

## Site Allocations Plan Preferred Options Consultation Assessment of Comments

The consultation period ran from 20 October to 18 December 2020.

A total of 1215 responses were submitted during that period, comprising 2858 individual comments.

Of these comments, 322 were supportive, 2201 raised objections, and 335 were neither.

Contents	Page No.
1. General and Introduction	2
2. Reserve Housing Sites	27
. SAP.1 – Identifying Reserve Housing Sites	27
. SAP.2 – Releasing Reserve Housing Sites	57
3. Self-build and Custom-build Housing Sites	77
. SAP.3 – Meeting Self-build and Custom-build Housing Needs	77
. SAP.4 – Self-build and Custom-build Housing Allocations	91
. SAP.5 – Unallocated Self-build and Custom-build Housing Sites	102
4. Built-Up Area Boundaries	105
. SAP.6 – Built-Up Area Boundaries	105
5. Employment Enabling Sites	113
. SAP.7 – Employment Enabling Sites	113
6. A46 Safeguarding	117
. SAP.8 – A46 Safeguarding	117
7. Specific Site Proposals	118
. SUA.2	118
. SUA.4	120
. SUA.5	121

· SUA.6	123
· SUA.7	125
· SUA.8	125
· STUD.1	126
· STUD.2	127
· RURAL.1	127
· RURAL.2	131
· RURAL.3	133
8. Policies Map	136
· Part A: Reserve Housing Sites	136
· Part B: Self-build and Custom-build Housing Sites	270
· Part C: Built-up Area Boundaries	299
· Part D: A46 Safeguarding	311
· Part E: Specific Site Proposals	311
Annex 1: Schedule of proposed Reserve Housing Sites	312
Omission Sites	331
Appendix 1: Methodology for defining Built-Up Area Boundaries	345
Appendix 2: Status of Built-Up Area Boundaries by settlement	348



## Section 1: Introduction

<b>Topic: Section 1 Introduction (General)</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
None				

<b>Topic: 1.1 Context</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---------------------------	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
None				

<b>Topic: 1.2 Relationship to Neighbourhood Plans</b>	<b>Support: 11</b>	<b>Object: 24</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
---	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Redrow Homes Rosconn Strategic Land William Davis Ltd Rainier Developments Ltd Mr Jonathan Tribe CEG and Mixed Farms Ltd Shipston-on-Stour Town Council	1. Support the approach of not identifying reserve sites where a NDP has already done so. This is consistent with the Localism agenda and encourages NDPs to be positively prepared.	None.	N/A	None.
Sharba Homes Cemex UK Ltd Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd	2. Automatically discounting sites from settlements covered by a 'made' NDP which allocate at least one reserve	All 'amber' sites in all settlements should be assessed on a fair and equitable basis and should	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already	None.

<p>Mr Paul Baggett Mrs Elizabeth Baggett Countryside Properties Tysoe Parish Council Claire Wegrzyn The Ettington Estate Cllr Manuela Perteghella (x3) Delta Planning Steve Taylor Barwood Development Securities Ltd</p>	<p>site will not result in a sustainable strategy, since it is not possible to conclude that reasonable alternatives have been considered. There is no assessment of the ability of such settlements to accommodate further growth and no assessment of 'amber' sites in the SHLAA.</p>	<p>include those settlements where a made NDP is in place.</p>	<p>does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.</p>	
<p>The White Family and Lone Star Land Welford-on-Avon Parish Council Richborough Estates Taylor Wimpey UK Long Compton Parish Council - Chair Clifford Chambers and Milcote Parish Council</p>	<p>3. Since the NDP for Clifford Chambers has been resolved to be submitted to referendum, in accordance with the approach set out in para 1.2.7 of the SAP, the only reserve site for Clifford Chambers should be the one set out in the NDP (site CLIF.01 in the SHLAA).</p>	<p>Remove the proposed reserve housing sites from the SAP in relation to Clifford Chambers due to the advanced stage of the NDP which has one reserve site within it.</p>	<p>It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Cemex UK Ltd, Sharba Homes Ltd and Spitfire Homes Linda Dane Wellesbourne Allotment Association Wychavon District Council Harbury Society Kineton Parish Council Richard Wilde Maureen Ankrett Salford Priors Parish Council Miller Homes</p>	<p>4. The SHLAA is incorrect for Long Compton in that it states that the 'made NDP does not identify reserve sites'. The NDP does have a reserve site for a further phase of affordable dwellings subject to identification of local need. It is therefore unacceptable for SDC to determine that a reserve site in the NDP does not count as a reserve site for SHLAA purposes.</p>	<p>Amend the SHLAA to correct the error or set out the reasons for the contradiction.</p>	<p>Policy H4 in the made NDP clearly states that the site identified is to meet local need for affordable housing, to meet the future needs of the community for people with a local connection to the Parish. As such, it is in effect a rural exception site for very specific local need purposes. This is not the same as a Reserve Housing site to accommodate District wide need for additional open market dwellings within the Plan period. Therefore, the SHLAA is correct in what it says. In any case, reserve</p>	<p>None.</p>

			housing sites have not been promoted in Long Compton due to the settlement being washed over by the Cotswolds AONB as explained at bullet point 2 of para 2.1.22 of the SAP.	
	<p>5. The Council has maintained the strategy of not identifying reserve sites in NDPs that are 'at an advanced stage of preparation' or 'made'. However, the Council provides no justification or clarity on this decision. The result of this, in effect, rewards those Parishes who have taken the 'initiative' to identify reserve sites and thus spare them from consideration of further potential sites identified through the SAP process. This approach has not been consistently applied with regards the Shipston-on-Stour NDP. The decision to exclude any consideration of new reserve sites through the SAP assumes all reasonable alternatives had been considered at the point the NDP was being progressed. Site SHIP.09 was not considered for allocation for housing or as a reserve site through the NDP process since it was not being promoted at that time. As such, the Council's decision prevents any</p>	<p>None specified. However, the representation would suggest the Council's decision to not identify further reserve sites in settlements covered by made NDPs which include reserve sites is flawed and this restriction should be removed to allow other sites to be considered as reserve sites in the SAP.</p>	<p>It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	consideration of other potentially suitable sites being considered through the SAP process, which is unfair and unjustified.			
	6. The respondent disagrees with the exclusion of 'Area 2' at Wellesbourne (identified in the made Wellesbourne & Walton NDP) as a Reserve Housing Site within the SAP [see foot note 4 on p.23 of the SAP] on the basis that the site has been identified to meet housing needs post 2030. This is illogical due to the SAP having an end date of 2031. The site is located in a MRC which is a 'second tier' location in the settlement hierarchy. The post 2030 timescale should not impede the inclusion of Area 2 as a reserve housing site in the SAP since it has already been identified as suitable through the NDP process. Since the NDP is over 3 years old there are no procedural reasons why the SAP should ignore the potential to bring this site forward.	Area 2 in the Wellesbourne & Walton NDP should be treated in a consistent manner for release of development as all other reserve housing sites across the District.	It would be appropriate for the SAP to identify this reserve housing site in the NDP in a manner which is consistent with the overall approach towards such sites in the Plan.	Identify this site in Policy SAP.2 in the Plan as appropriate.
	7. The approach of not identifying reserve sites through the SAP in those settlements with a reserve site identified in a NDP is welcomed. However, this should not enable disproportionately small	None specified.	A review of the contents of NDPs is a separate process.	None

	reserve sites to be added to future/emerging NDPs as a way of removing sites currently identified in the SAP and which might have lower development potential.			
	8. Wellesbourne allotment provides a wealth of social value and amenity benefits to the villagers and is a community asset. The respondent is opposed to the site being listed as a reserve housing site and any development of the treasured site.	None specified.	It would be appropriate for the SAP to identify this reserve housing site in the NDP in a manner which is consistent with the overall approach towards such sites in the Plan.	None.
	9. Support – a NDP forms part of the Development Plan for the area and their importance should not be dismissed as irrelevant community localism.	None specified.	N/A	None.
	10. The SAP excludes Kineton presumably because it has a 'made' NDP. This stance needs re-thinking because the Kineton NDP needs updating long before 2031. For example, the NDP does not offer any allocation of land in reserve should there be a need in the future.	None specified.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.
	11. The SAP does not take into account the policy frameworks within 'made' NDPs. For example Policy SAP.6 (self-build and custom housebuilding) supports	In the case of Welford-on-Avon, self-build and custom housebuilding being appropriate outside the BUAB conflicts with Policy HE5 of the made NDP which	Welford-on-Avon NDP is silent on the matter of self-build and custom housebuilding, much like the Core Strategy. Seeing as these forms of housing	None.

	development outside established built-up area boundaries of 'made' NDPs in contravention of NDP policies. .	stipulates specific criteria for certain forms of development being appropriate outside BUABs. This section of Policy SAP.6 should be removed.	development were not considered through the NDP, it is incorrect to state that Policy SAP.6 is in conflict with housing policies in the made NDP. There is no conflict with existing NDP BUABs, either. There is no requirement to amend SAP.6.	
	12. Clifford Chambers NDP is now at an advanced stage, has significant weight in the decision making process and the SAP must remove the reserve housing sites other than the one identified and promoted through the NDP.	Remove proposed reserve housing sites CLIF.A, CLIF.B and CLIF.D from the SAP.	It is appropriate that reserve housing sites not identified in a 'made NDP should be deleted from the SAP.	Delete reserve housing sites not identified in made NDP.
	13. Supports the notion of reserve sites in NDPs taking precedence and other sites not being included in the SAP where a neighbourhood plan is at an advanced stage.	None specified.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.
	14. The respondent would like specific reassurance that features included within their NDP (BUAB and reserve housing site) will be reflected in the proposed submission version SAP in line with para 1.2.2.	None specified.	Once NDPs reach an advanced stage of preparation, reserve housing sites and BUABs identified within those NDPs will prevail and the SAP will be changed to reflect this.	None.
	15. The emerging Tysoe NDP undermines, and is not aligned	None specified.	The respondent's objections relate to the Tysoe NDP	None.

	with, the SAP through the inclusion of a strategic gap which would sterilise the land outside the BUAB. SHLAA sites to the north of Lower Grounds and rear of Meadow Lane (which are located in this strategic gap area) are ideal locations for reserve housing sites but would be excluded from consideration under the proposed modifications to the NDP.		process particularly in respect of the proposed strategic gap rather than the SAP.	
	16. Supports the approach set out at para 1.2.8 where the submission version SAP will take account of the status of emerging NDPs.	The BUAB for Bearley should be aligned with the BUAB in the emerging NDP, specifically in relation to the separate parcel of land containing the former Countrywide Stores.	Comments noted in terms of the approach at para 1.2.8 of the SAP. The BUAB for Bearley is to be removed from the SAP due to the NDP being 'made after successful referendum.	Remove Bearley BUAB from next version of the SAP.
	17. Objects to the fact that Policy SAP.2 enables settlements with adopted NDPs in Tier 2 MRCs to avoid any apportionment of the additional reserve housing need, thus placing the additional burden on 'lower ranked' villages which by definition have limited amenities and fewer sustainable transport opportunities. The SAP acknowledges at para 1.2.6 that NDPs do not prohibit additional Local Plan allocations. However, para 1.2.24 confirms SDCs approach of not identifying reserve sites in those	None specified.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.

	settlements with a reserve site identified in a 'made' NDP. This seems somewhat contradictory.			
	18. Supports the commitment contained in Section 1.2 and request that this approach and strength of wording be maintained in all further iterations of the SAP. It is gratifying to see the principles of Localism being integrated within the strategic planning process.	None specified.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.
	19. The evidence base to the SAP will be subject to much more detailed scrutiny than that underpinning NDPs. NDPs are only required to meet the 'basic conditions' and therefore the NDPs strategy should not constrain the Council's approach to the SAP. This is particularly important, since the SAP does not propose to allocate any further sites for development in villages with NDPs, although no sound justification is proposed for this approach. As a matter of principle, it is considered this approach is unsound and contrary to national policy. There is no option to review whether there are sites within those settlements are suitable, viable and deliverable. No NDPs should be actively	The section of the SAP that confirms the Council's approach of not identifying reserve sites in those settlements with a reserve site identified within a 'made' or 'advanced' NDP needs to be deleted or amended or the SAP would be unsound.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.

	constraining development and yet the SAP is effectively applying the existence of a NDP as a policy constraint.			
	20. Support the Council's approach in general terms (i.e. not identifying reserve sites in those settlements with a reserve site in a 'made' NDP) where sufficient growth is proposed in those settlements. Where NDPs do not identify any reserve sites, it is entirely appropriate for the SAP to allocate such sites.	None specified.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.
	21. The Clifford Chambers NDP has chosen to allocate a reserve site that has significant deficiencies, which were recognised by the Council in earlier rejections. This site is not able to deliver market and affordable housing on an equivalent timescale [to the site being promoted through this representation]. Paragraph 1.2.8 is unclear. It would be unsound and damaging to the SAP strategy to consider deletion of sites that have long been identified as the best and most sustainable locations for growth, because they are not identified through a NDP.	The promoted site at Clifford Chambers should be retained in the SAP as a reserve housing site.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.
	22. It is acknowledged that NDPs provide the opportunity for local communities to shape their areas. However, NDPs must be in general conformity	The SAP should reconsider its approach to the identification of reserve sites in areas covered by made NDPs to allow further reserve	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly	None.

	with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. Whilst regard must be had to a made NDP, there is no requirement for an emerging local plan to be in accordance with it. Para 30 of the NPPF states: "Once a NDP has been brought into force, the policies it contains take precedence over existing non-strategic policies in a local plan covering the neighbourhood area, where they conflict; unless they are superseded by strategic or non-strategic policies that are adopted subsequently."	sites to be promoted through the SAP where appropriate.	the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	
	23. Since Ettington NDP has been 'made', there have been a number of updates to national planning policy, including a revised NPPF in 2019. It is argued that the NDP does not recognise the role that Ettington could play in helping meet the District's needs including future housing delivery targets. Identifying additional reserve housing sites in Ettington could provide greater flexibility in the range and choice of sites which in turn provides a more robust contingency plan should reserve sites be required.	To ensure a robust and flexible SAP and guard against delays in the future plan making process, suitable and deliverable sites should be included as reserve housing sites in the SAP [in settlements covered by a made NDP].	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.
	24. Do not agree with the Council's approach at para's 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 of the SAP which fails to allocate sites in areas where there is a made	The wording at Section 1.2 of the SAP should be revised to reflect the fact that there are sustainable opportunities to plan for growth in areas	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly	None.

	<p>NDP. This approach fails to represent the most appropriate strategy when taking into account the reasonable alternatives of allocating sites at suitable settlements where there is an existing NDP.</p>	<p>covered by a made NDP. These changes are required in order for the policy to satisfy the test of soundness.</p>	<p>the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.</p>	
	<p>25. The approach to not identify reserve sites in settlements that have a made or advanced NDP that already identifies reserve site(s) seems somewhat arbitrary. Para 1.2 states that "...importantly, both are necessary because they do different things" and goes on to state that "it is entirely appropriate that the two types of plans can coexist even if they have reached different conclusions about the appropriateness of development in certain locations." If this is the case, why does the Council take the view not to identify reserve sites in locations covered by made/advanced NDPs? This judgement takes no account as to whether the NDP meets the appropriate strategic housing requirement for the settlement as identified in the Core Strategy (which would tie in with para 2.2.13 of the SAP which states that "it is considered appropriate that in the first instance, reserve sites are focussed in those</p>	<p>The Council's approach should be amended so that reserve sites will not be identified in the SAP <u>only</u> where those communities have already delivered their Core Strategy housing requirements and/or have identified sufficient reserve sites in their NDPs.</p> <p>The SAP should make it clear that where NDPs promote less development than set out in the Core Strategy, the SAP will take precedence, to accord with para 30 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Land at Oxhill Road, Tysoe should be reinstated in the SAP as a reserve housing site to ensure that Tysoe meets the housing requirement for the village as set out in the Core Strategy. If the site is not reinstated, the SAP risks being found unsound.</p>	<p>It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	settlements that are yet to achieve the indicative numbers set out in the Core Strategy”). Furthermore, the Council intends to delete further sites in the Submission version SAP by which time it expects more NDPs will have reached an advanced stage.			
	26. Agree with the identification of Land East of Warwick Road, Wellesbourne (SHLAA ref: WELL.01) being identified as a reserve housing site in the NDP and the SAP at Appendix 1.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
	26. NDPs should not preclude the identification of further reserve sites in sustainable settlements such as Wellesbourne or Shipston-on-Stour when the SHLAA acknowledges that a site is suitable, available and achievable and would have otherwise been identified as a reserve site had the settlement not has an adopted NDP which included a reserve site of its own.	Re-instate site Land West of Kineton Road, Wellesbourne (SHLAA Ref: WELL.06) as a reserve site in the SAP.  Add land north of Darlingscote Road, Shipston-on-Stour (SHLAA ref: SHIP.02) to the SAP as a reserve site.  Add land at Tilemans Lane, Shipston-on-Stour (SHLAA ref: SHIP.03) to the SAP as a reserve site.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren’t required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.

<b>Topic: 1.3 Cross Boundary Issues</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Other: 5</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Cotswold District Council Natural England Cotswolds Conservation Board Taylor Wimpey UK Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council Birmingham City Council Association of Black Country Authorities Wychavon District Council Kingacre Estates Ltd	1. Close work between SDC and South Worcestershire Councils in relation to adjacent market housing areas is acknowledged. There is a minimal requirement for housing sites to be identified and allocated to meet either need.	This is recognised in para 2.2.33 but may be helpful to emphasise this in the introduction to re-affirm Duty to Co-operate between the neighbouring local authorities.	Comments noted. It is not considered there is any requirement to further emphasise current working relationships with local authorities in other HMAs beyond Birmingham and Coventry & Warwickshire.	None.
	2. Note that the SAP accepts a shortfall to 2031 with respect to Greater Birmingham HMA and propose to release sites to contribute to approx. 1/9 of that shortfall. It is requested that any future Plan updates correctly reflect the geography of the Greater Birmingham HMA and that it be referred to as the Greater Birmingham and Black Country HMA. As work continues on the Draft Black Country Plan, request SDC continues to work with the Black Country authorities to consider how any future SDC contributions could be apportioned across the HMA.	Amend references to GB HMA to GB & BC HMA.	Amend references to GB HMA to GB & BC HMA throughout the SAP, as appropriate.  Comment re: continued communication with Black Country authorities moving forward is noted and accepted.	Amend references to Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area to Greater Birmingham & Black Country Housing Market Area.
	3. Birmingham CC (BCC) is fully supportive of the approach taken in policies SAP.1, SAP.3 and SAP.4 as a logical, fair and consistent way of enabling any shortfalls experienced up to 2031 in the	None specified.	Comments noted.	None.

