

## Quinton Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Regulation 16 Representations: By Contributor

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
QUI01	CALA Homes (Midlands)	General	<p>It is understood from Paragraphs 6.1.5 and 3.17 of the draft NPD that the policies within the document do not apply to the land relating to the Long Marston Garden Village (boundary as defined in the adopted Core Strategy). Instead, the policies within the Core Strategy and Long Marston SPD apply to the site. This is despite part of the Long Marston Village site falling within the Quinton NDP boundary.</p> <p>On this basis, Cala Homes (Midlands) have no comments to make on the consultation document.</p>
QUI02	Coal Authority	General	No specific comments to make.
QUI03	Coventry Diocese	General	Do not believe the Plans affect any area of Coventry Diocese.
QUI04	Historic England	General	<p>We are pleased to note that our suggestions at Regulation 14 stage have been taken account of. Our other comments on the Regulation 14 Plan remain entirely relevant, that is:</p> <p>“Historic England is supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and strategic objectives set out in it. We are very pleased to note that the Plan evidence base takes a very thorough approach to the historic environment and is well informed by reference to the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record alongside formal historic environment assessment and archaeological sensitivity mapping.</p> <p>The emphasis on the conservation of local distinctiveness and variations in local character through good design and the protection of locally significant green space, valued historic buildings and historic landscape character including ridge and furrow and key views is to be applauded.</p> <p>The Quinton Design Guide is admirable in its detail providing an invaluable context for the Plan that</p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>will be of great assistance in ensuring future development respects and reinforces local distinctiveness.”</p> <p>Overall the plan reads as a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document which we consider takes a very thorough and suitably proportionate approach to the historic environment of the Parish.</p> <p>Beyond those observations we have no further substantive comments to make on what Historic England considers is a good example of community led planning.</p>
QUI05	National Grid	General	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>National Grid provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.</p> <p><a href="http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/">www.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</a></p>
QUI06	National Highways	General	<p>In responding to Local Plan consultations, we have regard to DfT Circular 02/2013: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development (‘the Circular’). This sets out how interactions with the Strategic Road Network should be considered in the making of local plans. In addition to the Circular, the response set out below is also in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other relevant policies.</p> <p>We note that the SRN in closest proximity to the plan area is the A46 trunk road, which sits outside of the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>We have considered the contents of the Neighbourhood Plan and as the plan does not introduce any new development sites or transport related policies that are likely to impact upon our network, we consider that the contents of the plan are for local determination, and we have no further comments</p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			to make.
QUI07	Natural England	General	No specific comments.
QUI08	RPS on behalf of Redrow Homes	General	Having reviewed the submitted documentation, RPS has a number of issues and concerns with the QNDP with regards to the basic conditions.  Full representations attached at Appendix 1.
QUI09	Rosconn Strategic Land	Policy NE1	Having considered the document and associated evidence base, we wish to raise objection to the specific issue of Local Green Spaces within the DNP on the basis that it is considered this fails to meet one of the basic conditions, in that it fails to have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.  Full representations attached at Appendix 2.
QUI10	Sports England	General	Government planning policy, within the <b>National Planning Policy Framework</b> (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.  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 <b>protecting playing fields</b> 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.

