Parish Council in the following document, which forms part of this</p>	<p>The District Council were content with the Examiner’s conclusions and recommendations on the issues relating to Natural Environment Policy 6 of the Tysoe NDP in the Examination of the Submission version Plan in 2020.</p> <p>In the Examination of the Submission version NDP, the Examiner proposed a revised policy and the removal of the geographical representation of a strategic (or settlement) gap from Policies Map 8.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in his report of February 2020, the proposed modification was deemed to meet the Basic Conditions. SDC agreed with this assessment.</p> <p>However, the Parish Council disagreed with the Examiner’s approach and in the spirit of Localism, the District Council supported the PC in re-consulting on a variance of the Policy, retaining a geographical representation of a settlement gap.</p> <p>The Examiner concluded that there was insufficient justification for the extent of the revised gap being</p>

Original Text	Examiner's modification	Proposed Amendments	Justification for amendments
	<p>to exclude the parcel of land to the west of Meadow Lane (as indicated on the map at Appendix 1 to his report).</p> <p>The Examiner was of the opinion that the hybrid nature of the policy (with geographic representation on a map) did not have the clarity required by the NPPF.</p> <p>In order to remedy this lack of clarity, he recommended a modified format for the policy which referred to the proposed geographic area of the Gap as shown in Appendix 1. The revised policy wording took account of the wider approach to development in the countryside as identified both in the Core Strategy and in Housing Policy 1 of the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The full text of the Examiner's assessment and recommendations can be read at para's 7.27 to 7.46 of his report.</p>	<p>consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Justification for Changes in re-submitted Plan 	<p>proposed through the Reg.17A version NDP and recommended a further reduction in the overall extent of the gap (see map at Appendix 1 to his report).</p> <p>The Parish Council did not agree with the revisions being proposed by the Examiner and proposed a solution of reverting back to the Examiner's recommended modification set out in his February 2020 report.</p> <p>Following the Parish Council's recent consultation event with parishioners of Tysoe to consider the Policy issue further, the District Council is content in supporting the Parish Council holding a second Reg.17A consultation on this specific matter. This is due to the fact that the proposed solution put forward by the Parish Council is one which has been previously Examined and deemed to meet the Basic Conditions test.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that this proposed amendment to the policy be incorporated into the NDP. The District Council considers that the policy as re-drafted complies with National and Local Plan policy and is also compliant with the Basic Conditions test.</p>