	<p>GB &amp; BC HMA and the Cov &amp; Wark's HMA at least being partly met on sites within Stratford District. BCC also agrees with the sites at Mappleborough Green towards the GB &amp; BC HMA due to functional relationship with the HMA. BCC therefore endorses and supports the development of an agreed Statement of Common Ground between the two Authorities.</p>			
	<p>4. Solihull MBC raises no objection to SDC's proposed contribution toward the GB &amp; BC HMA and the Cov &amp; Wark's HMA, especially in the context of the approach by other HMA authorities and the recent housing position statement.</p>	<p>None specified.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>5. Cotswold DC agrees with commentary relating to unmet needs from outside Coventry &amp; Warwickshire. As part of on-going Duty to Co-operate arrangements, highways issues north of Cotswold District are of interest and would wish to be kept informed of new transport evidence and any significant impacts that may arise.</p>	<p>None specified. However, inform CDC of any new evidence/assessments relating to highway capacity issues.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>6. The Council assumes the ongoing housing shortfall in Birmingham has been confirmed due to the</p>	<p>None specified. However, it is contended very little weight should be attributed to the changed position in</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p>publication of the GB &amp; BC HMA Housing Position Statement in September 2020. However, it is contended no such confirmation exists given that Birmingham City Council has decided to delay any review of its Local Plan for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Assumptions that have been applied in order to reduce Birmingham's shortfall from 37,900 to 2,597 have not been tested or scrutinised in a public forum. Consequently, whether this changes position for undertaking cross-boundary planning is valid or not has yet to be determined.</p>	<p>Birmingham's housing shortfall until it has been properly tested in relation to the review of the BCC Local Plan.</p>		
	<p>7. Strongly support the stance that reserve sites will not be identified in the Cotswolds AONB. As such, it is considered that there are no strategic cross-boundary issues in this regard.</p>	<p>None specified.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>8. Whilst para 1.3.3 is welcomed (i.e. SDC meet regularly with counterparts from other Council...to discuss cross-boundary issues, there is limited published evidence to prove these regular on-going meetings. It would have been helpful for SDC to provide further information on the ongoing work and efforts to</p>	<p>Recommend SDC continues to pursue active and constructive engagement with neighbouring authorities on strategic matters and just as importantly, encourage SDC to publish evidence demonstrating the ongoing engagement in advance of any further consultation on the SAP.</p>	<p>This point is acknowledged and such engagement will continue.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	ensure cross-boundary matters are being proactively and positively taken into account at this stage of the process.			
--	---	--	--	--

<b>Topic: 1.4 Vision and Strategic Objectives</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Other: 4</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Bellway Homes (West Midlands) Ltd Long Itchington Parish Council Braemar Property Developments Ltd Stefan Auckland Richard Thomas	1. Do not consider the vision for Bidford-on-Avon as stated has been realised. The village has poor infrastructure, is over-developed and the traffic levels are unsustainable.	None specified.	Comments noted. However, it is intended to achieve the visions outlined in the SAP by 2031.	None.
Warwickshire Police Goldfinch Town Planning Services Kler Group Andy List (x 2)	2. Disagrees that the vision in respect of Bidford-on-Avon is a reality. Little has been done to support the businesses in the village centre.	None specified.	Comments noted. However, it is intended to achieve the visions outlined in the SAP by 2031.	None.
Welford-on-Avon Parish Council Lockley Homes Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council Elisabeth Uggerloese	3. The vision and strategic objectives are laudable and should be adhered to. However, it is impossible to maintain objectives such as: maintaining rural character; maintaining historic character; protecting valued landscapes and mitigate/adapt to climate change when set against the proposed housing densities outlined in the SAP. LSV1	Reduce the 'dwellings per hectare' density figure for SSV Category 1 and 2 villages from the level set in the SAP (which is currently the same as for MRCs).	The vision and strategic objectives set out in the SAP are those set out in the Core Strategy since the SAP is based on the overarching strategy set by the CS. As such, there is no opportunity to revise or revisit the vision or objectives within the SAP.	None.

	and LSV2 densities should be lower than for MRCs and should reflect local characteristics.			
	4. No reference is made to climate change in the strategic objectives, which is a serious omission, given the District Council declared a Climate Emergency in July 2019.	Amend vision and objectives to reflect the Climate Emergency declaration.	As per response to point 3, above.	None.
	5. The current draft vision lacks sufficient ambition and fails to take available opportunities for improving the local area. It is critical that sustainable infill sites (including low-quality large green spaces and paddocks that have infill characteristics) located within existing settlements (i.e. Broom village) are considered favourably for housing development.	Amend the strategic objectives to include greenfield plots in smaller villages not currently included within the settlement hierarchy set out in the Core Strategy.	As per response to point 3, above.	None.
	6. Include potential cycling and walking routes in the list of strategic objectives (i.e. dis-used railway and tramways).	As per issue raised.	As per response to point 3, above.	None.
	7. The vision for Stratford should be amended to include the promotion of active travel (i.e. walking and cycling).	As per issue raised.	As per response to point 3, above.	None.
	8. Concern raised in relation to the vision for Southam. There is reference to 900	The vision for Southam should be amended to reflect the Core Strategy and SAP commitments.	As per response to point 3, above.	None.

	houses being delivered. However, there is an arithmetical issue insofar as the quantum of housing identified for the settlement through the Core Strategy, plus the amount of development identified through the various reserve sites exceed this 900 unit figure.			
	9. Support the Council's vision but it will be important to ensure that new and existing residential areas are safe and secure.	Recommend para 6 of the vision be amended to read as follows: "Overall, the strategy...development and activities. Furthermore, it will ensure a safe, secure and low crime environment for the residents throughout the District."	As per response to point 3, above.	None.
	10. Disappointed that the Strategic Objectives do not include Secured by Design or emergency services infrastructure.	Include a new Strategic Objective re: Secured by Design; and Amend Objective 9 to refer to emergency services infrastructure.	As per response to point 3, above.	None.
	11. There does not appear to be any mention of other transport modes other than the SWRR and no mention of reducing car usage. It is shamefully inadequate since it sets the tone for the whole document. Strategic Objectives 5 and 14 do not say how they will be achieved – they have no detail and are meaningless.	Amend vision and objectives to include more detail on transport modes other than the private motorcar and provide detail on how the objectives will be achieved.	As per response to point 3, above.	None.
	12. All critical projects should be listed in the Infrastructure	Include terminology to state that SDC will continually work with	As per response to point 3, above.	None.

	Delivery Plan (IDP), thus integrating the existing settlement with the proposed development via utility infrastructure.	infrastructure providers on all strategic sites in order to identify capacity and demand and update the IDP accordingly.		
	13. Raise concern that Bishops Itchington has been left out of the vision in the SAP. The settlement is a large LSV in the Core Strategy and given its size and sustainability credentials, it borders on the scale of settlement that could be classed as a small MRC.	Include Bishops Itchington in the vision at section 1.4 of the SAP.	The Vision in the CS and SAP specifically lists the main town of Stratford-upon-Avon, the MRCs, and 2 no. Large Rural Sites, not the LSVs. However, paragraphs within the Vision and Objectives relate to settlements and communities throughout the District (which include LSVs).	None.
	14. Stratford-upon-Avon is the main centre for shopping and services. The vision expects new and existing companies to have located to employment land on the periphery of the town. Given these ambitions, there needs to be appropriate residential development to support the additional employment land being proposed.	Propose additional residential development to the main town to match the proposed additional employment land.	As per response to point 3, above. This flows from the requirements of Policy CS.16 which establishes housing figures for the District.	None.

<b>Topic: 1.5 Key Diagram</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
-------------------------------	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
None				

<b>Topic: 1.6 Infrastructure Considerations</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 8</b>	<b>Other: 6</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
South Warwickshire Clinical Commissioning Group Warwickshire County Council - Infrastructure Planning British Horse Society CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd Stefan Auckland Warwickshire Police Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council James Church Tony Bromwich Elizabeth Folkes Andrew John Humphriss Ken McDougall D.B. Walker Elisabeth Uggerloese	1. CCG asks that District Council shares information regarding likely profile of population arising from planned housing development to assist its effective service development and delivery.	None specified.	The importance of this matter is recognised.	None.
	2. County Council is concerned that insufficient consideration has been given to potential impacts of proposed reserve sites on capacity of highway network and that significant proportion of sites are located where there is minimal or no sustainable transport options.	None specified.	This issue is critical to the ongoing preparation of the Plan. More detailed assessment of the impact of reserve sites on specific parts of highway network is being undertaken and will inform the situation.	Dependent on outcome of further Highway Capacity Assessment.
	3. Housing and infrastructure developments provide opportunities for extending, protecting and enhancing Public Rights of Way including for equestrians	Plan should refer to scope for extending Public Rights of Way network with the inclusion of equestrians.	Various site proposals identify the need to retain existing Public Rights of Way and to provide additional links where opportunities arise. Scope of SAP cannot take this matter any further.	None.
	4. Plan is not supported by an updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan setting out the infrastructure necessary to support delivery of specific	Specific requirement should be made in the Plan to ensure that relevant S106 contributions are made towards delivery of South Western Relief Road from	An IDP will be produced to accompany the Proposed Submission SAP.	None.

	reserve housing sites. Specific requirement should be made in the Plan to ensure that relevant S106 contributions are made towards delivery of South Western Relief Road from those sites which it would facilitate.	those sites which it would facilitate.		
	5. It is important that all critical projects are listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and that existing communities are supported and not segregated from provision of new infrastructure.	None specified.	This point is acknowledged and will be taken into account on a site by site basis.	None.
	6. Emergency services are an important aspect of community infrastructure.	Insert specific reference to improvements to emergency services in para 1.6.2.	This would be appropriate.	Amend para 1.6.2 to include a reference to emergency services.
	7. Current infrastructure in Bidford-on-Avon is entirely unsustainable.	None specified.	It is acknowledged that various aspects of infrastructure in Bidford are at or near capacity. Any future development in village would need to address this issue as appropriate.	None.
	8. General infrastructure and facilities cannot cope with rapid growth in Southam area.	None specified.	It is acknowledged that various aspects of infrastructure in the Southam area are at or near capacity. Any future development in this area would need to address this issue as appropriate.	None.
	9. We cannot continue to build houses where	None specified.	Any future development in the District would need to	None.

	infrastructure and services are not available.		address this issue as appropriate.	
	10. Location of Kineton High School means that infrastructure of village is being affected by school buses.	Kineton High School should be relocated to Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath new settlement or Warwick University Wellesbourne Campus.	Funding has been given by Department of Education to replace Kineton High School on its current site.	None.
	11. In light of plans for housing and road construction consideration should be given to reopening railway line between Stratford-upon-Avon and Honeybourne.	None specified.	This issue is being addressed in a specific study but falls outside the scope of this Plan.	None.

<b>Topic: 1.8 Equalities Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
None				

<b>Topic: 1.9 Consultation Responses</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Kevan Russell	1. Comments on page 251 of Appendix C Proposed Submission Consultation (August-September 2019) Analysis of Comments in supporting document Statement of Consultation	Amend document accordingly.	This would be appropriate in order for document to be accurate.	Amend Statement of Consultation so that relevant comments are attributed to TRED.A instead of TIDD.A in relation to Proposed Submission Consultation (August-September 2019)

	lists comments in relation to TIDD.A site that relate to a site in Tredington.			
--	--	--	--	--

<b>Topic: 1.7 Accompanying Technical Assessments - General</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Lockley Homes Goldfinch Town Planning Services Cllr Louis Adam	1. It is important that a clear and transparent approach is taken in relation to various supporting technical evidence base documents that are being used to inform and shape Plan.	Suggest a comprehensive list of technical evidence base documents is provided with dates to clarify when each was produced.	Such a list is already provided.	None
	2. Impact of HS2 on wider environment and future housing appears not to have been considered.	None specified	The impact of HS2 will be assessed in relation to development of specific sites as appropriate. The only site identified in the Plan that is directly affected by HS2 is west of Banbury Road, Southam (SOU.B).	None

<b>Topic: Accompanying Technical Assessments - Education</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Southam Town Council	1. There is a lack of rigour in assessing the scope to increase capacity at Southam College in order to	None specified.	Warwickshire County Council has identified the means of providing a modest increase in pupil capacity at Southam	None.

	accommodate further housing development in Southam, and a lack of analysis of highway or road safety issues relating to this.		College as part of school replacement scheme.	
--	---	--	---	--

<b>Topic: Accompanying Technical Assessments - Employment Market Signals Study</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
None				

<b>Topic: Accompanying Technical Assessments - Heritage</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 8</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Matthew Neal</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Lighthorne Parish Council Taylor Wimpey UK x2 White Family and Lone Star Land Historic England Ettington Estate Ltd Sheldon Bosley Knight Mr and Mrs Sabin Miller Homes	1. Acknowledges the detailed heritage assessment for site LIG.06 and notes the removal of the site from the latest version SAP. Consider that SDC has exercised its judgement with care and in good faith.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
	2. Concerns are raised with the approach to assessing heritage impact of the site options. The Council identifies that site SHIP.09 exhibits the potential for ridge and furrow to be present on site and is 'red' in the 2020 SHLAA.	None specified.	The respondent is conflating two separate 'scoring' mechanisms. The 'red' score in the SHLAA for heritage indicates the presence of designated or non-designated heritage assets within the site but is not itself based on	None.

	<p>Based on the Historic England Advice Note, 'red' relates to harm to a heritage asset where it is unlikely that impacts can be mitigated. No evidence is presented by the Council on the likelihood of 'significance' of harm to the heritage asset by way of a Heritage Impact Assessment. The ridge and furrow has been ploughed-out at some point in the past. The significance of the heritage asset is now negligible and the Council's assessment is therefore inadequate and not justified.</p>		<p>Historic England's Advice Note, as suggested.</p> <p>A detailed Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was not undertaken for site SHIP.09 or, indeed, any other sites on the edge of the settlement. This is due to the fact that the 'made' NDP for the Parish proposed a Reserve Housing Site. In accordance with Section 1.2 of the SAP, the Council are not pursuing Reserve Housing Sites in locations covered by advanced NDPs that have promoted their own Reserve Housing Site(s). For information, SHIP.09 was classified as 'red' in the SHLAA for public transport and relationship to the highway network, as well as heritage matters.</p>	
	<p>3. Concerns are raised with the approach to assessing heritage impact of the site options. The Council identifies that site SOU.12 exhibits the potential for impact in relation to a non-designated heritage asset (i.e. possible site of the Civil War battlefield of Southam, skirmish 1642) to be present on site and is 'red' in the 2020 SHLAA. Based on the Historic England Advice Note, 'red' relates to harm to a</p>	<p>None specified.</p>	<p>The respondent is conflating two separate 'scoring' mechanisms. The 'red' score in the SHLAA for heritage indicates the presence of designated or non-designated heritage assets within the site but is not itself based on Historic England's Advice Note, as suggested.</p> <p>A detailed HIA was not undertaken for site SOU.12 since, as well as heritage</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p>heritage asset where it is unlikely that impacts can be mitigated. No evidence is presented by the Council on the likelihood of 'significance' of harm to the heritage asset by way of a Heritage Impact Assessment. The ridge and furrow has been ploughed-out at some point in the past. The significance of the heritage asset is now negligible and the Council's assessment is therefore inadequate and not justified.</p>		<p>impact, the site was classified as 'red' overall for landscape sensitivity and also lack of availability (at the time of the SHLAA being published).</p> <p>It is acknowledged there is no ridge and furrow within the site – this was not suggested in the first instance through the SHLAA.</p>	
	<p>4. SHLAA site TYS.12 was identified as a reserve housing site in the 2019 SAP but is not identified as a reserve site in the 2020 version SAP. The site should be re-instated since (amongst other reasons) the Council's Heritage Impact Assessment for the site is flawed for the following reasons:  An over-reliance on an appeal decision from 2015 for a larger form of development;  A reliance on a flawed equation that 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of more than one heritage asset can add up to an overall conclusion of 'substantial' harm;  A conclusion that public benefits arising would not</p>	<p>Re-instate site TYS.12 in the SAP as a Reserve Housing Site.</p>	<p>SDC appointed an Independent Heritage Consultant to review a number of the heritage assessments produced by the Council. Site TYS.12 was one of the sites re-assessed by the consultant. The consultant has concluded that any development of this particular site would cause a high level of less than substantial harm to the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets, with little or no potential for mitigation to overcome the harm. Based on this evaluation, it is not considered appropriate by the Council to re-instate the site as a potential reserve housing site in the SAP.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset.			
	<p>5. SHLAA site ETT.11 was identified as a reserve housing site in the 2019 SAP but is not identified as a reserve site in the 2020 version SAP. The HIA produced by SDC is disputed, particularly in respect of the level of harm afforded to the setting of listed building 'Rye Piece Barn'. It is considered a lower quantum of development (than that dismissed at appeal in July 2015) would provide sufficient land to mitigate the loss of the field that provides the setting for the listed barn.</p>	<p>Re-instate site ETT.11 in the SAP as a Reserve Housing Site.</p>	<p>SDC appointed an Independent Heritage Consultant to review a number of the heritage assessments produced by the Council. Site ETT.11 was one of the sites re-assessed by the consultant. The consultant has concluded that development of this particular site would cause a moderate level of less than substantial harm to the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets, with potential for mitigation to overcome any harm. Based on this evaluation, it is considered appropriate by the Council to re-instate the site as a potential reserve housing site in the SAP.</p>	<p>Consider re-instating site ETT.11 as a potential reserve housing site in the next version of the SAP, subject to approach taken to identifying such sites.</p>
	<p>6. Strongly object to the omission of site LIG.06 from the 2020 SAP. This site was identified as a reserve housing site in the 2019 SAP but is not identified as a reserve site in the 2020 version SAP. The site has now been omitted on the basis of a HIA undertaken by the LPA. The respondent is of the opinion that the very high test of 'substantial harm' as suggested by SDC has not been met. The Heritage</p>	<p>Re-instate site LIG.06 in the SAP as a Reserve Housing Site.</p>	<p>SDC appointed an Independent Heritage Consultant to review a number of the heritage assessments produced by the Council. Site LIG.06 was one of the sites re-assessed by the consultant. The consultant has concluded that any development of this particular site would cause a high level of less than substantial harm to the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets,</p>	<p>None.</p>

	Statement submitted with the representation concludes sensitive design would lead to no harm to the significance of nearby heritage assets or their settings.		with little or no potential for mitigation to overcome the harm. Based on this evaluation, it is not considered appropriate by the Council to re-instate the site as a potential reserve housing site in the SAP.	
	7. The respondent notes that the SAP is accompanied by a suite of heritage evidence documents which assess the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings. The approach is welcomed, as is the fact the HIAs have been prepared in accordance with Historic England advice notes.	Recommend that the views of a chosen specialist archaeological adviser is sought on these allocations to confirm that the evidence base is sufficiently robust to ensure any proposed allocation is deliverable and whether any further assessment work is required to ensure the significance of non-designated heritage assets has been adequately understood.	SDC appointed an Independent Heritage Consultant to review a number of the heritage assessments produced by the Council. They had access to the Historic Environment Record supplied by Warwickshire County Council in order to consider potential impact of development on non-designated heritage assets.	None.
	8. Object to site HAMP.03 not being included on the list of reserve housing sites. The respondent strongly disagrees with the heritage statement that has been produced by SDC on this site. The cumulative 'substantial' level of harm is incorrect and the Council's HIA fails to take account of recent changes within the immediate setting of the nearest listed building to the site that have irreversibly weakened the significance of the asset.	Request that site HAMP.03 be added to the SAP as a Reserve Housing site.	SDC appointed an Independent Heritage Consultant to review a number of the heritage assessments produced by the Council. Site HAMP.03 was one of the sites re-assessed by the consultant. The consultant has concluded that development of this particular site would cause a low-level of less than substantial harm to the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets, with potential for mitigation to overcome any harm. Based	Consider re-instating site HAMP.03 as a potential reserve housing site in the next version of the SAP, subject to approach to be taken to identifying such sites.

			on this evaluation, it is considered appropriate by the Council to re-instate the site as a potential reserve housing site in the SAP.	
	9. The respondent broadly supports the findings of the assessment in relation to heritage harm at Bidford, and in respect of site BID.11/BID.D. However, site BID.13 is flagged as having some historic interest in the Historic Environment Record (HER) but the assessment doesn't consider significance of the heritage asset in question, as required by national policy.	There is a potential heritage issue that remains unresolved prior to the site being selected as a preferred site.	The cropmarks listed in the HER for site BID.13 have been assessed in the same way as all other non-designated heritage assets on all other reserve housing sites in the SAP. The fact is, without further investigation, any below-ground archaeological remains are of indeterminate significance, as set out in the HIA report. This is why it is recommended that further archaeological investigations would be required, should the site be brought forward for development.	None.

<b>Topic: Accompanying Technical Assessments - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Environment Agency Carolyn Lewis-Villacress	1. Plan runs the risk of being unsound without the support of a Level 2 SFRA, Sequential Test and Exception Test.	None specified.	A Level 2 SFRA has now been produced and will form part of the evidence base for the Proposed Submission version of the SAP. A Sequential Test and	None.

			Exception Test would only be required if development is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 should that be proposed.	
	2. Level 1 SFRA is inaccurate regarding flooding incidents in Mappleborough Green.	None specified.	The Level 1 SFRA is a high level report and may not capture the number and nature of flooding incidents. A more detailed assessment would be required as part of any planning application.	None.