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p data-bbox="842 320 1877 389"> <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</a> </p> <p data-bbox="842 421 2033 523"> Sport England provides guidance on <b>developing planning policy</b> 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. </p> <p data-bbox="842 560 1877 628"> <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</a> </p> <p data-bbox="842 660 2033 1034"> 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 <b>assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities</b>. 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 data-bbox="842 1070 2033 1331"> 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 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. </p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p data-bbox="842 320 1529 352"><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance">http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</a></p> <p data-bbox="842 379 2033 451">If <b>new or improved sports facilities</b> are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.</p> <p data-bbox="842 480 1939 512"><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p> <p data-bbox="842 539 2033 802">Any <b>new housing</b> 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 data-bbox="842 831 2033 1018">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 <b>any new development</b>, 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 data-bbox="842 1046 2033 1233">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 data-bbox="842 1262 2033 1334">NPPF Section 8: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</a></p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</a></p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a></p>
QUI11	Janet Neale Warwickshire County Council	General	<p>The County Council welcomes communities proposing Neighbourhood Plans that shape and direct future development. The County Council manages a number of services including highways and transport, education, social care, recycling and waste centres and the environment. This list is not exhaustive and all service areas within the County Council have been given an opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council were afforded the opportunity to consider an earlier draft and it is pleasing to see that many of the comments made have been reflected in the latest draft.</p> <p>Colleagues within Flood Risk Management and Transport Planning in particular do not feel that they have anything further to add at this stage.</p> <p>As with all Public Sector organisations, the County Council has the responsibility to deliver its services as effectively and efficiently as possible. It is important that I stress that the County Council cannot commit to any financial implications from any proposals emanating Neighbourhood Plans and as such Plans should not identify capital or revenue schemes that rely on funding from the Council. The County Council will, however, be happy to assist communities in delivering infrastructure providing they receive any funding that may arise from Developer Contributions or any other sources. It must also be noted that with regards to the road safety comments, any changes to the highway i.e. speed limits, traffic calming measures will need to meet the relevant criteria and receive any required consultation. In addition, funding will also need to be sought.</p> <p>Colleagues within the Adult Services Commissioning Team support the recommendation for the consideration of single-story dwellings, but they have expressed concern that the plan does not look to discuss how it will support individual within the community as they age or individuals with disabilities. We would hope that the Plan should consider the needs of the more vulnerable members</p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>of the community, and this isn't always apparent in the draft.</p> <p>Reference is made that affordable housing should meet the housing needs assessment, but it does not say what those needs are. We would hope that the Plan should consider the needs of the more vulnerable members of the community, and this isn't always apparent in the draft.</p> <p>The County Council will be happy to meet with the Parish Council or with the District Council moving forward to look for ways we can ensure that the needs of the most vulnerable can be considered.</p>
QUI12	Elizabeth Neal	General	<p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO1?</i></p> <p>Support - Strongly agree with built-up area boundary as defined within plan</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO2?</i></p> <p>Support - This is the only suitable reserve site within Quinton</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO3?</i></p> <p>Support - Strongly support this policy</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO4?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HD1?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE1?</i></p> <p>Support - Strongly support this policy</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE2?</i></p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>Support - These landscapes and views must be preserved to maintain the character and heritage of the village</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE3?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE4?</i></p> <p>Support - Strongly support this policy</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE5?</i></p> <p>Support - This is a treasured site within the village and must be preserved at all costs</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF1?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF2?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF3?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HA1?</i></p> <p>Support</p>
QUI13	Rosemary Kidd	General	<i>Do you support or object to Policy NE1?</i>



Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>Support - Meon Vale Residents Association supports the designation of the green spaces within Meon Vale (location 15) as Local Green Spaces. We also support the wording of the policy to safeguard the areas.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE4?</i></p> <p>Support - Meon Vale Residents Association is working to promote the enhancement of biodiversity throughout the new village and recognizes the importance of a network of wildlife areas and corridors particular linked to the stream adjacent to the plan area, and the woods and wetlands in Meon Vale where there are protected species.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF1?</i></p> <p>Support - Care will be needed to assess the impact of any new flood mitigation measures on the flood management scheme at Meon Vale</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF2?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF3?</i></p> <p>Support</p>
QUI14	Miss E H Blount		<p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO1?</i></p> <p>Support - I hope the power under SAP.7. will be exercised very sparingly</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO2?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO3?</i></p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>Support - So far as its powers permit, the planning authority should ensure that any new houses should be insulated and heated so as to minimise their contribution to climate change</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO4?</i></p> <p>Support - It should be noted that when the Lilac Avenue development was built, fewer 'affordable' homes were built than the original plans provided for. Provision for affordable homes should be in line with the real requirements of the local population.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HD1?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE1?</i></p> <p>Support - The green space at the heart of Fordway development is green, but was made with poor quality turf on whatever waste was left after the building of the development and levelling. There is still not a great diversity of species growing there, and not very much grass. So far as the authorities powers permit, any new green space should be of better quality.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE2?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE3?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE4?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE5?</i></p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF1?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF2?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF3?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HA1?</i></p> <p>Support</p>
QUI15	Jayne Cashmore, Oakwood Planning Ltd on behalf of A Valender	Policy HO1	<p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO1?</i></p> <p>Object - Policy HO1 is not consistent with nor in general conformity with the Core Strategy and requires amending.</p> <p>It is the case that new dwellings are acceptable within the countryside not just in Policy AS.10 of the Core Strategy but also in CS.15 G of the Core Strategy. CS.15 G allows for local housing needs dwellings adjacent settlements and HO1 classifies adjacent a built up area boundary as the countryside.</p> <p>Bullet Point 2 of Policy H01 should therefore refer not just to AS.10 but also refer to Core Strategy CS.15 G which allows for certain development (including affordable, or market housing with a local connection, or a mix of both) adjacent settlements.</p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>Additionally, the exceptions listed in bullet point 3 of HO1 do not include all those listed in Core Strategy Policy AS.10 and CS.15 G. Bullet point 3 is therefore inconsistent with Core Strategy Policy AS.10 and CS.15 G and should be amended.</p> <p>Bullet point 3 should therefore also include the housing related wording of Core Strategy AS.10(a) and CS.15 G. Therefore the list of exceptions should be added to, to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adjacent to a settlement, small-scale community led housing schemes to meet a need identified by that community (refer to CS.15 G), and</li> <li>• small-scale schemes for housing to meet a need identified by a local community in a Parish Plan, Neighbourhood Plan or other form of local evidence, on land adjacent to a village (refer to AS.10(a))</li> </ul> <p>The above two additional points include locals needs schemes which may be affordable, market housing with a local connection, or a mix of both. There is no reason to not include market housing with a local connection in the list of exceptions in Policy HO1 given the content of Core Strategy CS.15 G and AS.10(a). To exclude would be inconsistent with the Core Strategy.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, 'bullet points' referred to above are as they appear in the 17th December 2021 Submission Version Policy HO.1.</p>
QUI16	Savills on behalf of Magdalen College, Oxford	General	<p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO1?</i></p> <p>Support - The Neighbourhood Plan references the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (June 2019) throughout. The NPPF was revised on 20 July 2021 and therefore the most recent version of the NPPF should be referenced within the Plan and paragraph numbers updated accordingly. This comment relates to all policies within the plan and is therefore not repeated in this form.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO2?</i></p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>Support - Magdalen College supports the inclusion of land on the east side of Goose Lane as a Reserve Housing Site and confirms the site is available to come forward for development in the short term once there is an identified housing need for its release, having regard to the criteria in Policy CS.16 of the Core Strategy 2011-2031.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO3?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO4?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HA1?</i></p> <p>The last sentence of this policy ("Lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken as proof of absence") is unnecessary. Any assessment of archaeology will assess the potential for any archaeology in consultation with the Warwickshire HER, as is good practice.</p>