<b>Topic: Accompanying Technical Assessments – Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 42</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SHLAA ref</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Rosconn Group	Alderminster	ALD.5	Gross and net site areas are inaccurate and rating for various criteria should be amended.	Gross site area should read 3.2 hectares and net site area should read 1.8 hectares. Rating of various criteria should be amended	It is agreed that the gross and net site areas should be amended although latter should be less than identified by respondent. Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	Amend gross site area to read 3.2 hectares, net site area to read 1.0 hectares and dwelling capacity to 30 Amend extent of cross-hatching to show suitable extent of housing development
Miller Homes	Bidford-on-Avon	BID.11	Area should be amended to reflect extent of site being promoted and rating for various criteria should be amended.	Amend boundary of site and the rating of various criteria.	It would be appropriate to sub-divide BID.11 into two parts to reflect different ownerships. Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of certain criteria should be	Amend boundary of BID.11 to create separate BID.11B – see accompanying plan. For BID.11A amend the following: Gross site area = 4.0 hectares Access to Site (vehicles) – from Amber to Green Legal – from Amber to Green

					changed for factual reasons.	Suitability-Technical – from Amber to Green Net site area = 3.0 hectares Dwelling capacity = 90 Insert separate assessment of BID.11B – see accompanying schedule.
Braemar Property Developments Ltd	Bishop's Itchington	BISH.07	SHLAA should be revisited to show that site performs better than BISH.01 and BISH.02.	None specified.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Terra	Bishop's Itchington	BISH.08	Disagree with how various criteria have been classified for this site and in comparison with BISH.01 & BISH.02. Disagree that effective mitigation cannot be achieved	Categorisation of specific criteria should be changed. Suitability – Environment should be amended to Amber and Adjusted Overall Deliverability should be amended to at least Amber. Categorisation of specific criteria for BISH.01 & BISH.02 should be changed.	Assessment of three sites has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Mactaggat and Mickel	Bishop's Itchington	BISH.10	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of specific criteria should be changed including that site is available.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of certain criteria should be changed for factual reasons. As a result of site's availability it is necessary to assess scope for mitigation.	Intentions – from Red to Amber Ownership – from Red to Amber Availability – from Red to Green Insert following text under Scope for Mitigation: Elevated land forms an important part of setting and approach to the village which means that effective mitigation cannot be achieved

JS & DM Stanley & Son	Clifford Chambers	CLIF.01	Certain matters require clarification.	Categorisation of specific criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Barwood Development Securities Ltd	Kineton	KIN.05 & KIN.13	Assessment of various criteria contradict one another.	Categorisation of specific criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rosconn Strategic Land	Kineton	KIN.08	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of one criterion should be changed for factual reasons.	Settlement Character – from Red to Amber Suitability-Environmental – from Red to Amber
Warwickshire Hunt Trustees	Kineton	KIN.10	Assessment of the site is incorrect in certain respects.	Categorisation of specific criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Trenport Investments Ltd	Lighthorne	LIG.03	Heritage impact has been assessed inaccurately.	Site should be identified as Amber under Overall Deliverability	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately	None.
Jill Kirby	Long Compton	LC.04 & LC.11	Neither site is suitable, available or achievable for development for a range of reasons.	Both sites should be Red not Amber under Overall Suitability.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Long Compton Parish Council	Long Compton	LC.04 and LC.11	Neither site is suitable, available or achievable for development for a range of reasons.	Both sites should be Red not Amber under Overall Suitability.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rosconn Strategic Land	Long Itchington	LONG.01	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but	Relationship to Highway Network – from Red to Green

					categorisation of one criterion should be changed for factual reasons.	
Rosconn Strategic Land	Long Itchington	LONG.06	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Cemex UK Ltd	Long Itchington	LONG.07	Unclear why relationship to highway network is rated as Red.	Re-categorise relationship to highway network	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
L&Q Estates	Long Itchington	LONG.15	Relationship to highway network has been rated incorrectly.	Relationship to highway network should be re-categorised.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rosconn Strategic Land	Long Itchington	LONG.17	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of one criterion should be changed for factual reasons.	Scope for Mitigation – delete reference to mature hedgerow which would have to be removed to achieve an access
Kendrick Homes Limited	Long Marston	LMAR.17	Availability, achievability and viability of site is inaccurate and net area should be increased.	Various matters should be amended.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately. Net site area stated is appropriate at the present time.	None.
Sarah Walden Friends of Meon Vale Woodland Walk	Long Marston (Former Depot/ Meon Vale)	LSL.06A	Certain matters have not been assessed accurately.	Categorisation of specific criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of certain criteria should be changed for factual	Natural Features – from Amber to Red Suitability-Environment – from Amber to Red Scope for Mitigation – amend to read:

					reasons. Overall, it is now concluded that the site is not suitable for development due to environmental impacts.	Loss of mature trees and open spaces would have a significant impact on amenity and ecology of local area which could not be effectively mitigated Adjusted Overall Deliverability – from Amber to Red Delete dwelling numbers
Mr & Mrs J Brades	Pillerton Priors	PILL.11	Assessment contains numerous errors and is inconsistent with existing planning policy.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of certain criteria should be changed for factual reasons.	Access to site (walking and cycling) – from Green to Amber Neighbouring Amenity – Green to Amber Natural Features – from Green to Amber
Kingacre Estates Ltd	Priors Marston	PM.08	There are a number of apparent flaws in the site's assessment.	Various aspects of the SHLAA should be amended.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rosconn Strategic Land	Quinton	QUIN.02	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of certain criteria should be changed for factual reasons.	Access to Site (vehicles) – from Amber to Green Legal – from Amber to Green Suitability-Technical – from Amber to Green and delete reference to provision of vehicle access
Hayfield Homes Ltd	Quinton	QUIN.17	Situation regarding a number of criteria are not accurate and site is available, deliverable and suitable.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of certain criteria should be changed for factual reasons.	Intentions – from Red to Green Legal – from Amber to Green Ownership – from Red to Green Availability – from Red to Green Scope for Mitigation – insert following text: Development would extend residential

						development that is incongruous in the landscape and could not be mitigated effectively
Redrow Homes	Quinton	QUIN.18 & QUIN.19	Findings on a number of criteria are inaccurate and do not reflect the most up to date information available.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rainier Developments Ltd	Shipston-on-Stour	SHIP.01	Disagree with how various criteria have been classified.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rosconn Strategic Land	Shipston-on-Stour	SHIP.02	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of certain criteria should be changed for factual reasons.	Non-designated Heritage Asset – from Red to Amber Legal – from Amber to Green
Rosconn Strategic Land	Shipston-on-Stour	SHIP.03	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately. However, it is appropriate to amend the SHLAA to identify the site as Amber under Overall Deliverability rather than refer to its treatment as a potential development site in the made NDP.	Overall Adjusted Deliverability - from Grey to Amber Net Site Area = 3.0 hectares Dwelling capacity = 90
Taylor Wimpey UK	Shipston-on-Stour	SHIP.09	Findings on a number of criteria are inaccurate and do not reflect the	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but	Public Right of Way – from Amber to Green Intentions – from Amber to Green

			most up to date information available.		categorisation of certain criteria should be changed for factual reasons.	Legal – from Amber to Green
Kler Group	Southam	SOU.02	Site has been the subject of a planning application and subsequent appeal decision and SHLAA should take information relating to various issues into account.	Conclusions in relation to various criteria should be revisited.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of one criterion should be changed for factual reasons.	Intentions – from Amber to Green
Rockspring Barwood Southam Ltd	Southam	SOU.10 & SOU.11	Comparative analysis of Southam sites assessed in SHLAA shows that these sites perform better than all but one of those identified as Amber.	Rating of various criteria for a number of Southam sites should be amended.	Assessment of sites has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Taylor Wimpey UK	Southam	SOU.12	Findings on a number of criteria are inaccurate and do not reflect the most up to date information available.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of certain criteria should be changed for factual reasons.	Intentions – from Amber to Green Legal – from Amber to Green Ownership – from Red to Green Availability – from Red to Green Settlement Character – from Amber to Red Scope for Mitigation – insert the following text: Development would extend physical form of the town onto an elevated area of land which would have a major impact on the character of one of the main approaches to it.

Hallam Land Management	Southam	SOU.16	Has concerns about how SHLAA has assessed sites in Southam and effect this has had on determining reserve sites.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rosconn Strategic Land	Stockton	STOC.13	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Mark Workman Dawn Breese	Stratford-upon-Avon	STR.11	Site has been assessed incorrectly given major impact of housing development on landscape and surrounding residents.	Site should be re-categorised from Amber to Red.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None
Bellway Homes (West Midlands) Ltd	Stratford-upon-Avon	STR.15	Vehicular access can easily be provided into the site.	Reconsider assessment of vehicular access.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Grevayne Properties Ltd	Stratford-upon-Avon	STR.18	Basis for categorising criteria is flawed as it applies an absolute rating with no interpretation. Categorisation of various criteria should be amended.	More detailed interpretation of ratings should be provided. Categorisation of various criteria should be changed and site should be reassessed as Green overall.	SHLAA is intended to be a high level assessment of land parcels and is supplemented by more detailed evidence for specific factors. Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of certain criteria should be changed for factual reasons.	Accessibility to Local Facilities – from Amber to Green Current Use – from Amber to Green

Rosconn Group	Stratford-upon-Avon	STR.26	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately but categorisation of one criterion should be changed for factual reasons.	Legal – from Amber to Green
L&Q Estates	Tiddington	TIDD.03	Site should not be identified as being affected by non-designated heritage asset.	Amend rating of non-designated heritage asset to Green.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Catesby Estates	Tiddington	TIDD.08	Disagree with how various criteria have been classified.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed and site should be reassessed as Green overall.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rosconn Strategic Land	Wellesbourne	WELL.01	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rosconn Strategic Land	Wellesbourne	WELL.06	Various aspects of SHLAA should be amended.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.
Rainier Developments Ltd	Wellesbourne	WELL.08	Unclear why rating for various criteria has been changed from 2019 SHLAA.	Categorisation of various criteria should be changed.	Assessment of site has applied SHLAA Methodology appropriately.	None.

<b>Topic: Accompanying Technical Assessments - Sustainability Appraisal</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 10</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Jo Bozdoganli</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Taylor Wimpey UK x2 Redrow Homes John Cooknell Stratford Climate Action Miss P McDonagh Sarah Walden Bloor Homes Limited Natural England Miller Homes	1. Based on the Council's findings for SHIP.09 in the SHLAA 2020 update, SHIP.09 is not considered to be a 'reasonable alternative' and therefore has not been appraised as a site option in the SA. Based on the content of other representations made by the Respondent, it is proposed that SHIP.09 should be reclassified as an amber site and therefore should be considered for allocation as a reserve site. The Respondent has undertaken their own SA assessment of SHIP.09 indicating that the site addresses positively the SA objectives and also compares favourably with the other sites in Shipston-on-Stour. On this basis it is considered that SHIP.09 offers an opportunity to deliver sustainable development and is a reasonable alternative to the preferred option sites identified by the Council. The Council's approach to specifically excluding further consideration of sites in those areas with made NDPs prevents a fair consideration of the site without any clear justification for doing so.	SHIP.09 should be reclassified as an amber site and therefore should be considered for allocation as a reserve site.	As part of the iterative assessment process associated with the production of the SAP, officers will be reviewing the suitability of such sites. This will include any updates or revisions to the SA deemed appropriate, which will help address and inform the outcome of the re-assessment work.	Any proposed revisions to the SA will be dependent upon and inform the assessment of all sites that are identified in the Proposed Submission Plan in due course.
	2. Based on the Council's findings for SOU.12 in the SHLAA 2020 update, SOU.12 is not considered to be a	SOU.12 should be reclassified as an amber site and therefore should be considered for allocation as a reserve site.	Same as under point 1, above.	Same as under point 1, above.

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>'reasonable alternative' and therefore has not been appraised as a site option in the SA. Based on the content of other representations made by the Respondent, it is proposed that SOU.12 should be reclassified as an amber site and therefore should be considered for allocation as a reserve site. The Respondent has undertaken their own SA assessment of SOU.12 indicating that the site addresses positively the SA objectives and also compares favourably with the other sites in Southam. On this basis it is considered that SOU.12 offers an opportunity to deliver sustainable development and is a reasonable alternative to the preferred option sites identified by the Council.</p>			
	<p>3. Concur with the findings of the SA in relation to QUIN.18 and QUIN.19, both parcels of land perform well in sustainability terms when compared to the other site options at Quinton. On the basis of the SA there are no sustainability reasons to exclude either site from being identified as a reserve site. QUIN.19 arguably performs the best of all the options, and neither options scores 'major negative' against any SA objectives, unlike a number of other site options at</p>	<p>QUIN.19 should be reclassified as an amber site and therefore should be considered for allocation as a reserve site.</p>	<p>Same as under point 1, above.</p>	<p>Same as under point 1, above.</p>

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>Quinton which have been identified as reserve sites. QUIN.19 should not therefore be excluded from further consideration based on the findings of the Council's own evidence.</p> <p>Concern that the SA scores all sites the same (neutral) in terms of likely effects on flooding. However, the Council's own flood risk evidence raises concerns that development could increase the risk of flooding on certain sites. Specifically it indicates that QUIN.8 has a risk of flooding from surface water and thus the SFRA identifies the need for a level 2 assessment. No such assessment has been undertaken in support of QUIN.08 at this stage, rather the requirement has been put in the policy requirement in the site proforma summary. As such the SA should score QUIN.08 negative for flooding, and suggestion that no sites that are at risk of flooding should be identified as reserve sites.</p> <p>The provision of significant enhancements to green infrastructure should be properly recognised in the SA scoring for QUIN.18 and QUIN.19 which would properly reflect their sustainability benefits ahead of other alternatives.</p>			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>4. Support the proposal for the Warwick University Wellesbourne Campus but query why the SA scoring shows neutral and positive effects for natural resources.</p> <p>This allocation would result in the loss of 150 ha of best agricultural land and the valuable sand and gravel under the site will be sterilised. It is suggested that the sand and gravel will be extracted before development and so query over how a gravel and sand quarry would be assessed for SA and SEA. It is queried if this scoring has been based on the assessment that the site is mainly brownfield as this is not the case.</p> <p>It is also suggested that the neutral effect for flooding has only been achieved by the site being identified as brownfield which it is not. The site has groundwater flooding and existing buildings got damaged by floods in 1998.</p>	<p>Re-assess the SA scoring for natural resources for the UoW site at Wellesbourne, given the existence of sand and gravel and the issue of flooding within the site.</p>	<p>Officers will re-assess the scoring for these criteria. However, it should be borne in mind that only a small proportion of the overall site is intended to be developed.</p>	<p>Same as under point 1, above.</p>
	<p>5. Whilst noting that proposal RURAL.4 has been withdrawn by the developers, the fact that the SA scored the site major positive for climate change green infrastructure and biodiversity is questionable, given the loss of carbon sequestration and storage involved. The effect on the local</p>	<p>Re-consider SA to take account of the transition to a net-zero carbon future.</p>	<p>Seeing as RURAL.4 as proposed in the 2020 SAP is to be removed from the Plan, there is no requirement for the SA for this proposal to be updated.</p> <p>Consideration will need to be given as to whether any</p>	<p>Undertake a SA of a Local Green Space policy for this site, should one be included in the next iteration of the SAP.</p>

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>highway network has not been adequately assessed.</p> <p>Suggestion that Council's existing way of assessing sustainability is not fit for the purpose of transitioning to net zero. This needs to be redressed and recognise the carbon services provided by trees. For projects where issues are less clear cut it is imperative that the Council acquire carbon footprint capacities as soon as possible and apply them all to proposed developments of significant scale. These improved evaluation capacities also extends to ecology.</p>		<p>proposed new policy in the SAP for designated Green Space on the site would itself need to be covered in the SA.</p>	
	<p>6. Objection to the comment in the overview for Wellesbourne that there are no known congestion issues within Wellesbourne. This needs to be withdrawn or amended as Mountford Close, the site of the infants and junior school, is often highly congested, contributed to by a combination of school, residential and commercial traffic, exacerbated by on-line shopping.</p> <p>On-going development within the village and expansion of the infant school have been permitted but no parking provision has been delivered. Further development</p>	<p>Reconsider assessment of traffic and congestion within Wellesbourne.</p>	<p>Same as under point 1, above.</p>	<p>Same as under point 1, above.</p>

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
	will only exacerbate the problems and cause even more chaos. There is also often congestion on bridge Street and other areas of the village, arising from a combination of on-going housing development, general through traffic as well as market traffic.			
	7. Development should not take place on sites that have high quality soil – such as Site WELL.06. This depletes the ability of the nation to feed an ever growing population. Development on WELL.06 would also have a damaging effect on the landscape and the setting of the Listed Buildings. Further, there would be traffic implications, as children and parents are most unlikely to walk to school from any part of such a development.	Query SA scoring for 'best and most versatile agricultural land' and question the wisdom of developing sites with high quality soil.	Same as under point 1, above.	Same as under point 1, above.
	8. The site 'East of Mountford Close, Wellesbourne' is designated as a Community Asset, and is a site having high quality soil. Development on this site would deplete the ability of the nation to feed an ever growing population, and have an adverse effect on the landscape and nearby listed buildings.	None specified.	Same as under point 1, above.	Same as under point 1, above.
	9. STR.14 has been assessed as grade 3a agricultural land (best and most versatile) in the SA however the Respondent has	Amend the Natural Resources –Agricultural score for site STR.14 to reflect that the	Same as under point 1, above.	Same as under point 1, above.

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
	undertaken an assessment of the site (enclosed) and found the majority to be Grade 3b of moderate quality.	majority of the site is Grade 3b of moderate quality.		
	10. The Local Plan's HRA should be updated (from the 2015 version to support the Core Strategy) in order to consider ecological linkage in relation to the allocated sites, migratory fish and the context regarding the recent Holohan judgement.	Update the HRA assessment for the Core Strategy to consider ecological linkage in relation to the allocated sites, migratory fish and the context regarding the recent Holohan judgement.	The HRA is to be updated accordingly.	Update the HRA to accompany the Proposed Submission version of the Plan.
	11. A number of the proposed allocation sites have been highlighted as being within the Impact Risk Zones for SSSI/SAC/SPA/Ramsar sites as discharge sensitive or water supply sensitive. The need for the robust water quality and water quantity measures should be reinforced when delivering the allocated sites below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· CLIF.Q, CLIF.B, CLIF.C, CLIF.D</li> <li>· FEN.A, FEN.B, FEN.C, FEN.D</li> <li>· GAY.A, GAY.B, GAY.C</li> <li>· LMAR.A</li> <li>· LMD.A</li> <li>· QUIN.A, QUIN.B, QUIN.C, QUIN. D</li> <li>· STR.A, STR, B</li> <li>· TIDD.A</li> <li>· SCB.2, SCB.4, SCB.10</li> </ul>	None specified.	Comments noted. It is acknowledged that this is an important issue and will be taken into account for any proposed development sites.	None.

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SUA.2, SUA.4, SUA.5, RURAL.1, RURAL.3, RURAL.5</li> </ul>			
	12. Query as to why sites MAPP.A, MAPP.B and MAPP.C have been given a positive scoring for biodiversity within the SA.	Amend the biodiversity score for sites MAPP.A, MAPP.B and MAPP.C from a positive to a negative.	Same as under point 1, above.	Same as under point 1, above.
	13. Evidence published by the Council in the SFRA level 1 defines part of BID.08a and BID.13 within flood zone 2 and 3a. The SA has misapplied the scoring based on the methodology on flooding against Sites BID.08a and BID.13. This is because a 'minor negative' score should be applied to factors that are only related to 'potential' sustainability issues. However, the problem of flooding and flood risk at Bidford is well known and well documented. Therefore, the effect is likely to be problematical to any sensitive development in the southern part of Bidford, including at the two sites referred to here. Furthermore, any mitigation is likely to involve considerable expenditure in order to properly safeguard new homes built on these sites. On this basis, sites BID.08a and BID.13 should be scored at least 'major negative/uncertain' for flooding in the assessment.	The flooding score for sites BID.08 and BID.13 should be amended to at least 'major negative/uncertain'.	Same as under point 1, above.	Same as under point 1, above.

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
	14. The landscape SA scoring for site BID.11 is questioned. The SA score the site as minor negative/uncertain but as the site has been previously assessed as part of a larger land parcel, the site boundary has thus been updated since the Council published its landscape evidence to exclude the land parcel to the immediate east of the main site. As such the site is now bounded by development on three sides and should be treated as forming part of the existing built-up area rather than an extension to the settlement. Thus the site's landscape impact has changed and any potential impacts can be mitigated through sensitive design of the layout.	The landscape score for site BID.11 in the SA should be amended to 'neutral' or 'minor positive'.	Same as under point 1, above.	Same as under point 1, above.

<b>Topic: Accompanying Technical Assessments - Transport</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Highways Agency CEG and Mixed Farms Ltd Stratford upon Avon Town Transport Group	1. Transport modelling has not been undertaken to understand impact of proposed development on the operation of the strategic road network most notably the A46 corridor.	None specified	Where appropriate the need for a Transport Assessment to consider impact on the strategic road network is specified in the development proposal or Site Proforma.	None.

	<p>2. Latest available evidence shows that assumed traffic growth has not been realised in Stratford-upon-Avon and there is capacity on highway network for additional development over and above that identified in Highway Capacity Assessment.</p>	<p>Additional housing sites should be identified on the edge of Stratford-upon-Avon to reflect this situation.</p>	<p>The Highway Capacity Assessment was produced by consultants on behalf of the District and County Councils. It has been reviewed and updated to reflect the latest evidence to inform the preparation of next version of the Plan.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>3. Highway assessment identifies significant traffic impacts of proposed reserve housing sites. It is considered that these impacts are not acceptable without additional mitigation and/or infrastructure provision.</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that improvements to the highway network may be required to facilitate the development of specific sites identified in the Plan. Detailed work will be undertaken to establish the nature of mitigation measures that would be required.</p>	<p>None.</p>

## Section 2: Reserve Housing Sites

<b>Topic: Section 2 Reserve Housing Sites (General)</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
James Gordon-Cumming Stephen Nicholson Elizabeth Baggett	1. No consideration has been given to the quantum of houses already built in villages (such as Bishop's Itchington) or across the rural area since the Core Strategy commenced. As settlements get bigger, the size of increases gets proportionality smaller.	Need to consider services available and population density and allocate a fair proportion of homes accordingly.	Issues of fair distribution of development across the settlements within the District and associated issues of infrastructure constraints throughout the District are being given further consideration.	Depending upon the result of further technical assessment work (including infrastructure capacity constraints) the proposed distribution strategy of the next iteration of the SAP may change.
	2. All District-level plan-making should be paused given pending local government review to allow us to consider more densely populated areas with infrastructure that are better suited to additional development.	Halt preparation of the SAP, pending Unitary Authority status.	There is no guarantee of Unitary Authority status. The Government has yet to announce their intentions. Plan-making cannot stop in the meantime. As such, work on progressing the SAP (and the South Warwickshire Local Plan) will continue.	None.
	3. Support the revised approach set out in the SAPPO consultation and that the 2019 Proposed Submission version has been withdrawn.	No changes sought.	Comments noted.	None.
	4. It is unclear how SDC will deal with alternative sites proposed. If substantive changes are proposed (e.g. large sites re-inserted), a	Carry out further Reg.18 consultation if suite of Reserve Housing sites changes substantially	Comments noted. It is acknowledged that should the list of proposed Reserve Housing Sites change substantially, there would be a	Carry out a further Reg.18 consultation should the list of proposed Reserve Housing Sites change substantially.

	further Reg.18 consultation should be carried out before moving to Reg.19.	following evaluation of this consultation.	requirement for a further Reg.18 consultation.	
	5. Support notion of reserve sites in NDPs taking precedence and other sites not being included in the SAP where a NDP is at an advanced stage of preparation or has been 'made'.	None specified.	Comments noted. The mechanisms for assessing the inclusion of Reserve Housing Sites are under review. Should the relationship between the SAP and NDPs change, this would result in a further Reg.18 consultation.	Carry out a further Reg.18 consultation should the relationship between the SAP and NDPs change.

<b>Topic: Policy SAP.1 – Identifying Reserve Housing Sites</b>	<b>Support: 16</b>	<b>Object: 47</b>	<b>Other: 14</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
--	--------------------	-------------------	------------------	--

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Graham Nicholson Ole Schmidt-Hansen Kineton Parish Council Wychavon District Council St Philips Jonathan Church Lockley Homes Cllr Nigel Rock Birmingham City Council Hallam Land Management (2 off) Taylor Wimpey UK (3 off) Deeley Homes Redrow Homes Peter Drew Contracts Ltd Christ Church, Oxford Goldfinch Town Planning Services The Home Guard Club	1. Support 2. SAP needs to be kept up-to-date and reflect changing situation re job growth (given recent redundancies) and need for housing at JLR. 3. Stronger and clearer statement that bringing forward a reserve site outside of a BUAB does not weaken the validity of that BUAB thereby 'inviting' applications for land outside the BUAB. 4. Support identification of reserve sites to meet potential undersupply within HMA as this will help mitigate pressure on adjacent areas. Agree that matters relating to additional	Note: Due to the revised approach to identifying reserve housing sites, this column has not been populated.	The wording of Policy SAP.1 is a direct reflection of the provisions of Policy CS.16.D in the adopted Core Strategy. Given that the Site Allocations Plan is being prepared to conform to the Core Strategy it would not be appropriate to for a different approach to be taken.  However, due to changing circumstances, in particular the commencement of work to prepare a South Warwickshire Local Plan, a revised approach to the identification of reserve housing sites in the SAP to	Amend the Explanation to Policy SAP.1 to set out the basis for the revised approach to the identification of reserve housing sites in the SAP.

<p>Harbury Parish Council Barwood Development Securities Ltd David Wilson Homes Cala Homes (Midlands) Ltd Kler Group Ltd St. Philips Alamo Group Europe Ltd Persimmon Homes Bloor Homes South Midlands L &amp; Q Estates Mr Steve Keep Corbally Group (Harbury) Ltd Follett Property Holdings Ltd South Staffordshire District Council Tysoe Parish Council IM Land Rosconn Strategic Land Grevayne Properties Ltd Liz Baggett Paul Baggett Rainier Developments Ltd (4 off) Bellway Homes (West Midlands) Ltd Mr M Perry Saffron Estates Morris Homes Bellway Homes Liberal Democrat Group Warwickshire Hunt Trustees Gladman IM Land Hayfield Homes Ltd Terra CEG and Mixed Farms Ltd Natural England</p>	<p>housing needs above and beyond the Core Strategy should be considered through a Local Plan review.</p> <p>5. Supports indicative densities set out for reserve sites.</p> <p>6. Support identification of additional homes/sites above the 2,920 figure as this accords with NPPF requirement for flexibility.</p> <p>7. Support the flexible application of the spatial strategy to identify reserve sites.</p> <p>8. Approach unduly restricts release of Green Belt sites and has resulted in identification of reserve sites in unsustainable locations within the settlement hierarchy. SDC needs to test through reasonable alternatives that a deviation from the Core Strategy distribution would still result in sustainable development. Entirely appropriate for the SAP to undertake a Green Belt review and needs to be done given acuteness of shortfall from the Birmingham HMA. Such a need should be considered an exceptional circumstance.</p> <p>9. SDC has erred in its interpretation of the NPPF in</p>		<p>focus on the short-term is appropriate.</p>	
---	---	--	--	--

<p>Braemar Property Developments Ltd  Sharba Homes  Cemex UK Operations Ltd  Cemex UK Ltd, Sharba Homes Ltd and Spitfire Homes  Clifford Chambers and Milcote Parish Council  Rectory Homes Ltd (2 off)  Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council  Vistry Group  Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd  Cotswolds Conservation Board (3 off)  Ellis Machinery Ltd  Cllr Gill Cleeve  CPRE Warwickshire  David Batty  Myles Thornton  Highways England</p>	<p>its focus on greenfield sites. It needs to optimise brownfield land, densities and demonstrate that how it is proposing to meet shortfalls from neighbouring LPAs has the agreement of those LPAs.</p>			
	<p>10. Evidence regarding Birmingham HMA shortfall is fundamentally flawed and scale of shortfall is markedly higher and acute (23,400 homes to 2031).</p>			
	<p>11. Methodology and process for identifying reserve sites very helpfully articulated in the Topic Paper.</p>			
	<p>12. Fully supportive of approach taken in SAP.1 as a logical, fair and consistent way of enabling any shortfalls experienced up to 2031 in the Greater Birmingham and Black Country HMA at least being partly met in sites within Stratford District.</p>			
	<p>13. Support notion of reserve sites in NDPs taking precedence and other sites not being included in the SAP for those settlements.</p>			
	<p>14. It is sensible to agree reserve housing sites and thus prevent speculative applications.</p>			
	<p>15. Since the Core Strategy was adopted, the Standard Methodology has been</p>			

	<p>introduced for identifying local housing needs. Using this method, the annual requirement is much lower than proposed in the CS. The reserve housing policy is therefore based on out of date figures.</p>			
	<p>16. There is too much development around Quinton, Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield. All these new developments bring increased problems of noise, light and traffic pollution. Enough is enough.</p>			
	<p>17. Question the validity of the claimed 5 YHLS, particularly the ambitious stepped trajectory in the Core Strategy. Consider there is a significant need for more homes in the District. The 20% requirement in the SAP should be increased to ensure delivery does not reduce.</p>			
	<p>18. The 20% reserve is on the 14,600 dwellings in the Core Strategy. Current granted schemes plus the reserve figure already equate to 16% increase over the 14,600. Therefore, the concept of reserve sites is largely redundant.</p>			
	<p>19. The scope of the SAP should include a commitment to an early Local Plan Review.</p>			

	<p>The decision to release reserve sites to contribute to meeting unmet need of HMA is supported. However, concern that scale has been based on arbitrary pro rata basis (i.e. one ninth of identified shortfall).</p>			
	<p>20. Object to SAP mechanism that states that if a settlement has committed more than 20% of the CS figure, then no sites over 30 dwellings are allocated. This is not based on technical site specific reasoning. Object to the omission of site SALF.11 on this basis (due to the NDP allocating a large number of dwellings).</p>			
	<p>21. Inclusion of purpose (d) is welcomed. However, the approach to identifying and distributing the sites within the District is inappropriate and has little regard to the distribution set out in the Core Strategy (i.e. directing more development to LSVs than MRCs).</p>			
	<p>22. Support pragmatic decision to designate reserve sites. Support Council's approach to reserve sites in NDPs. The methodology and process for identifying reserve sites is logical and supported.</p>			

	<p>23. The SAP is too heavily reliant on the inflexible planning approach of reserve housing sites. The SAP is relying upon the Core Strategy, which is becoming dated and itself relies upon an older out of date evidence base. The approach does not allow for other potentially new housing development sites to be considered.</p>			
	<p>24. The initial work on the SAP was undertaken under a different set of economic circumstances (i.e. pre-pandemic). Associated modelling assumptions are therefore unreliable. The severe economic recession likely to be created appears to have been given no material weight.</p>			
	<p>25. There is no guarantee that some of the reserve sites will ever come forward for future development. Relying on reserve sites is a vague, ambiguous, confusing, uncertain, chaotic and unpredictable approach to Plan making.</p>			
	<p>26. Should dwelling numbers to meet housing shortfall for Birmingham be increased this will need to be fully assessed and modelled for its impact on strategic road network.</p>			

<b>Topic: Policy SAP.2 – Reserve Housing Sites in Neighbourhood Plans</b>	<b>Support: 8</b>	<b>Object: 27</b>	<b>Other: 5</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Matthew Neal</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Graham Nicholson Wellesbourne Allotment & Garden Holders Association John Hargis Kineton Parish Council Councillor Anne Parry Stratford-on-Avon Town Council Jonathan Church Wellesbourne & Walton Parish Council James Hall Ilmington Parish Council Clifford Chambers & Milcote Parish Council Taylor Wimpey UK Richborough Estates Michaela Evans Peter Drew Contracts Ltd Councillor Edward Fitter Steve Keep Corbally Group (Harbury) Ltd Follett Property Holdings Ltd Ettington Parish Council Patricia McDonaugh Rosconn Strategic Land Liz Baggett Paul Baggett Rainier Developments Lt,	1. Support. 2. Object to Wellesbourne Allotments (site East of Kineton Road) being included as a Reserve Housing Site.	None. Remove the allotments site from the Plan.	Noted. The site in question is identified by the Parish Council as a reserve housing site in the NDP for the area. The NDP has passed independent examination, passed referendum as has been 'made'. As such, the SAP is merely reflecting the fact that the site is an approved reserve housing site.	None. None.
	3. Support position set out at para 2.1.4 and agree it is sensible to have a suite of reserve housing sites thus preventing speculative applications on other land.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
	4. Support the approach to promoting reserve housing sites set out in NDPs to ensure a consistent approach across the Plan area.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
	5. Concerned about the possibility of the building of more new houses on land South of Oldbutt Road, Shipston-on-Stour (which is	None specified.	The site in question is identified by the Town Council as a reserve housing site in the 'made' NDP. However, its identification as a reserve	Delete site from SAP.

Warwickshire Hunt Trustees Messrs Croft, Croft and Caton William Davis Ltd Miller Homes	listed as a reserve housing site at Tier 2, Tranche B) with no consideration of the impact on the town and its resources.		housing site in the SAP is no longer appropriate based on the revised approach to identifying such sites.	
	6. Welcomes that the reserve housing site in the Ilmington NDP has been adopted as a reserve site in the SAP. However, the site has not been recreated accurately at Appendix 1 of the SAP.	Rectify reserve site size discrepancy by amending SAP map at Appendix 1 to reflect approved map in the NDP.	Agree that there is a discrepancy and the map at Appendix 1 of the SAP is incorrect in that the site is shown too large.	Amend map at Appendix 1 of the SAP to reflect the reserve site map in the NDP.
	7. Support the notion of reserve sites in NDPs taking precedence and other sites not being included in the SAP. Since the NDP has been resolved to be submitted to referendum, site CLIF.01 should be added to the list of sites in Policy SAP.2 and other reserve sites identified in the SAP for the settlement should be removed.	Include CLIF.01 (listed as CLIF.C in the SAP) in the list of NDP reserve housing sites at Policy SAP.2 (and add a map of the site to associated Appendix 1).  Remove sites CLIF.A, CLIF.B and CLIF.D from the SAP (and remove the map from Part A of the Policies Map).	The NDP has now passed referendum and as such, site CLIF.C (as described in the SAP) should now be added to the list of sites in Policy SAP.2 and a map of the site should also be added to Appendix 1.	Amend Policy SAP.2 and include a map at Appendix 1 to reflect the position of the NDP.
	8. Object to the removal of Land at Orchard Close, Brailes from the list of reserve housing sites in the District.	Reinstate the Land at Orchard Close, Brailes to the list of proposed reserve housing sites in the SAP.	The 'made' Brailes NDP does not have any reserve sites. Therefore, this representation does not relate to SAP.2 since there was no site listed for Brailes in the first instance.	None.
	9. Welcomes reference in the reasoned justification to the policy that the Core Strategy does not restrict additional housing in any or all circumstances and there are a number of instances where	None specified.	Comments noted.	None.

	proposals for additional homes will be policy compliant and therefore granted planning consent (para 2.1.5 refers).			
	10. Supportive in principle of a consistent approach to standardise the release mechanisms for NDP reserve sites to ensure consistency with SAP reserve housing sites. However, object to 'Area 2' at Wellesbourne (identified as a reserve site through the NDP) being excluded as a reserve site from the SAP. Its exclusion due to the NDP identifying the site to meet housing needs post 2030 is illogical since the SAP end date is 2031. Additionally, the site is in a Main Rural Centre, has been recognised by its status in the NDP and should be brought forward for development at the earliest opportunity. The NDP is over 3 years old and given its age, there are no reasons for the SAP to ignore the potential to bring the site forward.	Include 'Area 2' as set out in the made Wellesbourne & Walton NDP on the list of reserve housing sites set out at Policy SAP.2 and remove Footnote 4.	It is acknowledged that Area 2 should be considered for inclusion in the SAP, subject to it being consistent with the revised approach to identifying reserve housing sites.	Identify Area 2 in Wellesbourne & Walton NDP as a reserve housing site in the SAP subject to approach taken to identifying such sites.
	11. It is considered expedient that, where allocations are either 'made' or at a very advanced stage through the NDP process, these should be reflected through the SAP.	None specified.	Comments noted.	None.

	12. To destroy Wellesbourne Allotments (recorded as site East of Kineton Road) would be a tragedy for Wellesbourne residents. It would also be contrary to Wellesbourne NDP.	None specified.	The inclusion of Wellesbourne Allotments as a Reserve Housing site is clearly set out in Policy WW7 of the made NDP and as such was promoted for that purpose by the Parish Council. As such, its inclusion in Policy SAP.2 is not contrary to the NDP, as suggested.	None.
	13. Kineton requires more reserve land to be allocated to ensure that the settlement makes a sufficient contribution towards meeting the District's housing needs.	Include the Warwickshire Hunt kennels site as a further reserve housing site.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.
	14. Support the identification of land south of Oldbutt Road, Shipston-on-Stour as a reserve site in the SAP.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
	15. SAP.2 enables MRCs with adopted NDPs to avoid any apportionment of the additional reserve housing need, thus placing the additional burden on lower ranked villages, which by definition have fewer amenities and limited sustainable transport opportunities. This does not allow housing to be distributed in accordance with	For the emerging SAP to be considered sound, Policy SAP.2 should be removed, with the strategy for locating reserve housing sites to be in line with national policy relating to sustainability.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.

	the established settlement hierarchy, is not consistent with the NPPF and is not sound. THE NDPs for Kineton, Shipston and Wellesbourne are considered to be out of date since they pre-date the most recent NPPF.			
	16. Object to the policy since the SAP has not identified additional reserve sites in those settlements with at least one reserve site already identified in a 'made' NDP. This is unsound. Such a restriction is inconsistent with the Core Strategy and unfair on those communities that have not progressed a NDP. With the Council's stance not to propose reserve sites in Green Belt settlements and the existence of the Kineton, Shipston & Wellesbourne NDPs (each of which identify at least one reserve site), this leaves Southam and Bidford as MRCs through which further reserve sites will be identified through the SAP. The result will be a very unbalanced distribution of growth and underprovides reserve sites in many of the District's most sustainable settlements.	In order to redress the balance of development and to ensure deliverability, the Council should not preclude the identification of further reserve sites in settlements with made NDPs.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.
	17. Support the recognition of site WELL.01 as a reserve	NDP reserve site capacity should be stated within the	Not all reserve sites within NDPs quote an indicative site	None.

	<p>site in the Wellesbourne NDP and Policy SAP.2. However, note that the SAP does not currently state the indicative capacity for NDP reserve housing sites.</p>	<p>SAP and that Land East of Warwick Road should be recognised as potentially being able to accommodate up to 50 dwellings.</p> <p>Additionally, the policies map at Appendix 1 of the SAP should be amended to be consistent with the NDP allocation.</p>	<p>capacity. This is the reason figures have not been quoted within the SAP policy.</p> <p>It is not for the LPA to introduce a different capacity to that set out in the NDP. The policies map at Appendix 1 is consistent with the NDP map in that it shows the 'area reserved for new housing' as denoted by the dashed line on map 11 of the NDP (which is the area of land outside flood zones 2 and 3).</p>	
	<p>18. Object to the Council's approach summarised at para 2.1.24 which states that the SAP will not identify reserve sites in areas that have already identified such a site in a NDP. Such an approach is not justified given MRCs such as Kineton are sustainable locations and can take additional growth over and above. Other sustainable sites within Kineton cannot be considered subjectively due to the stance set out in Section 1.2 of the SAP. It is requested that land north of Banbury Road (east), Kineton is identified as a reserve site.</p>	<p>It is requested that land north of Banbury Road (east), Kineton is identified as a reserve site in the SAP.</p>	<p>It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>19. The Council's approach in SAP.2 is not justified, particularly in the case of Shipston-on-Stour where there are significant concerns</p>	<p>It is requested that SHLAA site SHIP.02 is identified as a reserve site in the SAP.</p>	<p>It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly</p>	<p>None.</p>

	regarding the deliverability of the NDP's chosen reserve site due to access issues. The representation is supporting the inclusion of land north of Darlingscote Road (SHLAA Ref. SHIP.02) as a reserve site in the SAP.		the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	
	20. Reserve sites identified through NDPs should also be allocated through the SAP. However, these sites should not be subject to scrutiny through examination, since they will have already been through this process, albeit via a different mechanism.	Identify NDP reserve sites in the SAP.	Those reserve sites in 'made' NDPs which are consistent with the revised approach to identifying such sites are listed within the SAP.	Amend the list of reserve housing sites identified in 'made' NDPs to be consistent with the revised methodology that has been applied.

<b>Topic: Policy SAP.3 – Releasing Reserve Housing Sites</b>	<b>Support: 14</b>	<b>Object: 76</b>	<b>Other: 9</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
--	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Alamo Manufacturing Services Ltd	Support proactive approach of 5.5 year trigger.	Note: Due to the revised approach to releasing reserve housing sites, this column has not been populated.	Due to changing circumstances, in particular the commencement of work to prepare a South Warwickshire Local Plan, a revised approach to the release of reserve housing sites in the SAP to focus on the short-term is appropriate.	Amend Policy SAP.1 and its explanation to set out the basis for the revised approach to the release of reserve housing sites in the SAP.
Barratt David Wilson Homes	Support identification of reserve sites as a way to prevent speculative applications.			
Barwood Development Securities	Support approach that releases reserve sites in those settlements yet to achieve the indicative Core Strategy numbers.			
Bellway Homes	Supportive of approach			
Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council (2 off)	Identification of Quinton within Tier 3 Tranche A is supported.			
Birmingham City Council				
Bishop's Itchington Parish Council				

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Bloor Homes South Midlands Ltd Bloor Homes Western Braemar Midlands Catesby Estates Cemex UK Ltd Sharba Homes Spitfire Homes Christ Church, Oxford Corbally Group (Harbury) Ltd Countryside Properties CPRE Deeley Homes Ellis Machinery Ltd Follett Property Holdings Gladman Goldfinch Town Planning Services Grevayne Properties Ltd Harbury Parish Council Hayfield Homes HIA Developments Kendrick Homes Ltd Kineton Parish Council Kingacre Estates Kler Group L&Q Estates (4 off) Lockley Homes Lone Star Land Long Itchington Parish Council Mactaggart and Mickel Miller Homes Morris Homes Persimmon Homes	<p>Relative distribution set out in CS.16 remains important (given adopted Local Plan) as well as ensuring development remains proportionate to the scale of existing settlements.</p> <p>Identification of Land North of Barley Fields, Long Marston as a reserve site in Tranche A</p> <p>Supportive of prioritising sites by size and location.</p> <p>Supportive of both Stockton and Long Itchington being included within Tier 7 as this reflects the scale of housing already delivered in these communities.</p> <p>Support requirement to submit site delivery assessments at least annually.</p> <p>Support approach of releasing reserve sites in those settlements yet to achieve the indicative dwelling numbers in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>5YHLSC should be measured against the Core Strategy housing requirement as a minimum. Alternative of using a lower figure would not be consistent with boosting housing supply.</p> <p>Unclear what level of housing will be released to ensure supply is maintained – Council may constantly be required to drip-feed release to remain above 5.5</p>			