QUI17	Ian McDonald	General	<p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO1?</i></p> <p>Object - I am the owner of "the orchard" by Upper Quinton Green and I object to the orchard having being placed outside the built-up area boundary. I think its exclusion from the BUAB is unreasonable and maybe unjust. With that sole exception, I generally support the rest of Policy HO1, i.e. I would support it fully if my orchard was within the BUAB. Please see further relevant detail in my representation to Q13, Q33 and Q35.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO2?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO3?</i></p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>Object - Same type of reasoning as my reply to Q9. i.e. I would fully support Policy HO3 if my orchard by Upper Quinton Green was categorised as falling within the BUAB. Also, please see my detailed reply to Q9, Q33 and Q35.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HO4?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HD1?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE1?</i></p> <p>Object - I am the owner of the land which this Plan seeks to designate as LGS14 - Upper Quinton: The Orchard (by Upper Quinton Green). This land has been categorised as "non-developable" by the LPA. I think that this categorisation is probably unreasonable and possibly unjust. The location of the land within the reality of the village, as opposed to somewhat arbitrary lines drawn on a map. is that this land is broadly surrounded on three sides by existing built development - its third or eastern side having the relieving feature of an interpositioned very large village green in front of that line of houses. I think that this land, standing adjacent to and recessed from Tailors Lane, or some part of this land, would be eminently developable in the fullness of time. Given the planning history of our nation and its relationship to demographic and economic development, I think that no designation or categorisation should be applied to this land which would prejudice some future development in the fullness of time. I note from the SHLAA 2020 that this land was therein mapped as number 15 and tinted brown on the map, so that it was considered for future development but classified as being "unbelievable". I, as the present owner, do not wish to pursue planning applications on this land, but I think that future successors in title should have that potential options held open by an open-minded LPA, to be judged and decided by the future requirements and rules of society. On 14th October 2021 I wrote to parish councillor Mr Paul Milliken and I understand from his reply letter</p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>to me of the 1st November 2021 that he forwarded my letter to the Planning Department at Stratford-on-Avon District Council involved in looking at the Consultation. I can precis the sentiment and points contained in that letter by saying here that I make the hypothetical suggestion that this land would be suitable, in terms of medium to long-term usage, for about half a dozen bungalows or cottages in order to potentially free up the same number of much larger houses - the idea being that elderly single-occupiers of larger houses might be pleased to sell to a family (consisting of a few or several people) if they knew that they (single-occupiers) could buy a bungalow or cottage within the village and thus not need to break ties with the village in their old age. This idea would boost the sustainability of the village to a modest extent and it could continue to offer that boost indefinitely into the future, as generations come and go. Also, and importantly, it would be development that does not merge Lower with Upper Quinton, nor spread further from Upper Quinton towards Meon Vale. It would be within the existing envelope of the hamlet of Upper Quinton. Therefore, I object to the proposal to designate this land as a Local Green Space LGS14.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE2?</i></p> <p>Support - I note from Figure 23 - Valued Landscapes and Key Views - that a low-impact, small-scale, bungalow-type development in the Orchard by Upper Quinton Green would have zero or negligible effect on the far-reaching, long distance views towards Meon Hill from the various viewpoints listed and this is still true from the existing nearby houses which are 2-storey and 3-story buildings. Also, in such a supposed planned development, except for the actual land footprint involved, there would be little impact on the larger landscape.</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE3?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE4?</i></p> <p>Support</p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p><i>Do you support or object to Policy NE5?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF1?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF2?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy INF3?</i></p> <p>Support</p> <p><i>Do you support or object to Policy HA1?</i></p> <p>Support</p>
QUI18	Stratford-on-Avon District Council	Para 3.17	<p>Clarity is needed in relation to paragraph 3.17 which states that some of the planned 3500 homes in LMA fall within the parish and neighbourhood area (probably many of the first 400 in phase 1). This is then elaborated on by saying that 'this part of the airfield development is not covered by this plan but is covered by the provisions of the Core Strategy Proposal for the LMA and the Framework Masterplan Supplementary Document'.</p> <p>However, there are elements of Long Marston Airfield (LMA) that are within the Neighbourhood area, and Parish. As such, paragraph 3.17 is factually incorrect. Those homes in LMA that fall within the Neighbourhood area will be subject to the NDP policies, subject to specifically stating they do not. As such, this paragraph should be amended for the sake of factual accuracy.</p>



Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