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Persimmon Homes South Midlands Ltd	years/HDT. This needs to be clear.			
Rainier Developments Ltd (4 off) Rectory Homes (3 off) Redrow Homes Richborough Estates Rockspring Barwood Southam Ltd Rosconn Strategic Land (2 off) Saffron Estates Sharba Homes	Equivalent of 0.5 years (365 homes) when reserve sites would be released is too narrow a window for the policy to operate effectively. By the time application delivers, likely that supply will be below 5 years. Reserve housing sites should be supported in short-term because of their benefits irrespective of triggers.			
Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd St Philips Land Ltd Solihull MBC South Staffordshire Council	Unclear how it will operate in practice given 5YHLSC published annually and the significant time lag between monitoring and release could delay necessary homes.			
Severn Trent Stratford-upon-Avon Town Council	Seek clarity regarding democratic process confirming release of reserve sites			
Taylor Wimpey UK (3 off) The Ettington Estate Vistry Group PLC Warwickshire County Council - Infrastructure	More clarity required as to how different settlements within the same tier are the triggers that may engage in relation to one settlement but not another.			
Warwickshire Hunt Trustees	Clarity regarding the process of joint monitoring of the HMA			
Welford-on-Avon Parish Council William Davis Ltd Wychavon District Council	Clarity required regarding the timing and trigger points especially in relation to shortfall and increased housing needs arising from joint working with WDC.			
Elizabeth Uggerloese Graham Nicholson	Disagree with deducting surplus from 5YHLSC.			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Kevan Russell Jennifer Wood-Hill Marcus Pestell Thiago Pereira Cllr Nigel Rock Cllr Tony Bromwich Jonathan Church Jessica Jackson Michelle Head Messrs Croft, Croft and Caton Cllr Chris Kettle Myles Thornton John Bredavs Cllr Louis Adam David McWhirter John Bredavs Cllr Gill Cleeve Terra Highways England Shaun Bredavs Propernomics Ltd I M Land Liberal Democrat Group	No justification for selection of a 5.5 year trigger. What alternatives have been considered?			
	Set trigger to either of the buffers SDC uses (5% or 20%) as opposed to 10% which is only applicable if SDC publishes an APS			
	Policy should reflect other circumstances where reserve sites would be released			
	Sites controlled by house builders should be looked at first as they are immediately deliverable as opposed to those controlled by land promoters.			
	Bringing forward reserve sites in settlements already delivering in excess of the Core Strategy is inappropriate especially where there is existing unused capacity in other settlements.			
	Reserve sites are commensurate to their sustainability i.e. smaller sites in lower order settlements. This approach is logical and consistent with NPPF.			
	Tranche system is fair and transparent and clear which sites will be delivered first allowing sites to be brought forward to the market quickly.			
	Without a tranche system, unclear how sites would be released in an effective manner. Other methods are too chaotic and would result in wasted expense.			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	Wording of release criteria for purpose B is clear and concise.			
	Trigger should be set at 6 years taking into account need for realistic lead-in times to bring forward sites e.g. ecological surveys.			
	5YHLSC is not robust shows shortfall equivalent to 4.4 years and trigger already been met. Housing supply should not be reduced to account for COVID.			
	1,000 dwelling cap is arbitrary isn't referred by Core Strategy Inspector. If an identified need has been established and accepted that it should be met in the District, the SAP should enable sites to come forward to meet that need.			
	Cap contrary to NPPF requirement to boost housing growth, could prevent needs being met (e.g. Birmingham shortfall) and inappropriate given significant increase in housing set out in the Standard Method.			
	Ambiguous. Assumed that for each of the 3 purposes identified that 1,000 dwellings will be required.			
	In order to comply with CS.15 sites in the more sustainable settlements should be released as the priority (especially for purpose A) although to ensure variety as per NPPF para 68,			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>some lower order settlements might be better placed to meet particular purpose e.g. JLR.</p> <p>The LSV targets are not not a rigid limit and should be applied flexibly as per Welford Appeal Inspector (PINS 3174376). Only scenario in which they could be relevant is if a settlement was accommodating so much additional growth that the Core Strategy spatial strategy would become distorted. Core Strategy wouldn't be undermined if LSVs were prioritised accordingly to the relative sustainability of the settlement. Some are more constrained than others. Many LSVs will exceed their indicative numbers if they are to accommodate reserve sites; unclear why those LSVs that do so are sent to the back of the queue.</p> <p>Artificially restricting sites 100+ to lower order tranches fails to acknowledge the benefits that could otherwise be achieved e.g. affordable housing, infrastructure etc.</p> <p>Core Strategy does not ascribe indicative quantum of development to each MRC: as such, the SAP should allocate sites in the most sustainable locations i.e. Southam</p>			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>Site size threshold is inappropriate. If housing shortfall is greater than 100 homes sensible for larger sites to be released in first instance. Even if shortfall is smaller, sensible to release large sites to ensure a supply buffer</p>			
	<p>Phasing the release of sites on the basis of the settlement hierarchy is also unnecessary, complicated, arbitrary and slows down delivery.</p>			
	<p>Insufficient consideration has been given to the potential transport implications of the reserve sites. Releasing all 3,130 homes would be a significant additional volume of housing. Transport impacts are likely to be compounded given the dispersed nature of the proposed allocations in settlements with little or no transport infrastructure. WCC is concerned with the cumulative impacts.</p>			
	<p>Apportionment of reserve sites is not supported by the Core Strategy and would result in a huge imbalance between settlements even in the same tier.</p>			
	<p>Council seems pre-occupied with ensuring the release of sites doesn't result in an apparent over-supply in excess of the identified shortfall rather than establishing a mechanism that</p>			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	sites are genuinely available at a point in time.			
	Consideration of deliverability of sites appears to be absent from the Council's approach with regards to the identification of reserve sites within individual tranches. Reference to deliverability in SAP.3 lacks clarity and delegates decisions about release of sites based on information that is not yet known or available.			
	More suitable tiered system relevant to each purpose.			
	Object to the identification of LSVs in tier 7 – they should not be overlooked if there are suitable and deliverable sites available. Settlements may contain sites that are less constrained and may be better related to the settlement.			
	Favours sites in larger settlements over smaller settlements at the expense of the effectiveness of the plan. Such sites are likely to be larger with longer delivery times which is counterproductive to the purpose of seeking to maintain a deliverable supply			
	Challenge the statement that Birmingham shortfall has reduced substantially although note that not with the remit of the SAP to examine Birmingham's unmet			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	needs; only to what extent that can positively be met with the District.			
	Policy should include safeguards should SoCGs not be published in a timely manner and that SDC will meet its proportional share within 2 years of SAP adoption if no SoCG signed.			
	Tranches should be listed in one place i.e. in the Policy not appendix.			
	Unclear why LSVs are in Tranche A ahead of MRC in Tranche B. Should accord with Core Strategy.			
	Given that unmet needs have already been established for Birmingham and Coventry, unclear why the SAP is not releasing such sites immediately as per SAP.4.			
	Concern with tying release to decision of Cabinet – the release of sites should be tied to policy defined criteria and transparency. This is ambiguous as Cabinet could choose not to release sites even when there is a clear policy imperative to do so.			
	Should Council's LHN increase drastically, Council should commit to releasing all reserve sites immediately.			
	New tier 8 required for those settlements (e.g. Long Marston)			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	that have exceeded Core Strategy by 100%.			
	More equitable to position LSVs into tiers according to their degree of shortfall against the Core Strategy target rather than LSV category, especially as CS.16 already makes adjustments to the scale of those targets according to their LSV category..			
	Location of reserve sites is not consistent with the balance of distribution in CS.16 with a disproportionate reliance on a small number of sites within the MRCs as well as reliance on smaller settlements.			
	Phasing the release of reserve sites based on the settlement hierarchy is also unnecessary, arbitrary and over-complicated. Sustainability of site should be determining factor.			
	Release of smaller sites first is inappropriate and works directly against the NPPF objective of boosting supply. Large sites may have added benefits e.g. open space.			
	Sites under 100 homes which have no significant infrastructure or utility constraints and accessed off the public highway should be released first irrespective of the locational criteria especially given that are more readily deliverable			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>compared to longer timescales of larger sites.</p>			
	<p>Proposes to release sites in tranches as per the settlement hierarchy according to differing triggers. Very difficult to assign a particular site and location to a particular need.</p>			
	<p>Proposed tranches do not accord with NPPF. Do not agree with approach of LSV1s that have significantly exceeded the Core Strategy numbers being in tranche 7 as this results in sites in lower category LSVs coming forward before more sustainable LSV1s.</p>			
	<p>Approach will see sites being brought forward in settlements constrained by AONB, SLA and Vale of Evesham Control Zone ahead of more unconstrained settlements.</p>			
	<p>Requirement for promoters to do work upfront before there is any certainty that a site may be released. Could lead to abortive work.</p>			
	<p>Disproportionate identification of sites/homes between the tranches with reliance on small number of MRCs and lower order, less sustainable LSVs (e.g. LSV4 10.6% compared to LSV1 8.5%).</p>			
	<p>Object to inclusion of Large Rural Sites in tier 3</p>			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>Inconsistencies in the quantum of homes identified within LSV1 settlements which restricts identifying sustainable sites. Also inconsistent between the tiers with LSV4 Mappleborough Green delivering 55 homes whereas LSV1 Long Itchington delivers 26 homes.</p>			
	<p>No requirement for homes to be balanced evenly across settlements. No fixed upper limit in relation to the quantum of housing to be delivered. Policy threshold is set approximately to allow for additional growth without conflicting with the distribution strategy.</p>			
	<p>Restricting settlements on basis of previous provision will see less sustainable sites come forward. Tier 7 includes some of the best performing LSVs.</p>			
	<p>Reserve sites are to accommodate specific purposes; not meet the existing needs of the District. As such, there should be no disaggregation between those settlements that have accommodate significant housing growth and those that haven't.</p>			
	<p>Priority given to Main Town and MRCs is understood but CS.15 is not a hierarchy – all locations are sustainable – and the tiered approach is contrary to CS.15.</p>			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>Para 2.2.23 appears to allow sites in communities that have already exceeded the Core Strategy numbers can be brought forward before sites in those communities that have delivered very little.</p>			
	<p>Releasing sites in line with the tiers and tranches is simplistic as lower tier settlements are still sustainable and appropriate locations for proportionate new development.</p>			
	<p>SDC has not considered alternative approaches to the release of reserve housing sites, or shown that this would be unsustainable or contrary to the Core Strategy objectives, specifically one that would allow sites to come forward from lower tier settlements at the same time or in advance of those tier 1 and tier 2 settlements</p>			
	<p>SAP.3 lacks flexibility as it limits the release of reserve housing sites to no more than a handful of sites in a specific tranche that may have delivery constraints or issues at the required time.</p>			
	<p>By collecting together the larger MRC sites, it appears that the need will have to be quite substantial for tranches C1 or C2 to be released.</p>			
	<p>Given sustainability of Gaydon, including its proximity to GLH, question its inclusion within Tier</p>			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>7. Logical to release sites in Gaydon for Purpose B (JLR @ GLH).</p> <p>Tranches A and B should also acknowledge a site's location within the district (akin to Tranches C1 and C2) and the order of release should reflect the source of need.</p> <p>Release mechanisms too vague and therefore unworkable.</p> <p>Policy fails to tabulate the sites to be released under the different tranches.</p> <p>Consideration of deliverability does not factor in the selection of sites within tranches</p> <p>Policy does not explain how the residual number of homes would be released. Almost all tranches include more than 1 site requiring a choice to be made. Such a choice would be arbitrary and is not based on a methodology.</p> <p>Object to Stratford-upon-Avon town being in Tier 1. Release should be related to need and tied into availability of infrastructure.</p> <p>Concern with speed at which development in lower tiers would occur if higher tiers failed to deliver as anticipated especially given 6-month window for submission prior to release of further tranches. For sites in tier 6, there could be a 5.5year period</p>			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	of simply waiting for higher tiers to pass.			
	When releasing sites to meet an identified need, the Council should include a buffer to provide flexibility.			
	Whilst LSVs as a whole have contributed, some individual LSVs are well short of their 'targets'.			
	Difficult to see how 2,920 target could be achieved without LSVs. Core Strategy inspector's conclusions for approximately 2,000 homes in LSVs and that LSVs were appropriate locations for reserve sites seems mutually exclusive.			
	Core Strategy has already established sustainable levels of delivery in lower order settlements and can help with sustainability of those settlements. Such sites more likely to be smaller and in control of SME builders which will deliver more quickly. Alternative approach: Tranche A Tiers 1-6, Tranche B, Tiers 1-6 (excluding Tier 7 as these have already overprovided)			
	No justification for the inclusion of sites in settlements that have already done their bit e.g. Welford-on-Avon.			
	Object to Stratford town being in tier 1: release of sites should be based upon most suitable sites to			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	deal with shortfall tying in availability of infrastructure as opposed to on a predetermined basis.			
	More weight should be given to those sites that are readily deliverable.			
	Bishop's Itchington is highly sustainable and should not be in Tier 7 and well located to JLR (Purpose B) and should be in Tier 3 to comply with SAP.1			
	Numbers in CS.16 are indicative and are not a ceiling nor maximum.			
	Presence of neighbourhood plans with reserve sites and NDPs that do not allocate any reserve sites in favour of more sustainable settlements e.g. Shipston-on-Stour is arbitrary, unfair and unjustified.			
	The use of site size as a blanket threshold for determining tranches is also not justified and not founded on robust evidence.			
	Object to exclusion of reserve sites in settlements with made NDPs with reserve sites (e.g, Wellesbourne)			
	Not repeating reserve housing sites in the Core Strategy review is a flawed approach (para 2.2.5).			
	Bidford-on-Avon should not be considered as a MRC / Tier 2 owing to its lack of infrastructure.			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	Object to inclusion of Bidford-on-Avon in the first tranche owing to lack of infrastructure.			
	Locational advantages of raising the tier that includes Harbury Cement Works because it is well-placed to meet JLR and CW HMA needs.			
	Will result in blighting effect on the villages			
	GBBC Position Statement out of date and unmet needs now exist that SAP.3 should acknowledge.			
	Geographical approach to releasing reserve sites is unjustified.			
	3,000 homes is unmet need and should be added to the housing requirement			
	SAP is too heavily reliant on inflexible approach of using reserve housing sites based on a 4 year old and out of date Core Strategy. Reserve sites do not provide certainty to neither the landowner nor the community. SAP is insufficiently robust, unsound, unjustified and conflicts with the NPPF requirement to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.			
	Include site South or Alcester Road, Stratford-upon-Avon within SAP.3			
	Will pattern of development be aligned as per the Core Strategy in percentage terms e.g. LSV1			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	25% of 450 homes = 22.5 dwellings?			
	Requires developers to provide up-to-date and accurate site delivery information without any redress should the information be flawed.			
	Release mechanism needs to take account of climate change e.g. release those sites in proximity to railways			
	Welcome opportunity to engage with Council and developers to discuss how SAP.3 could be amended to ensure it is implementable from a DM perspective.			
	The GBBCHMA shortfall is identified to 2036 whereas the SAP runs to 2031. The early review of the Core Strategy is welcomed.			
	Object to inclusion of BID.11/BID.D in tranche C1 because it is in a Made NDP area and assumed to have a capacity over 100 dwellings. These considerations are contrary to the Core Strategy which make no reference to prioritising sites.			
	BID.11/BID.D capacity should be reduced to 87 and site included with tranche B			
	Long Marston has already exceeded its requirements by 250%			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>Stop turning villages into towns! Green space is vital to people's wellbeing. Policy will have blighting effect.</p>			
	<p>Proposed reserve sites in the Southam catchment area (coupled with homes built and committed) would result in significant overprovision compared to the CS.16 requirements: Harbury 123%, Napton 133%, Southam 176%, Bishops Itchington 203%, Long Itchington 250%.This cannot be sustainable. East of the District is taking 47% of reserve sites with 53% going to rest of District which represents 80% of the land and 83% of the population. This is a significant and unsustainable mismatch.</p>			
	<p>Infrastructure constraints including Southam college remain. Despite increase in number of dwellings, number of GP practices, pharmacy, clinics, police, library and parking have not increased and in some cases diminished.</p>			
	<p>Release of sites not supported by any commitment to infrastructure improvements.</p>			
	<p>Shipston-on-Stour is entirely suitable for expansion given its amenities.</p>			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	Warwickshire Hunt Site in Kineton would support purposes b, c and d.			
	30 dwelling cap in those settlements that have significantly exceeded the Core Strategy numbers is entirely arbitrary.			
	Object to inclusion of best scoring in terms of deliverability Bidford site BID.C in Tranche C rather than Tranche A.			
	Reserve sites should be identified in Kineton to provide diversity of choice.			
	Object to the identification of reserve sites in LSV3 and LSV4 (with exception of Mappleborough Green) as these are the last sustainable locations.			
	Area 2 in Wellesbourne NDP should be identified in Tier 2 Tranche B.			
	Include commitment to an early plan review.			
	Caution that growth within the Itchen Bank catchment would have a high risk on the sewerage works. Further development until improvement works are completed in 2024 is not appropriate.			
	Sites CLIF.B and CLIF.D should be higher up the tiers and are capable of being released immediately.			
	Sites SOU.10 and SOU.11 would meet 3 of the 4 purposes for			

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	reserve sites (A, B and C) and should be identified in Tier 2 Tranche A.			
	Site LONG.A should be moved from Tier 7 to Tier 3.			

<b>Topic: Policy SAP.4 – Releasing Reserve Housing Sites for Purpose D</b>	<b>Support: 4</b>	<b>Object: 22</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
CPRE Warwickshire Myles Thornton Carolyn Lewis-Villacress Rosconn Strategic Land Rainier Developments Ltd (4 off) Braemar Property Developments Ltd HIA Developments LLP Gladmans Morris Homes Follett Property Holdings Ltd Corbally Group (Harbury) Ltd Cllr Kate Rolfe & Cllr Ian Fradgley Councillor Gill Cleeve Stratford-upon-Avon Town Council Harbury Parish Council Bloor Homes Birmingham City Council Taylor Wimpey UK St. Philips Jonathan Church	1. Part of a long and complex set of criteria and procedures for releasing reserve sites which will only add to blighting effect on villages. 2. Unclear whether Policy SAP.4 guarantees that no further reserve sites in Mappleborough Green will be required or developed. 3. Object to assumption underpinning Policy SAP.4 that level of Birmingham housing shortfall is confirmed as it hasn't been tested and there are significant concerns regarding its accuracy. 4. Meeting shortfall in Birmingham's housing requirement in other local authority areas is a significant and ongoing matter. 5. Raise significant concerns about paragraph 2.2.5 which	Delete Policy SAP.4.  None specified.  Council must keep situation under review and plan for further reserve sites if necessary.  Policy should provide additional flexibility to be able to accommodate changing situation.  A robust approach would be that sites identified in SAP are	This purpose of reserve housing sites has been reconsidered as part of the wider revised approach to identifying and releasing such sites.	Amend Policy SAP.4 to identify those reserve housing sites that should be released to meet Purpose D and the explanation to set out the basis for this revised approach.

<p>Lockley Homes Goldfinch Town Planning Services Lichfield District Council Graham Nicholson</p>	<p>suggests reserve sites identified in Site Allocations Plan won't be carried forward into Core Strategy Review</p>	<p>rolled into Core Strategy Review apart from those that don't align with any revised development strategy.</p>		
	<p>6. There has been very little growth in Henley-in-Arden due to its location in Green Belt but its protection is a burden on sustainable development.</p>	<p>Consideration should be given to identifying sites(s) at Henley-in-Arden to address housing shortfall in Birmingham.</p>		
	<p>7. Level of unmet need in Birmingham is far in excess of that specified.</p>	<p>Additional sites should be identified in the Plan that can be released at an early stage to contribute to meeting need.</p>		
	<p>8. Support identification of MAPP.A, B and C as being suitable and available.</p>	<p>Some flexibility in number of dwellings will need to be exercised to ensure sound planning and urban and design objectives are met.</p>		
	<p>9. Object to site STR.B East of Shipston Road, Stratford-upon-Avon being released immediately to remedy shortfall in Birmingham HMA without evidence of shortfall and need for it to be this site.</p>	<p>If provision needs to be made it should be north of the river nearer to Stratford Parkway.</p>		
	<p>10. Oppose any requirement for Stratford District to contribute to meeting unmet needs of other areas.</p>	<p>None specified.</p>		
	<p>11. Concerns as to appropriateness of restrictive nature of policy in light of national policy.</p>	<p>None specified.</p>		
	<p>12. Council assumes ongoing shortfall for Birmingham has been confirmed but this is not the case and very little weight should be attributed to this</p>	<p>An 'area of search' should be identified in the broad location around Mappleborough Green as a potential location for further housing provision to</p>		

	position until it has been properly tested and scrutinised.	address future needs of Greater Birmingham & Black Country HMA.		
	13. Support identification of MAPP.A, B and C due to their proximity and functional relationship with Greater Birmingham and Black Country HMA	None specified.		
	14. Policy SAP.4 has paid insufficient regard to meeting current and future housing needs of Redditch Borough. SAP provides an opportunity to address emerging issues facing a neighbouring authority.	Consider identifying additional land such as east of Redditch as identified in Birmingham HMA Strategic Growth Study which specified that development would have no effect on strategic function of the Green Belt		
	15. Concerns regarding robustness of evidence underpinning specified level of unmet need in Birmingham HMA and proposed approach would not sufficiently contribute towards meeting these needs. It is not the case, as stated in the 2020 Position Statement, that Stratford District has already contributed towards meeting some of Birmingham HMA's unmet needs.	Further sites need to be identified to meet needs of Birmingham. This should include a Green Belt Review to explore identification of reserve sites in close proximity to Redditch, such as at Studley.		
	16. Mechanisms to release reserve sites must be appropriate.	None specified.		
	17. Proposed policy approach regarding reserve housing sites is insufficiently robust, unsound, unjustified and	Approach to reserve housing sites should be reconsidered based on up-to-date evidence and current circumstances.		

	inconsistent with Government planning guidance.			
	18. For clarity it would be helpful to set out capacity of sites in Policy SAP.4.	Specify dwelling capacity of sites identified in Policy SAP.4.		

<b>Topic: Policy SAP.5 – Applications for Reserve Housing Sites</b>	<b>Support: 7</b>	<b>Object: 35</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
CPRE, Warwickshire IM Land Rosconn Strategic Land Rainier Developments Ltd (4 off) Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd Vistry Group Lone Star Land Ltd Bloor Homes Western Terra Hayfield Homes Ltd L&Q Estates (4 off) Messrs Croft, Croft and Caton Saffron Estates Rectory Homes Ltd (3 off) Severn Trent Water Follett Property Holdings Ltd Kingacre Estates Ltd Stratford Climate Action (2 off) Liberal Democratic Group Goldfinch Town Planning Services David Wilson Homes Alamo Group Europe Ltd Bloor Homes South Midlands	Long and complex set of procedures that will only add to blighting effect on villages. Alternative sites should be identified as part of plan-making process if there is not a specific commitment to bring certain reserve sites forward. There is no clarity on what should happen if certain sites do not meet six month deadline for submitting a planning application. Timescale for submitting reserved matters application should be a matter of discussion with applicants on a case-by-case basis as process is dependent on a number of site-specific and external factors. Policy requires applications for reserve sites to be fully compliant with adopted policies. Planning law states	Policy should be deleted. None specified. In such circumstances, sites from the next tranche should be released. A more flexible approach should be adopted such as a commitment to monitor reserve sites with outline permission on a consistent and ongoing basis. Wording of policy should recognise that material considerations can apply.	It is appropriate to amend various aspects of the Policy and accompanying explanation in order to clarify the approach to be taken on planning applications and the standards of development that would be required. It is necessary to ensure that rigorous procedures are in place given that reserve housing sites must be delivered effectively and to a high standard should they need to be released.	Amend Policy SAP.5 and its explanation to clarify and bolster the process for assessing and delivering proposals for reserve housing sites.

<p>Corbally Group (Harbury) Ltd  Taylor Wimpey UK (3 off)  Miller Homes  Lockley Homes  Deeley Homes  Redrow Homes  Christ Church, Oxford  Jonathan Church  Wychavon District Council  Kineton Parish Council  Graham Nicholson</p>	<p>that applications should be determined in accordance with development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In the case of affordable housing, provision should be subject to site-specific evidence of viability as recognised in Core Strategy Policy CS.18.</p>			
	<p>Second paragraph of Part A of policy does not allow for flexibility regarding type and mix of homes which is provided for in Core Strategy Policy CS.19 and Developer Requirements SPD.</p>	<p>Policy should be redrafted to state that reserve sites will be expected to meet relevant policies subject to viability, up-to-date evidence on housing need and local market conditions, as appropriate.</p>		
	<p>Not clear whether reduction in carbon emissions applies to all new dwellings or just those on reserve sites. If the latter, there is no clear justification for why this measure should be targeted towards reserve sites. There is no known viability evidence supporting this policy requirement. SAP should not pre-empt Government's potential changes to Building Regulations. Standards should not be in excess of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 which represents around a 19% improvement. As such, Part B of Policy is contrary to national planning policy.</p>	<p>Delete requirement to achieve 31% reduction in carbon emissions as contrary to national planning policy unless supported by viability evidence. If retained, policy should make it clear that requirements will fall away if and when corresponding changes to Building Regulations come into effect.</p>		
	<p>Requirement that applications are fully compliant with</p>	<p>Policy should be reworded to state that applications should</p>		

	relevant planning policies is overly prescriptive to reflect NPPF paragraph 11.	accord with up-to-date development plan policies rather than be fully compliant.		
	Research by Lichfields showed that for a site of 210 dwellings it takes roughly four years on average to reach delivery.	Should be a greater provision of smaller reserve sites to ensure prompt delivery.		
	Appreciate that a restricted timescale is to encourage quicker delivery of sites but this has to be realistic. Six month period specified to commence construction from date of consent is incredibly tight.	Time period should be increased to twelve months from date of consent to start on site but would agree to nine months.		
	New developments have a role to play in ensuring that design of development is water efficient.	Wording should be inserted in policy to require new developments to demonstrate they are water efficient.		
	Wording in para 2.3.5 is factually incorrect regarding the Council's Climate Emergency declaration in July 2019.	Wording should state that the Council aims to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030.		
	Support requirement for zero carbon development on reserve housing sites but flooding and drainage network must be addressed as part of climate change adaptation.	Insert reference that foul and surface water must be addressed.		
	Concerned about restrictive nature of Policy SAP.5 in light of national policy, find it complicated and difficult to understand and strong reservations as to how it will work in practice. Mechanisms	None specified.		

	are skewed towards administrative function of the Council rather than to an understanding of time and resources involved with development projects.			
	Policy has not been subjected to viability testing which raises concerns about ability of reserve sites to meet proposed delivery timescales and 31% reduction in carbon emissions, contrary to NPPF paragraph 34 and associated Government advice.	None specified.		
	Approach is generally supported but speed at which reserve sites are released impacts on implementation of this policy. Not all released sites will achieve planning permission and not all sites will be able to deliver policy compliant affordable housing. There is no explanation as to what happens if a site that has been released doesn't get developed.	Policy should set out that in the event that an application timeframes are not met that the next tranche would be released within that calendar month to ensure housing need can be met in a pragmatic and speedy manner.		
	Support provision for material commencement within six months but there is no definition of material commencement and no remedy/penalty should commencement stop once qualification has taken place.	Policy should define what is meant by material commencement and explain what would happen if progress on implementation stops.		

	<p>Welcome 31% reduction in carbon emissions but measurements should be made against Part L1A of Building Regulations 2013 (as amended) rather than Building Regulations 2010 (as amended)</p>	<p>Amend reference to Building Regulations 2013 (as amended) (Part L1A).</p>		
	<p>Proposed timescales for release of reserve housing sites is unrealistic and unenforceable. For example, ecological surveys can only be undertaken during spring and summer months. It is also reliant on Local Authority and consultees being readily available to engage in pre-application process. It would be unrealistic for the Council to resist an application on a preferred site once six month period had passed.</p>	<p>Delivery timescale requirements should be removed from policy in their entirety.</p>		
	<p>Attachment of conditions to full and reserve matters permissions to ensure material commencement within six months is unrealistic as it is commonplace for conditions not to be discharged within statutory time period. Also, some conditions may require survey work which can take several months to complete.</p>	<p>Delivery timescale requirements should be removed from policy in their entirety.</p>		
	<p>There is no clarity on what should happen if certain sites do not meet the deadlines specified and there is insufficient headroom within</p>	<p>Policy should expressly state that sites from the next tranche should be released to ensure any shortfall is expeditiously addressed.</p>		

	the tranche to accommodate the level of identified need.			
	It should be recognised that in planning law other factors can outweigh compliance with adopted planning policies such as in relation to affordable housing provision and preferred housing mix.	Second para in Part A of Policy SAP.5 should be amended to provide flexibility to take into account viability and up-to-date evidence on housing need and local market conditions.		
	Object to requirement in Part B of policy that new dwellings are required to achieve 31% reduction in carbon emissions because it is not clear whether it applies to all new dwellings coming forward in the District or just those on reserve sites. If the latter, there is no clear justification for why this measure should only be targeted towards reserve sites and will have viability implications.	Viability evidence should be provided to support this policy requirement and referred to in supporting text.		
	The 31% figure stated pre-empt the Government's potential changes to the Building Regulations. As such, this part of the policy is contrary to national planning policy and is unsound.	Delete Part B from Policy SAP.5.		
	Government has not yet decided how to progress a 31% reduction in carbon emissions. If it is to be through Building Regulations there will be no need for it to be covered in the Plan.	Policy should make it clear that this provision would not be needed if Building Regulations are to be used to secure reduction in carbon emissions.		

	<p>The speed at which reserved matters applications come forward can be dictated by a number of site specific or external factors which are not always within the applicant's control. Timescales should be a matter of discussion with applicants on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>Council should adopt a more flexible approach such as a commitment to monitor reserve sites with outline planning permission on a consistent and ongoing basis.</p>		
	<p>Six-month timescale is too onerous given the need to address certain technical requirements, eg. ecological surveys that have to be undertaken at certain times of the year.</p>	<p>Twelve months would be a more realistic and workable period.</p>		
	<p>The proposed timescales for the release of reserve housing sites is unrealistic and unenforceable. Submitting a valid application with supporting material within six months may be difficult to achieve. Once the six month period has passed it would be unrealistic for the Council to resist an application and identify an alternative site instead.</p>	<p>Delivery timescale should be removed from the Plan in its entirety.</p>		
	<p>Policy assumes that any delay will be due to applicants and developers. This can also be due to local authority and statutory consultees, including negotiating Section 106 agreements, undertaking various approval processes.</p>	<p>Requirement that a site must commence within 6 months of grant of reserved matters or full planning permission should be amended.</p>		

	Time limit conditions cannot be varied by a Section 73 application and therefore policy should not set deadlines that cannot be met due to no fault of the developer.	Any time limited condition should allow for at least one year for a site commencement.		
	Whilst 12 months should be sufficient on the trigger for reserved matters applications, the Council should not apply a blanket policy that does not allow for appropriate engagement with applicants.	None specified.		
	Policy SAP.4 should be added to second sentence as it confirms the need for release of reserve sites listed.	Insert reference to Policy SAP.4 at end of second sentence.		
	Object to first paragraph in Part A as it is not deliverable due to timescales involved in securing discharge of conditions and consents. It is therefore contrary to paragraph 16.b) of the NPPF.	Amend first paragraph in Part A from 6 months to 12 months.		
	Object to second paragraph in Part A as it assumes policies in Core Strategy and NDPs are consistent which they are not in respect of Stratford-upon-Avon and housing mix.	Policy should be clear as to which policies take precedence in circumstances where there is a conflict.		
	Time period for submission of valid planning applications places a significant burden on parties promoting sites. To expect promoters to have evidence produced given level of uncertainty about a site's	Timescale should be revised to within 9 or 12 months.		

	release is not proportionate or reasonable.			
	Implementation timescale is not just challenging but potentially unrealistic, eg. period taken to discharge conditions.	Timescale should be revised to within 9 or 12 months.		
	Any policy that seeks to incorporate specific targets or thresholds must be justified, otherwise it is not soundly-based. There is no evidence presented that offers sufficient justification for proposed time limits.	Delete time limits from policy.		
	There is uncertainty as to what processes applicants need to follow to ensure their applications are submitted within specified time limits. Will the Council specifically invite applications from site owners or developers? If not, how will they be made aware that a purpose has been triggered?	Process for triggering planning applications needs to be clarified.		
	Proposed timescales are unrealistic and unenforceable given procedures that have to be followed. It would be unrealistic for the Council to resist an application. Proposal that conditions would be attached to permissions to ensure that material commencement starts on site within six months is also unrealistic given need to	Delivery timescale required in Policy SAP.5 should be removed entirely.		

	<p>discharge conditions. Developers may delay signing of S106 Agreement after there has been a resolution to grant planning permission to extend six month period.</p>			
	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that requirement to comply with proposed Zero and Low Carbon Home Standards has been viability tested. Possible that final version of Future Home Standards will include different provisions. Final requirements are to be included within Building Regulations which will make proposed policy unnecessary.</p>	<p>Delete Policy SAP.5.</p>		
	<p>The six-month timescale is too onerous given technical requirements that need to be dealt with and completion of S106 Agreements.</p>	<p>A twelve month period is more flexible, realistic and workable.</p>		
	<p>Timescales specified are challenging and not it is not clear what evidence has informed them and what impact will be for applicants if timescales aren't adhered to.</p>	<p>Absolute deadlines should be removed and presented as a guide to encourage prompt delivery.</p>		

## Reserve Housing Sites

<b>Topic: ALC.A South of Allimore Lane (west), Alcester</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Historic England L&Q Estates Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Wychavon District Council Environment Agency	1. Support requirement for an archaeological investigation.	None	This is specified in Site Proforma.	None
	2. Sites ALC.A and ALC.B can come forward together and provide approximately 187 dwellings.	None specified	Noted	None
	3. Site has areas of high surface water flood risk. Any application for development must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	4. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None
	5. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.	Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. Site Proforma specifies requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Insert reference to requirement for a Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.

<b>Topic: ALC.B South of Allimore Lane (east), Alcester</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Historic England L&Q Estates Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Wychavon District Council Environment Agency	1. Support requirement for an archaeological investigation.	None	This is specified in Site Proforma.	None
	2. Sites ALC.A and ALC.B can come forward together and provide approximately 187 dwellings.	None specified	Noted	None
	3. Site has areas of high surface water flood risk. Any application for development must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	4. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None
	5. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.	Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. Site Proforma specifies requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Insert reference to requirement for a Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.

<b>Topic: BID.A South of Salford Road (middle), Bidford-on-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 4</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer:</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council Elisabeth Uggerloese Wychavon District Council Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Severn Trent Water Environment Agency Steven Lincoln Michael Franklin Josephine Satwell David and Judith McCabe	1. Parish Council is prepared to support this site.	None	N/A	None
	2. Accept site on condition that it is a long-term allocation.	Nothing specified but implies that site should be placed in a later tranche for release.	It is not possible to stipulate when reserve sites would need to be released. As things stand the site is in Tier 2, Tranche A because Bidford is a Main Rural Centre and it is a relatively small site.	Dependent on any review of tiers and tranches set out in Annex 3.
	3. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None
	4. Site has areas of high surface water flood risk. Any application for development must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy. Modelling of surface water flows should be considered and managed appropriately.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. Site Proforma specifies need for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Insert references to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy, incorporation of necessary easements, and modelling of flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.
	5. Capacity issues may arise if more than one development connects into drainage system. Cumulative hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine full impact	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. The need for a Transport Assessment is already specified in Site Proforma.	None

	6. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.	Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. Site Proforma specifies requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Insert reference to requirement for a Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.
	7. Bidford has had far more than its fair share of development and no real improvements to local facilities and infrastructure.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that Bidford has grown considerably over recent years but it is a Main Rural Centre due to the range of shops and services it provides and its accessibility.	None
	8. Site is prime agricultural land and should be kept for this purpose.	Delete site	Site is very small and therefore has limited agricultural value.	None
	9. Development would be further encroachment into open countryside and impact on ecosystem and wildlife.	Delete site	Site is very small so development would have limited impact on countryside. It has no specific ecological value although existing hedgerows should be retained as far as possible.	None
	10. B439 is a busy road with frequent collisions. Development will increase traffic and pollution.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development would have very limited impact on traffic flows and pollution.	None
	11. In Bidford Neighbourhood Plan this site is outside village boundary and classified as countryside.	Delete site	Bidford NDP doesn't identify reserve housing sites so it is necessary for Site Allocations Plan to do so in accordance with Policy CS.16 in Core Strategy.	None

<b>Topic: BID.B South of Salford Road (west), Bidford-on-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 5</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council Elisabeth Uggerloese Wychavon District Council Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Severn Trent Water Environment Agency Steven Lincoln Michael Franklin Josephine Satwell David and Judith McCabe Rosconn Strategic Land	1. Parish Council is prepared to support this site.	None	N/A	None
	2. Accept site on condition that it is a long-term allocation.	Nothing specified but implies that site should be placed in a later tranche for release.	It is not possible to stipulate when reserve sites would need to be released. As things stand the site is in Tier 2, Tranche A because Bidford is a Main Rural Centre and it is a relatively small site.	Dependent on any review of tiers and tranches set out in Annex 3.
	3. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None
	4. Site is partly within Flood Zones 2 and 3 of a main river. Any proposed development should be in consultation with Environment Agency. Site has areas of high surface water flood risk. Any application for development must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy. Appropriate easements should be built into any development proposal. Modelling of flood waters and surface water flows should be considered and managed	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. Site Proforma specifies need for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Insert references to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy, incorporation of necessary easements, and modelling of flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.

	appropriately. May wish to consider viability of development given site will require significant mitigation.			
	5. Capacity issues may arise if more than one development connects into drainage system. Cumulative hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine full impact	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. The need for a Transport Assessment is already specified in Site Proforma.	None
	6. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.	Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. Site Proforma specifies requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Insert reference to requirement for a Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.
	7. Bidford has had far more than its fair share of development and no real improvements to local facilities and infrastructure.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that Bidford has grown considerably over recent years but it is a Main Rural Centre due to the range of shops and services it provides and its accessibility.	None
	8. Site is prime agricultural land and should be kept for this purpose.	Delete site	Site is relatively small and therefore has limited agricultural value.	None
	9. Development would be further encroachment into open countryside and impact on ecosystem and wildlife.	Delete site	Site is relatively small so development would have limited impact on countryside. It has no specific ecological value although existing hedgerows should be retained as far as possible.	None

	10. B439 is a busy road with frequent collisions. Development will increase traffic and pollution.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development would have very limited impact on traffic flows and pollution.	None
	11. In Bidford Neighbourhood Plan this site is outside village boundary and classified as countryside.	Delete site	Bidford NDP doesn't identify reserve housing sites so it is necessary for Site Allocations Plan to do so in accordance with Policy CS.16 in Core Strategy.	None
	12. Supported by site promoter but it is capable of accommodating 75-80 dwellings.	Amend capacity from 60 to 80 dwellings.	Dwelling capacity stated is indicative but takes into account the need to avoid flood zone on eastern part of site and to provide extensive landscaping along outer boundaries.	None
	13. Site boundary should be altered to incorporate additional land to south to provide better opportunities for open space and green infrastructure provision.	Amend site boundary to include additional area of land to south.	What is proposed is excessive and unnecessary in relation to creating a suitable layout and design of development on the area currently identified.	None

<b>Topic: BID.C North of Salford Road, Bidford-on-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 5</b>	<b>Object: 6</b>	<b>Other: 4</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council Elisabeth Uggerloese Wychavon District Council	1. Parish Council strenuously objects to site.	Delete site	There are no overriding reasons for deleting site based on environmental and technical grounds.	None

Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Severn Trent Water Environment Agency Steven Lincoln Michael Franklin Josephine Satwell David and Judith McCabe Penny Barry Richborough Estates Sport England	2. Further large scale development in Bidford is unsustainable unless major improvements to infrastructure are carried out.	Delete site	Further development in Bidford would be expected to provide necessary improvements to infrastructure.	None
	3. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None
	4. Site is partly within Flood Zones 2 and 3 of a main river. Any proposed development should be in consultation with Environment Agency. Site has areas of high surface water flood risk. Any application for development must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy. Appropriate easements should be built into any development proposal. Modelling of flood waters and surface water flows should be considered and managed appropriately. May wish to consider viability of development given site will require significant mitigation.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. Site Proforma specifies need for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Insert references to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy, incorporation of necessary easements, and modelling of flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.
	5. Capacity issues may arise if more than one development connects into drainage system. Cumulative hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine full impact	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. The need for a Transport Assessment is	None

			already specified in Site Proforma.	
	6. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.	Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference for development to avoid flood risk area and requirement for a Level 2 SFRA, Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.
	7. Bidford has had far more than its fair share of development and no real improvements to local facilities and infrastructure.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that Bidford has grown considerably over recent years but it is a Main Rural Centre due to the range of shops and services it provides and its accessibility.	None
	8. Site is prime agricultural land and should be kept for this purpose.	Delete site	This site would involve the loss of high quality agricultural land. However, the site area is well below the 20 hectare threshold specified in Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 whereby Natural England should be consulted.	None
	9. Development would be further encroachment into open countryside and impact on ecosystem and wildlife.	Delete site	It is accepted that this site would extend the built form of village into open countryside but it is relatively well contained in the landscape. It has no specific ecological value although existing hedgerows and other features should be retained as far as possible.	None
	10. B439 is a busy road with frequent collisions.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to this site but requires a Transport	None

	Development will increase traffic and pollution.		Assessment to be submitted by any applicant. This is already specified in Site Proforma.	
	11. In Bidford Neighbourhood Plan this site is outside village boundary and classified as countryside.	Delete site	Bidford NDP doesn't identify reserve housing sites so it is necessary for Site Allocations Plan to do so in accordance with Policy CS.16 in Core Strategy.	None
	12. Site is suitable because it gives access to bypass to Evesham or Alcester thus reducing traffic travelling through village.	None	Noted	None
	13. Promoter supports identification of site.	None	Noted	None
	14. Support indication that developable area will not abut adjacent playing field.	None	Noted	None

<b>Topic: BID.D East of Victoria Road, Bidford-on-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 4</b>	<b>Other: 4</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council Elisabeth Uggerloese Wychavon District Council	1. Parish Council strenuously objects to site.	Delete site	There are no overriding reasons for deleting site based on environmental and technical grounds.	None
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Severn Trent Water	2. Further large scale development in Bidford is unsustainable unless major	Delete site	Further development in Bidford would be expected to provide necessary	None

Environment Agency Michael Franklin David and Judith McCabe Miller Homes	improvements to infrastructure are carried out.		improvements to infrastructure.	
	3. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None
	4. Site has areas of high surface water flood risk. Any application for development must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy. Modelling of surface water flows should be considered and managed appropriately.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. Site Proforma specifies need for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Insert references to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy, incorporation of necessary easements, and modelling of flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.
	5. Capacity issues may arise if more than one development connects into drainage system. Cumulative hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine full impact.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. The need for a Transport Assessment is already specified in Site Proforma.	None
	6. A Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.	Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. Site Proforma specifies requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Insert reference to requirement for a Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.
	7. Bidford has had far more than its fair share of development and no real	Delete site	It is acknowledged that Bidford has grown considerably over recent years but it is a Main Rural	None

	improvements to local facilities and infrastructure.		Centre due to the range of shops and services it provides and its accessibility.	
	8. In Bidford Neighbourhood Plan this site is outside village boundary and classified as countryside.	Delete site	Bidford NDP doesn't identify reserve housing sites so it is necessary for Site Allocations Plan to do so in accordance with Policy CS.16 in Core Strategy.	None
	9. Promoter supports identification of site but requests site boundary is amended to exclude eastern part which is in a separate ownership.	Amend site boundary to exclude eastern part and amend dwelling capacity accordingly.	This would be appropriate as site promoter has no control over this area of land. Consequential changes to Annex 1 and Site Proforma would also be required.	Amend site boundary as shown on accompanying map. Amend Site Proforma to read Site Area (Gross) = 4.0 hectares, Net Site Area = 3.0 hectares, Dwelling Capacity = 90 Amend Annex 1 to read 90 dwellings