		Para 6.1.1	<p>This states that ‘The Quinton NDP is outlined on the map in figure 2 – Quinton NDP Boundary – by the pink dotted line’. Adjacent to the area boundary a significant amount of housing is either under development or planned with the associated impacts on local infrastructure as detailed in in 6.1.2, 6.1.3 and 6.1.4’.</p> <p>However, saying ‘adjacent to the area boundary’ in the context of LMA is incorrect, as part of it is also within the area boundary. This should be corrected.</p>
		Para 6.1.23 & Figure 10	<p>Although reference is now made to the 2020 version of the SHLAA, there is now a 2021 version which has been produced. The contents of the map at Figure 10 has not changed, but the title needs changing to 2021 and the word ‘proposals’ deleting. Para 6.1.38 should also refer to the 2021 SHLAA.</p>
		Policy HO.1	<p>2nd bullet point – not all areas abutting the BUAB are open countryside – for example, Meon Vale and LMA.</p> <p>The 3rd bullet point does not include the full list of exceptions included in Policy AS.10. This bullet point also appears to be unnecessary as the 2nd bullet point already states it will be limited to those exceptions listed in Policy AS.10. As such, it is recommended that this bullet point is deleted.</p> <p>4th bullet point. This is unclear. Should state what additional policies (of any over and above Core Strategy) apply within Meon Vale and LMA.</p> <p>5th bullet should refer to Policy SAP.6. Suggest deleting “It is recognised that” from beginning of the sentence, as it is not written like a policy.</p> <p>6th (and final) bullet point. This should arguably form a separate policy, as it essentially covers a different topic. It is also vague.</p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
		Policy HO.2	<p>Policy HO.2 is welcome in terms of providing clarity and is a good example of a clear policy.</p> <p>2nd bullet point should also refer to the findings of landscape assessment being reflected in the actual design/layout. It should reference impacts on heritage assets and traffic, too. Note also the explanatory text, at para. 6.1.37, which also refers to impact on heritage assets (setting of the church) and traffic – yet these points are not reflected in the 2nd bullet point to HO.2 – only landscape.</p> <p>2nd line in 2nd bullet should read ‘reserve site’</p>
		Policy HO.4	<p>Whilst this policy is to be encouraged, it is unclear whether this policy relates solely to affordable housing or market housing as well; concerns with this policy are that it arguably conflates two separate issues – affordable housing and stock mix respectively. It would be preferable to separate the two. In terms of housing stock, the NDP should decide whether they want to rely on CS.19 or have a bespoke policy tailored to meet the identified local need. For examples of this, see Wellesbourne and Stratford-upon-Avon made NDPs. As the Housing Need Survey 2019 identified both affordable housing and (local) market housing, the NDP could consider how to meet this need in a bespoke stock mix e.g. 14 of the 19 homes required from the HNS 2019 were for bungalows.</p> <p>In term of affordable housing, the NDP may want to consider whether it is happy to rely on CS.18, and as such doesn't need an extra policy. The alternative would be to have a specific affordable housing policy. It should, however, be noted that as the majority of development will be limited infill development, and with no specific site allocations for a rural exception site, such development is unlikely to attract an affordable housing requirement, with the important exception of the further development that may come forward at LMA.</p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
		Policy NE.1	<p>A more detailed look at Policy HO.4 is as follows, notwithstanding comments above to restructure the Policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals for new dwellings should take account of the preferences indicated by residents including for small development and for 2/3 bedroom houses and bungalows.</li> </ol> <p>Regard to the findings of the HNS (or any subsequent Survey) would be preferable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed developments should also consider the provision of affordable homes to reflect the needs identified in the Local Housing Needs Survey.</li> </ol> <p>Whilst identifying there is a need as identified in the Housing Needs Survey 2019, bullet point 2 is unclear – and see above comments. Any reference to Housing Needs Survey should include Housing Needs Survey 2019 (and any subsequent Housing Needs Survey).</p> <p>Instead of being drafted “should consider...”, suggest the policy points should be drafted to state that proposals “will be supported...”.</p> <p>Concern is raised that the following parcels of land may not meet the NPPF criteria: 1 (3 parts); 2, 7 (verges – 3 parts); 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15.</p> <p>Whilst an argument may be possible for sites 1 and 12 that contain children’s play areas (although it is not clear that in itself is justification for LGS designation), the other parcels at site 1, 2, 9, 11 and 12 in particular are just areas of open grass. In terms of Meon Vale (sites 15a-h), an argument may be possible for sites e, f and g (tree belt/amenity land for community), but sites a, b, c, d and h are less convincing – these are just open areas between dwellings with a few trees on them.</p>

Rep.No.	Name	Policy/Section	Representation
			<p>The size and shape of proposed LGS site 8 seems to be incorrect, when looking at it on GIS and the Landscaping Plan for the Reserved Matters permission (Ref: 17/00863/REM).</p> <p>There is a typo in the last line.</p>
		Figure 12	The BUAB on this map is different to the BUAB shown on Figure 9.
		Policy NE.2	Would question why Fig.23 is not embedded within the Plan next to Policy NE.2 for ease of reference.
		Policy NE.3	It should be noted that lighting relating to public highways would fall under the powers of the Highways Authority and therefore would not be subject to this Policy.
		Policy INF.2	It looks as if the 3rd bullet point should have been deleted as there were originally sub-bullet points in the Reg.14 Plan underneath this bullet that have now been deleted. This bullet point no longer makes sense in the context of the policy.