<b>Topic: BID.E West of Grafton Lane, Bidford-on-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 6</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council Elisabeth Uggerloese Wychavon District Council Severn Trent Water Environment Agency Michael Franklin David and Judith McCabe Steven Lincoln	1. Parish Council supports site being developed for mixed use (business/housing) but objects to it being allocated at this time.	Delete site	There are no overriding reasons for deleting site based on environmental and technical grounds. It would be appropriate to consider whether provision for business uses should be made on this site given its	Insert reference to provision of business floorspace as part of development in Site Proforma. Amend Site Proforma to read Net Site Area = 3.0 hectares, Dwelling Capacity = 90 Amend Annex 1 to read 90 dwellings

Suzanne Lincoln			proximity to existing industrial estate.	Amend net site area shown in cross-hatching on accompanying map.
	2. Further large scale development in Bidford is unsustainable unless major improvements to infrastructure are carried out.	Delete site	Further development in Bidford would be expected to provide necessary improvements to infrastructure.	None
	3. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None
	4. Capacity issues may arise if more than one development connects into drainage system. Cumulative hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine full impact	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application. The need for a Transport Assessment is already specified in Site Proforma.	None
	5. Bidford has had far more than its fair share of development and no real improvements to local facilities and infrastructure.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that Bidford has grown considerably over recent years but it is a Main Rural Centre due to the range of shops and services it provides and its accessibility.	None
	6. In Bidford Neighbourhood Plan this site is outside village	Delete site	Bidford NDP doesn't identify reserve housing sites so it is necessary for Site Allocations	None

	boundary and classified as countryside.		Plan to do so in accordance with Policy CS.16 in Core Strategy.	
	7. Site is much needed arable land.	Delete site	This site would involve the loss of high quality agricultural land. However, the site area is well below the 20 hectare threshold specified in Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 whereby Natural England should be consulted.	None
	8. Site is frequented by wildlife.	Delete site	Site has no specific ecological value although existing ecological features should be retained as far as possible.	None
	9. Grafton Lane is not suitable for amount of traffic that would arise.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but a Transport Assessment would be required as specified in Site Proforma.	None

<b>Topic: BISH.A North of Ladbroke Road, Bishop's Itchington</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

<p>Terra Rebecca Grier Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Environment Agency James Gordon-Cumming</p>	<p>1. Inclusion of site is unsound and unjustified as SHLAA has demonstrated that it has various constraints and would require substantial mitigation</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that site is affected by various constraints but limiting development to south-western part adjacent to committed doctor's surgery reduces impact of development and provides sufficient scope for mitigation.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>2. Village has experienced considerable development and growth in recent years or so and its character is changing. There is limited employment and increased traffic.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>While Bishop's Itchington has taken a significant amount of development in recent years, it supports a reasonable range of services and is relatively accessible. Further modest development would not have a major impact on its character.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>3. Additional traffic will need to negotiate a narrow and dangerous route through village and increase safety issues.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Scale of development proposed would not increase traffic flows significantly. County Highway Authority has not raised concerns about principle of site.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>4. Site has areas of high surface water flood risk. Any application for development must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy.</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.</p>	<p>Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.</p>
	<p>5. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.</p>	<p>Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.</p>	<p>This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.</p>	<p>Insert reference for development to avoid flood risk area and requirement for a Level 2 SFRA, Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.</p>

<b>Topic: BISH.B North of Hambridge Road, Bishop's Itchington</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Rebecca Grier Follett Property Holdings Ltd Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Environment Agency James Gordon-Cumming	1. Village has experienced considerable development and growth in recent years or so and its character is changing. There is limited employment and increased traffic.	Delete site	While Bishop's Itchington has taken a significant amount of development in recent years, it supports a reasonable range of services and is relatively accessible. Further modest development would not have a major impact on its character.	None
	2. Additional traffic will need to negotiate a narrow and dangerous route through village and increase safety issues.	Delete site	Scale of development proposed would not increase traffic flows significantly. County Highway Authority has not raised concerns about principle of access to site.	None
	3. Proposed widening of Hambridge Road would involve loss of grass strip that is an integral part of village, be detrimental to its enjoyment and increase risk of accidents.	Delete site	Loss of any of the grass strip would not be significant. County Highway Authority has not raised concerns about principle of access to site.	None
	4. Development would extend village beyond a well-established edge and into open countryside.	Delete site	Development of site would not be a significant extension of village into open countryside.	None
	5. Whole of site is uniform in its physical attributes and is capable of development.	Extend area identified as suitable for development.	Northern part is designated as a Local Wildlife Site so is unsuitable for development.	None
	6. Site has areas of high surface water flood risk. Any	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk

	application for development must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy.		applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	7. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.	Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference for development to avoid flood risk area and requirement for a Level 2 SFRA, Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.

<b>Topic: CLIF.A West of Campden Road (north), Clifford Chambers</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 23</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
A.S Kenny C & CM Ironmonger Mr Jonathan Tribe Natural England Mr Paul Baggett Mrs Elizabeth Baggett CPRE Warwickshire	1. Site is disconnected from current settlement and not well-integrated with existing community.	Delete site	While the site is on other side of main road it's adjacent to existing dwellings and well-related to village.	None
Louise Armstrong Historic England Miss Alison Gray Mr Robert Sprason Cllr Manuela Perteghella	2. Access to site onto B4362 would be dangerous.	Delete site	Access is proposed to be off Milcote Lane.	None
Dr Sara Reed and Mr John Reed Chris Fox Mr Myles Thornton Harold Frost Lisa Geldard	3. Site is adjacent to Built-Up Area Boundary which is contradictory to policies in Core Strategy.	Delete Site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	4. Village has very limited facilities	Delete site	This is acknowledged but village is a Category 4 LSV due to its regular bus service.	None
	5. Would represent over development in a location without facilities	Delete site	Scale of development on this site is very modest.	None

David Renfrew John Gray Angela Powell Clifford Chambers Parish Council Belinda Littleton Nicola Stratton A Simons Mr and Mrs Cryan	6. Additional development will focus on upmarket expensive housing and do nothing to provide affordable homes for young people born in village.	Delete site	There is scope within Core Strategy policies to provide for local housing need that is identified.	None
	7. There have been massive allocations at Long Marston Airfield and former MOD site so should not add more housing in village.	Delete site	Provision for further housing development is expected to be made across the District.	None
	8. Site is not included in Clifford Chambers and Milcote Neighbourhood Plan.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that NDP identifies a reserve housing site. That being the case the District Council's current position is not to identify further reserve sites in the SAP.	Dependent on District Council reviewing its approach on this matter.
	9. Milcote Road is busy and access would be dangerous.	Delete site	County Highway Authority has not objected to principle of access to site.	None
	10. Landowner of Rectory Farm is not supportive of providing access to site.	Delete site	Specific access arrangements have not been identified although acknowledged that if overriding ownership constraint to delivering site it should be deleted	None – subject to ownership issue being resolved.
	11. People would need to cross B4632 on foot or by car which would pose significant safety risk.	Delete site	County Highway Authority has not objected to principle of this site on safety grounds.	None
	12. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	13. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Clifford Chambers due to lack	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach	None

	of housing need and impact on village form and character.		established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	
	14. Increased amount of traffic would worsen existing noise and light pollution.	Delete site	Increase in traffic from development of site would be very modest and have negligible impact.	None
	15. Assessment of impact on heritage assets and mitigation of impact should be carried out.	Insert reference to this in Site Proforma.	This would be appropriate.	Insert reference to assessment of impact on heritage assets and appropriate mitigation in Site Proforma.
	16. Development would impact negatively on rural feel of settlement and its landscape setting	Delete site	Scale of development is very small and adjacent to existing dwellings so its impact would be minor.	None
	17. Site is best agricultural land.	Delete site	Loss of agricultural land is very small.	None
	18. Campden Road is already dangerous due to vehicles driven at excess speed.	Delete site	County Highway Authority has not objected to principle of this site on safety grounds.	None
	19. Campden Road is already at full capacity and cannot cope with any more vehicles.	Delete site	Number of additional vehicles generated by development of site would be very small.	None
	20. Would extend ribbon development on opposite side of road to village proper.	Delete site	Impact of small-scale development would be modest and be adjacent to existing development.	None
	21. Site is prone to serious flooding due to steep hillside and development would worsen flood conditions.	Delete site	Development of site would need to resolve surface water flooding satisfactorily.	Insert reference to managing surface water flood risk in Site Proforma.
	22. Rectory Fold development to north of site is an anomaly and should not be repeated.	Delete site	The existing development is attractive and there is scope to develop the adjacent site in a sensitive and consistent	None

			manner through an appropriate layout and design.	
	23. Site is important for flora and fauna it supports.	Delete site	No specific ecological value has been identified.	None

<b>Topic: CLIF.B East of Campden Road (south), Clifford Chambers</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 21</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
A.S Kenny Severn Trent Water C & CM Ironmonger Mr Jonathan Tribe	1. Site is disconnected from current settlement and not well-integrated with existing community.	Delete site	Site is adjacent to existing built form of village and is readily accessible to it.	None
Natural England Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd Mr Paul Baggett Mrs Elizabeth Baggett CPRE Warwickshire Louise Armstrong Miss Alison Gray Mr Robert Sprason Cllr Manuela Perteghella	2. Site is susceptible to flooding and its development would exacerbate this.	Delete site	The site clearly floods due to surface water run-off and would need to be addressed satisfactorily. There is no overriding reason why this won't be possible by incorporating effective measures into development as specified in Site Proforma.	None
Dr Sara Reed and Mr John Reed Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Jacqui Dyos Nicholas Dyos Chris Fox Mr Myles Thornton David Renfrew Belinda Littleton Nicola Stratton	3. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed as specified in Site Proforma. It would be appropriate to specify requirement for a Level 2 SFRA in Site Proforma.	Insert reference to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in Site Proforma.

A Simons Mr and Mrs Cryan Michael Genge Clifford Chambers Parish Council	4. Access to site onto B4362 would be dangerous.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't raised concerns about principle of site but a Road Safety Audit will be required as specified in Site Proforma.	None
	5. Site is adjacent to Built-Up Area Boundary which is contradictory to policies in Core Strategy.	Delete Site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	6. Village has very limited facilities	Delete site	This is acknowledged but village is a Category 4 LSV due to its regular bus service.	None
	7. Would represent over development in a location without facilities	Delete site	Scale of development on this site is very modest.	None
	8. Additional development will focus on upmarket expensive housing and do nothing to provide affordable homes for young people born in village.	Delete site	There is scope within Core Strategy policies to provide for local housing need that is identified.	None
	9. There have been massive allocations at Long Marston Airfield and former MOD site so should not add more housing in village.	Delete site	Provision for further housing development is expected to be made across the District.	None
	10. Site is not included in Clifford Chambers and Milcote Neighbourhood Plan.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that NDP identifies a reserve housing site. That being the case the District Council's current position is not to identify further reserve sites in the SAP.	Dependent on District Council reviewing its approach on this matter.
	11. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy	None

	quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.		CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	
	12. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Clifford Chambers due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	13. Promoter of site supports its allocation as it represents a highly sustainable site.	None specified	This is accepted subject to further assessment of site specific issues.	None
	14. Assessment of impact on heritage assets and mitigation of impact should be carried out.	Insert reference to this in Site Proforma.	This would be appropriate.	Insert reference to assessment of impact on heritage assets and appropriate mitigation in Site Proforma.
	15. Campden Road is already dangerous due to vehicles driven at excess speed.	Delete site	County Highway Authority has not objected to principle of this site on safety grounds.	None
	16. Campden Road is already at full capacity and cannot cope with any more vehicles.	Delete site	Number of additional vehicles generated by development of site would be very small.	None
	17. Site is best agricultural land.	Delete site	Loss of agricultural land is very small.	None
	18. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed. Comprehensive mitigation is expected to ensure there will be no increase in flood risk to existing and proposed developments. May wish to consider viability of	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.

	development given site will require significant mitigation.			
	19. Development will destroy unique character of environment.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is relatively modest and well-related to existing village form.	None
	20. Village has no street lighting resulting in a dark night sky which is part of its character. New development would require street lighting which will adversely alter its traditional nature.	Delete site	While development would probably require street lighting its design should be sensitive to the area to reduce impact.	None
	21. Would cause significant detriment to outlook of conservation area and amenity of local residents.	Delete site	Site is some distance from boundary of conservation area with little inter-visibility. Impact of development on existing properties would be addressed in its layout and design.	None
	22. Site provides a visual break between main road and village.	Delete site	Site's contribution in this respect is very limited.	None
	23. Site acts as natural air pollution filter from traffic fumes.	Delete site	Site's contribution in this respect is very limited.	None
	24. Site is important for flora and fauna it supports.	Delete site	No specific ecological value has been identified.	None

<b>Topic: CLIF.C East of Campden Road (north), Clifford Chambers</b>	<b>Support: 11</b>	<b>Object: 4</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	--------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

<p>Mr Paul Baggett  Mr Paul Baggett  David Renfrew  A.S Kenny  John Eillot  Mr Jonathan Tribe  Natural England  Mrs Elizabeth Baggett  Michael Farthing  CPRE Warwickshire  Louise Armstrong  U.S &amp; D.M Stanley &amp; Son  Historic England  Trevor Acreman  Warwickshire County Council -  Flood Risk  Melanie Hateley  Environment Agency</p>	<p>1. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed. Comprehensive mitigation is expected to ensure there will be no increase in flood risk to existing and proposed developments. May wish to consider viability of development given site will require significant mitigation.</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.</p>	<p>Insert references to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.</p>
	<p>2. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.</p>	<p>Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.</p>	<p>This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.</p>	<p>Insert reference for development to avoid flood risk area and requirement for a Level 2 SFRA, Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.</p>
	<p>3. Development should be set back at minimum 8m from watercourse to allow access for maintenance and restoring natural floodplain.</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>This point is noted but proposed extent of development does not impinge on watercourse.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>4. Assessment of impact on heritage assets and mitigation of impact should be carried out.</p>	<p>Insert reference to this in Site Proforma.</p>	<p>This would be appropriate.</p>	<p>Insert reference to assessment of impact on heritage assets and appropriate mitigation in Site Proforma.</p>
	<p>5. Will cause increased amount of traffic with noise, general pollution and increased amount of accidents.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Scale of increase in traffic and its impact will be relatively modest. County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>6. No justification for identifying reserve sites in</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites</p>	<p>None</p>

	Clifford Chambers due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.		accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	
	7. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None

<b>Topic: CLIF.D East of The Nashes, Clifford Chambers</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 26</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
A.S Kenny Severn Trent Water C & CM Ironmonger Mr Jonathan Tribe Natural England	1. Site is disconnected from current settlement and not well-integrated with existing community.	Delete site	Site is adjacent to existing built form of village and is readily accessible to it.	None
Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd Mr Paul Baggett Mrs Elizabeth Baggett Michael Farthing CPRE Warwickshire Louise Armstrong Historic England	2. 150 year old oak trees along northern edge of site form historic boundary of village and are protected by TPOs would be put at risk if site developed due to change in water table.	Delete site	Protection of these trees is specified in Site Proforma and this would need to take into account any effect of development on the water table.	None
Miss Alison Gray Mr Robert Sprason Cllr Manuela Perteghella Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Jacqui Dyos	3. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed as specified in Site Proforma. It would be appropriate to specify requirement for a Level 2 SFRA in Site Proforma.	Insert reference to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in Site Proforma.

Clifford Chambers Parish Council Nicholas Dyos Chris Fox Mr Myles Thornton David Renfrew Angela Powell Belinda Littleton Nicola Stratton A Simons Paul Collins Mr and Mrs Cryan Michael Genge Linda Pollock	connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.			
	4. Access to site onto B4362 would be dangerous.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't raised concerns about principle of site but a Road Safety Audit will be required as specified in Site Proforma.	None
	5. Site is adjacent to Built-Up Area Boundary which is contradictory to policies in Core Strategy.	Delete Site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	6. Village has very limited facilities	Delete site	This is acknowledged but village is a Category 4 LSV due to its regular bus service.	None
	7. Would represent over development in a location without facilities	Delete site	Scale of development on this site is very modest.	None
	8. Additional development will focus on upmarket expensive housing and do nothing to provide affordable homes for young people born in village.	Delete site	There is scope within Core Strategy policies to provide for local housing need that is identified.	None
	9. There have been massive allocations at Long Marston Airfield and former MOD site so should not add more housing in village.	Delete site	Provision for further housing development is expected to be made across the District.	None
	10. Site is not included in Clifford Chambers and Milcote Neighbourhood Plan.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that NDP identifies a reserve housing site. That being the case the District Council's current position is not to identify further reserve sites in the SAP.	Dependent on District Council reviewing its approach on this matter.

	11. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	12. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Clifford Chambers due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	13. Promoter of site supports its allocation as it represents a highly sustainable site.	None specified	This is accepted subject to further assessment of site specific issues.	None
	14. Assessment of impact on heritage assets and mitigation of impact should be carried out.	Insert reference to this in Site Proforma.	This would be appropriate.	Insert reference to assessment of impact on heritage assets and appropriate mitigation in Site Proforma.
	15. Path along northern boundary is well used by residents due to its admirable landscape and rural setting.	Delete site	Not evident that this path is a public right of way.	None
	16. Campden Road is already dangerous due to vehicles driven at excess speed.	Delete site	County Highway Authority has not objected to principle of this site on safety grounds.	None
	17. Campden Road is already at full capacity and cannot cope with any more vehicles.	Delete site	Number of additional vehicles generated by development of site would be very small.	None
	18. Site is best agricultural land.	Delete site	Loss of agricultural land is very small.	None
	19. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.

	how water will be managed. Comprehensive mitigation is expected to ensure there will be no increase in flood risk to existing and proposed developments. May wish to consider viability of development given site will require significant mitigation.			
	20. Development will destroy unique character of environment.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is relatively modest and well-related to existing village form.	None
	21. Village has no street lighting resulting in a dark night sky which is part of its character. New development would require street lighting which will adversely alter its traditional nature.	Delete site	While development would probably require street lighting its design should be sensitive to the area to reduce impact.	None
	22. Would cause significant detriment to outlook of conservation area and amenity of local residents.	Delete site	Due to existing development between site and conservation area there is little inter-visibility. Impact of development on existing properties would be addressed in its layout and design.	None
	23. Site provides a visual break between main road and village.	Delete site	Site's contribution in this respect is very limited.	None
	24. Site acts as natural air pollution filter from traffic fumes.	Delete site	Site's contribution in this respect is very limited.	None
	25. Site is important for flora and fauna it supports.	Delete site	No specific ecological value has been identified.	None

<b>Topic: FEN.1 East of Ridge Way, Fenny Compton</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 14</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Fiona and Julian Meyrick Sarah and Paul Grant Jane and Alton Ainley Stratford District Council Liberal Democrat Group Jason Wise Natural England	1. Government has announced an updated method for the amount and location of new homes. This revised strategy suggests sites in Fenny Compton are no longer required.	Delete site	Such a revised approach is yet to be confirmed and the District Council is currently obliged to identify reserve sites for approximately 3000 dwellings in accordance with adopted Core Strategy.	None
Greg and Cherie Southgate Robert Purse Sam Hunt Jill and Alan Rankin	2. Supply of new homes in Fenny Compton has already exceeded Core Strategy allocation in Policy CS.16.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
Michael and Lesley Bosman CPRE Warwickshire Josephine Taylor Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Christ Church College	3. Additional housing developments would increase flood risk. Flood mitigation measures must be considered given recent flooding history in village.	Delete site	Development of the site will be required to ensure that flood risk isn't increased off site. In light of this issue, it would be appropriate to require a Level 2 SFRA to be produced.	Insert reference to need to address flood risk and require a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in Site Proforma.
Fenny Compton Parish Council Historic England Cllr Nigel Rock	4. Limited infrastructure in village to cope with further housing.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	5. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	6. Fenny Compton is a relatively small village that has already taken considerable development.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that the village has taken a substantial amount of development in recent years although this will	None

			mainly be through redeveloping the Compton Buildings site. The reserve sites identified are all relatively small.	
	7. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Fenny Compton due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	8. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed. Comprehensive mitigation is expected to ensure there will be no increase in flood risk to existing and proposed developments. May wish to consider viability of development given site will require significant mitigation.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	9. Landowner states that site can be brought forward quickly.	None specified	Noted	None
	10. Fenny Compton is not a sustainable location for further development due to lack of adequate public and road transport links	Delete site	Fenny Compton is identified as Category 2 Local Service Village because it supports a relatively good range of facilities and is reasonably accessible.	None
	11. Neighbourhood Plan is well advanced and does not	Delete site	Until the Neighbourhood Plan is made it is necessary for the	None

	identify any of reserve sites identified as suitable for development.		District Council to identify reserve housing sites in accordance with Core Strategy.	
	12. Reference to assessment and mitigation of impact of development on heritage assets adjacent to site is supported.	None	Noted	None
	13. Site acts as important location to delay movement of water off the hills into village during high rainfall. Issues associated with Ridge Way development must be resolved before any attempt to develop this site.	Delete site	It will be necessary to ensure development of site doesn't increase off-site flood risk and there is potential for existing flooding issues to be alleviated.	None

<b>Topic: FEN.B North of Northend Road (west), Fenny Compton</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 13</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Fiona and Julian Meyrick Sarah and Paul Grant Jane and Alton Ainley Jason Wise Natural England Greg and Cherie Southgate Robert Purse Sam Hunt	1. Government has announced an updated method for the amount and location of new homes. This revised strategy suggests sites in Fenny Compton are no longer required.	Delete site	Such a revised approach is yet to be confirmed and the District Council is currently obliged to identify reserve sites for approximately 3000 dwellings in accordance with adopted Core Strategy.	None
Jill and Alan Rankin Michael and Lesley Bosman CPRE Warwickshire	2. Supply of new homes in Fenny Compton has already exceeded Core Strategy allocation in Policy CS.16.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None

<p>Josephine Taylor Historic England Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Mr E Smith and Mrs S Smith Fenny Compton Parish Council Jacci Gooding</p>	<p>3. Additional housing developments would increase flood risk. Flood mitigation measures must be considered given recent flooding history in village</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Development of the site will be required to ensure that flood risk isn't increased off site. In light of this issue, it would be appropriate to require a Level 2 SFRA to be produced.</p>	<p>Insert reference to need to address flood risk and require a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in Site Proforma.</p>
	<p>4. Limited infrastructure in village to cope with further housing.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>5. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>6. Fenny Compton is a relatively small village that has already taken considerable development.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the village has taken a substantial amount of development in recent years although this will mainly be through redeveloping the Compton Buildings site. The reserve sites identified are all relatively small.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>7. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Fenny Compton due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>8. Need to ensure that satisfied that impact on non-designated heritage asset is appropriately addressed through archaeological evaluation of site as site may be within extent of medieval</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>Such an assessment would be required to be undertaken and submitted with any planning application for the site. This matter is already identified in Site Proforma.</p>	<p>None</p>

	settlement. This should be done in advance of allocation being made.			
	9. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed. Comprehensive mitigation is expected to ensure there will be no increase in flood risk to existing and proposed developments. May wish to consider viability of development given site will require significant mitigation.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	10. Landowner confirms that site is available for development.	None specified	Noted	None
	11. Fenny Compton is not a sustainable location for further development due to lack of adequate public and road transport links	Delete site	Fenny Compton is identified as Category 2 Local Service Village because it supports a relatively good range of facilities and is reasonably accessible.	None
	12. Neighbourhood Plan is well advanced and does not identify any of reserve sites identified as suitable for development.	Delete site	Until the Neighbourhood Plan is made it is necessary for the District Council to identify reserve housing sites in accordance with Core Strategy.	None
	13. Site is in close proximity to existing industrial units	Delete site	Impact of commercial uses will need to be addressed.	Insert reference to ensuring impact of adjacent industrial units is taken into account in Site Proforma.

	14. Need to review speed limit due to site's proximity to entry to village.	Delete site	This is a matter that County Highway Authority will address through planning application process.	None
	15. Northend Road suffers from amount of traffic and speeding drivers and is relatively straight. There is no provision for cycle lanes and traffic calming measures.	Delete site	These are matters that County Highway Authority will address through planning application process.	None

<b>Topic: FEN.C North of Station Road (west), Fenny Compton</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 13</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Fiona and Julian Meyrick Sarah and Paul Grant Jane and Alton Ainley Stratford Liberal Democrat Group Jason Wise Natural England	1. Government has announced an updated method for the amount and location of new homes. This revised strategy suggests sites in Fenny Compton are no longer required.	Delete site	Such a revised approach is yet to be confirmed and the District Council is currently obliged to identify reserve sites for approximately 3000 dwellings in accordance with adopted Core Strategy.	None
Greg and Cherie Southgate Robert Purse Sam Hunt Lagan Homes	2. Supply of new homes in Fenny Compton has already exceeded Core Strategy allocation in Policy CS.16.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
Jill and Alan Rankin Michael and Lesley Bosman CPRE Warwickshire Josephine Taylor Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk	3. Additional housing developments would increase flood risk. Flood mitigation measures must be considered given recent flooding history in village.	Delete site	Development of the site will be required to ensure that flood risk isn't increased off site. In light of this issue, it would be appropriate to require a Level 2 SFRA to be produced.	Insert reference to need to address flood risk and require a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in Site Proforma.

Fenny Compton Parish Council Historic England	4. Limited infrastructure in village to cope with further housing.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	5. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	6. Fenny Compton is a relatively small village that has already taken considerable development.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that the village has taken a substantial amount of development in recent years although this will mainly be through redeveloping the Compton Buildings site. The reserve sites identified are all relatively small.	None
	7. Landowners and developers support site but believe it is capable of delivering 25 dwellings to ensure effective use of land.	Increase site capacity to 25 dwellings.	Site is constrained by ecological value of northern part and watercourse along western boundary.	None
	8. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Fenny Compton due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and which was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	9. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed. Comprehensive mitigation is	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.

	expected to ensure there will be no increase in flood risk to existing and proposed developments. May wish to consider viability of development given site will require significant mitigation.			
	10. Fenny Compton is not a sustainable location for further development due to lack of adequate public and road transport links	Delete site	Fenny Compton is identified as Category 2 Local Service Village because it supports a relatively good range of facilities and is reasonably accessible.	None
	11. Neighbourhood Plan is well advanced and does not identify any of reserve sites identified as suitable for development.	Delete site	Until the Neighbourhood Plan is made it is necessary for the District Council to identify reserve housing sites in accordance with Core Strategy.	None

<b>Topic: FEN.D North of High Street, Fenny Compton</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 16</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Fiona and Julian Meyrick Sarah and Paul Grant Jane and Alton Ainley Stratford District Council Liberal Democrat Group Jason Wise Natural England	1. Government has announced an updated method for the amount and location of new homes. This revised strategy suggests sites in Fenny Compton are no longer required.	Delete site	Such a revised approach is yet to be confirmed and the District Council is currently obliged to identify reserve sites for approximately 3000 dwellings in accordance with adopted Core Strategy.	None
Greg and Cherie Southgate Robert Purse	2. Supply of new homes in Fenny Compton has already	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the	None

<p>Sam Hunt Jill and Alan Rankin Michael and Lesley Bosman CPRE Warwickshire Josephine Taylor Historic England Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Fenny Compton Parish Council Cllr Nigel Rock Courtney Sullivan Chris Whitwell</p>	exceeded Core Strategy allocation in Policy CS.16.		allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	
	3. Additional housing developments would increase flood risk. Flood mitigation measures must be considered given recent flooding history in village.	Delete site	Development of the site will be required to ensure that flood risk isn't increased off site. In light of this issue, it would be appropriate to require a Level 2 SFRA to be produced.	Insert reference to need to address flood risk and require a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in Site Proforma.
	4. Limited infrastructure in village to cope with further housing.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	5. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	6. Fenny Compton is a relatively small village that has already taken considerable development.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that the village has taken a substantial amount of development in recent years although this will mainly be through redeveloping the Compton Buildings site. The reserve sites identified are all relatively small.	None
	7. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Fenny Compton due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy which endorsed by Inspector who examined it.	None
	8. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.

	how water will be managed. Comprehensive mitigation is expected to ensure there will be no increase in flood risk to existing and proposed developments. May wish to consider viability of development given site will require significant mitigation.			
	9. Area could be a continuation of medieval settlement and should be reviewed in advance of being allocated to assess whether it is deliverable in accordance with NPPF. This should be done in advance of allocation being made.	None specified	Such an assessment would be required to be undertaken and submitted with any planning application for the site. This matter is already identified in Site Proforma.	None
	10. Fenny Compton is not a sustainable location for further development due to lack of adequate public and road transport links	Delete site	Fenny Compton is identified as Category 2 Local Service Village because it supports a relatively good range of facilities and is reasonably accessible.	None
	11. Site is primary outflow route for water from village by means of watercourse adjacent to site which has itself flooded.	Delete site	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to requirement for a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	12. Neighbourhood Plan is well advanced and does not identify any of reserve sites identified as suitable for development.	Delete site	Until the Neighbourhood Plan is made it is necessary for the District Council to identify reserve housing sites in accordance with Core Strategy.	None
	13. Proposal for 15 dwellings exceeds proposed	Delete site	Neighbourhood Plan has not reached an advanced stage	None

	Neighbourhood Plan limit of 10 dwellings.		so it would be inappropriate to place significant weight on this matter.	
--	---	--	--	--

<b>Topic: GAY.A South of Church Lane (west), Gaydon</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 5</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
John Davies Paul Graham Morgan Natural England Environment Agency Ms Cathie Tsoukkas Hayward Developments Ltd Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk CPRE Warwickshire Steve Taylor	1. Gaydon does not have the infrastructure to support further housing development.	Delete site	Scale of housing development identified on reserve sites in Gaydon is relatively small and there are no known overriding constraints.	None
	2. Gaydon has exceeded the number of houses allocated in adopted Core Strategy.	Delete site	Provision of dwellings on reserve housing sites is over and above that specified in Core Strategy Policy CS.16 for Local Service Villages.	None
	3. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	4. Detailed hydraulic modelling should be undertaken to establish impact of flood risk from watercourse.	None specified	This is an issue that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need for hydraulic modelling to establish impact on flood risk from watercourse in Site Proforma.
	5. Perverse that further housing arising out of employment allocation at Jaguar Land Rover isn't proposed within or adjacent	Delete site	Inspector who examined Core Strategy made it clear that provision for reserve housing should not be	None

	to Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath new settlement.		related to an existing new settlement as there was no prospect of dwellings being delivered in a timely manner.	
	6. Proximity of built development so close to adjacent listed building (The Leys) would have a permanent and significant effect on its setting contrary to objectives and provisions of national planning guidance.	Delete site	Extent of development has been identified on Site Proforma in order to reduce impact on setting of listed building. Heritage Impact Assessment has concluded that this would mitigate level of harm by focussing development away from heritage asset.	Dependent on outcome of heritage consultant's assessment of site.
	7. Proposed development would extend across most of length of boundary of The Leys and result in loss of outlook towards rolling countryside to south.	Delete site	It is accepted that the development would affect outlook from property to some extent but this isn't an overriding constraint to development in itself.	None
	8. Development would result in significant harm to landscape and visual setting of village.	Delete site	While wider landscape south of village is of high sensitivity development of a small parcel would not be inappropriate subject to suitable mitigation through layout and landscaping along outer boundary of site.	Insert reference to creating a hedgerow with intermittent trees along southern and eastern boundaries of site in Site Proforma.
	9. Site includes an area of land forming part of curtilage of The Leys.	Delete site	Proposed development area of site doesn't include any of this property	None
	10. Promoter of site and have retained an interest in access from Edgehill View development to west so are in a position to deliver site	None	Noted	None
	11. Proposed housing site should be extended to boundary	Amend extent of proposed development area.	Proposed development area as shown by cross-hatching	None

	of neighbouring property to east rather than follow an arbitrary line.		on Site Proforma reflects the need to avoid adverse impact on setting of adjacent listed building.	
	12. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed. Consideration of overland flow routes needed in any management schemes including providing surface water flooding compensation.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	13. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Gaydon due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None

<b>Topic: GAY.B East of Banbury Road (south), Gaydon</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Lone Star Land Limited Steve Taylor John Davies	1. Promoter of site supports its identification and confirms it is available.	None specified	Noted	None
Natural England Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk	2. Site extends into open countryside and is highly	Delete site	Site is well-related to form of village and would have little impact on its setting.	None

Paul Tracey CPRE Warwickshire	visible from approach road to village			
	3. Gaydon does not have the infrastructure to support further housing development.	Delete site	Scale of housing development identified on reserve sites in Gaydon is relatively small and there are no known overriding constraints.	None
	4. Gaydon has exceeded the number of houses allocated in adopted Core Strategy.	Delete site	Provision of dwellings on reserve housing sites is over and above that specified in Core Strategy Policy CS.16 for Local Service Villages.	None
	5. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	6. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed. Consideration of overland flow routes needed in any management schemes including providing surface water flooding compensation.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	7. Would take away further natural land where many rare animals have been sighted.	Delete site	Site hasn't been identified as having any specific ecological value and amount of land affected is relatively modest.	None
	8. Access through Edgehill View is a minor estate road with very limited visibility and	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it	None

	access at entrance is very narrow.		requires will need to be achievable.	
	9. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Gaydon due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None

<b>Topic: GAY.C South of Kineton Road, Gaydon</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 9</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Steve Taylor John Davies Paul Tracey Joe Hudson Cathy Morgan (Petition of local residents)	1. Site extends into open countryside and is highly visible from approach road to village	Delete site	Site is well-related to form of village and would have little impact on its setting subject to appropriate layout, design and landscaping along outer boundary.	None
Cathy Morgan Paul Graham Morgan Natural England Ellis Machinery Ltd CPRE Warwickshire Steve Taylor	2. Gaydon does not have the infrastructure to support further housing development.	Delete site	Scale of housing development identified on reserve sites in Gaydon is relatively small and there are no known overriding constraints.	None
	3. Gaydon has exceeded the number of houses allocated in adopted Core Strategy.	Delete site	Provision of dwellings on reserve housing sites is over and above that specified in Core Strategy Policy CS.16 for Local Service Villages.	None
	4. Would take away further natural land where many rare animals have been sighted.	Delete site	Site hasn't been identified as having any specific ecological	None

			value and amount of land affected is relatively modest.	
	5. Infilling between Toll House Cottage and existing edge of Gaydon would significantly detract from its historic charm	Delete site	Toll House Cottage is not listed so its setting is not protected as such.	None
	6. Existing levels and speed of traffic along Kineton Road are of great concern to village residents.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	7. Site is supported by landowner but area identified for housing development represents an under-utilisation of suitable land.	Extend area identified for housing development to cover entire field.	Such an increased scale of development would be too large given the size of Gaydon and have a significant impact on its character and setting. It is maintained that the current area identified is appropriate.	None
	8. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	9. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Gaydon due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	10. No amount of landscaping and public open space will mitigate adverse visual impact of housing development on the site.	Delete site	It is agreed that extensive landscaping would be required to assist in minimising the impact of development but site is well-related to existing physical form of village.	None

<b>Topic: HALF.A East of Fosse Way (north), Halford</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
CPRE Warwickshire Warwickshire County Council – Flood Risk Alick Petit Historic England	1. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Halford due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	2. Western part of site is high surface water risk so any future application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	3. Landowners support allocation as a reserve site and confirm it can be delivered.	None specified	Noted	None
	4. Mitigation such as reduced developable area and/or appropriate planting would help reduce harm to heritage assets.	None specified	These matters can be addressed by an applicant and through the determination of any planning application.	None

<b>Topic: HAR.A North of Mill Street (west), Harbury</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer:</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Harbury Society Warwickshire County Council – Flood Risk Severn Trent Water Mr & Mrs Hart Historic England	1. Harbury has already achieved its requirements for housing which has put significant strain on facilities, utilities and road congestion.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. Scale of development on site is relatively small and would have limited impact on village.	None
	2. Site has pocket of surface water flood risk so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	3. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed as specified in Site Proforma. It would be appropriate to specify requirement for a Level 2 SFRA in Site Proforma.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	4. Site is outside village envelope identified in Neighbourhood Plan where there is a presumption to develop within but not outside.	Delete site	Harbury NDP doesn't identify reserve housing sites so it is necessary for Site Allocations Plan to do so in accordance with Policy CS.16 in Core Strategy.	None

	5. No evidence that village infrastructure could cope with such an influx of development.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is relatively modest and there are no apparent overriding infrastructure constraints.	None
	6. Requirement for an archaeological investigation is welcomed as ridge and furrow present on site.	None specified	Noted	None

<b>Topic: HAR.B South of Middle Road, Harbury</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 10</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
R.L & S.K Phillips Mr and Mrs Hart Mr and Mrs M.H. and J.A. Morris Harbury Society	1. Treens Hill access is unsuitable and addition of another entrance would add extra hazards.	Delete site	Proposed access to site is off Farley Avenue with only an emergency access to be provided off Middle Road (Treens Hill)	None
Mr and Mrs J.F and P.S Smith Mr and Mrs E Wilson Christopher and Cassie Houghton Andrew Cook Environment Agency	2. Access from Farm Road and Farley Avenue would be difficult and unsuitable as route is narrow and would cause problems for vans or large vehicles.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires as identified in Site Proforma will need to be achievable.	None
John Holden Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk	3. No evidence that village infrastructure could cope with such an influx of development.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is relatively modest and there are no apparent overriding infrastructure constraints.	None
	4. It is wrong to destroy this part of south Warwickshire.	Delete site	Only a small-scale development is proposed which would have a very	None

			limited impact on character of area.	
	5. Treens Hill is considered to be natural and sensible boundary to village as land drops away significantly at this point.	Delete site	Development is proposed to be restricted to eastern part of site that is level with existing village and well-enclosed.	None
	6. Harbury Neighbourhood Plan identifies significant views out of village which should be preserved.	Delete site	Development is proposed to be restricted to eastern part of site that is well-enclosed and with limited views.	None
	7. Provides an important wildlife habitat including for several rarer and endangered species.	Delete site	Site hasn't been identified as having any specific ecological value and very small amount of land is affected so loss of habitat would be limited.	None
	8. Site provides natural drainage of water run-off down escarpment from village.	Delete site	Development is proposed to be restricted to eastern part of site that is level and wouldn't affect natural drainage provided by sloping land to west.	None
	9. Topography would demand a pumped system to connect with village sewer network.	Delete site	Development is proposed to be restricted to eastern part of site that is level with existing village so pumping would not be required.	None
	10. There is a shortage of water supply at western end of village.	Delete site	Severn Trent Water is responsible for ensuring water supply is sufficient.	None
	11. Site is a significant distance from centre of village and would require residents to climb a steep hill this encouraging use of motor vehicles to access amenities.	Delete site	Access is proposed off Farley Avenue so village amenities would be relatively easily accessible.	None
	12. Detailed hydraulic modelling should be	None specified	This is an issue that needs to be addressed by an applicant	Insert reference to need for hydraulic modelling to

	undertaken to establish impact of flood risk from watercourse.		and in determination of any planning application.	establish impact on flood risk from watercourse in Site Proforma.
	13. Public footpath would be severed by access from Farley Avenue.	Delete site	Proposed development should ensure public footpath is retained.	Insert reference to incorporation of public footpath in Site Proforma.
	14. Site has pocket of surface water flood risk so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	15. Site is one of very few enclosures farmed in the traditional way and its partial development would be detrimental to viability of holding.	Delete site	Development is proposed to be restricted to eastern part of site so only a small amount of land would be lost from farming activities.	None

<b>Topic: HAR.C North of Binswood End, Harbury</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 5</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Harbury Society Warwickshire County Council – Flood Risk Rainier Developments Ltd P & A Crowton Mr and Mrs Hart Historic England	1. Harbury has already achieved its requirements for housing which has put significant strain on facilities, utilities and road congestion.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. Scale of development on site is relatively small and would have limited impact on village.	None
	2. Site is outside village envelope identified in	Delete site	Harbury NDP doesn't identify reserve housing sites so it is	None

	Neighbourhood Plan where there is a presumption to develop within but not outside.		necessary for Site Allocations Plan to do so in accordance with Policy CS.16 in Core Strategy.	
	3. Site has pocket of surface water flood risk so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	4. Site promoter supports its identification in the Plan although believe it can accommodate additional number of dwellings.	Increase dwelling number indicated for site	Extent of suitable housing development is identified given nature of site in relation to physical form of village and surrounding countryside.	None
	5. Land has a history of flooding and is site of sewage pumping station that has overflowed in the past.	Delete site	This matter would need to be resolved satisfactorily through a planning application.	None
	6. Mill Street is not suitable for HGVs due to pinch points, increased vehicle movements could endanger school children, and is very congested when parents drop off or collect children.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	7. Field gives one of few remaining views of countryside.	Delete site	This impact is acknowledged but retention of public footpaths in any development will ensure that countryside remains accessible and visible.	None
	8. Public footpaths that cross site are very well used linking to Centenary Way.	Delete site	These will be incorporated into any development.	None

	9. Cost of removing fuel tanks at redundant garage would be very costly.	Delete site	This is a matter developer to assess.	None
	10. No evidence that village infrastructure could cope with such an influx of development.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is relatively modest and there are no apparent overriding infrastructure constraints.	None
	11. Mitigation such as reduced developable area and/or appropriate planting would help reduce harm to heritage assets.	None specified	These matters can be addressed by an applicant and through the determination of any planning application.	None

<b>Topic: HAR.D West of Butt Lane, Harbury</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Harbury Society Mr & Mrs Hart	1. Harbury has already achieved its requirements for housing which has put significant strain on facilities, utilities and road congestion.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. Scale of development on site is relatively small and would have limited impact on village.	None
	2. If site is developed there should be no building on allotment land.	None specified	Retention of allotments is stipulated in Site Proforma.	None
	3. Site is outside village envelope identified in Neighbourhood Plan where there is a presumption to develop within but not outside.	Delete site	Harbury NDP doesn't identify reserve housing sites so it is necessary for Site Allocations Plan to do so in accordance	None

			with Policy CS.16 in Core Strategy.	
	4. No evidence that village infrastructure could cope with such an influx of development.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is relatively modest and there are no apparent overriding infrastructure constraints.	None

<b>Topic: HCW.A North of former Harbury Cement Works</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 4</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Bishop's Itchington Parish Council Corbally Group (Harbury) Ltd Mark Russell Gary Mallinson Anonymous	1. Bishop's Itchington has proposed 183% of its proposed housing identified in Core Strategy Policy CS.16 so if this site is developed it would further village's over delivery.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	2. Promoter of site supports its identification in the Plan.	None specified	Noted	None
	3. Development of site would result in loss of rear views from property.	Delete site	Development of site would be required to protect amenity of adjacent properties but loss of a view is not an overriding constraint to development.	None
	4. Loss of current character of recent development to south.	Delete site	Layout and design should seek to respect character of existing development and integrate with it.	None
	5. Would result in joining up with Deppers Bridge.	Delete site	A significant gap would remain between development and Deppers Bridge with railway	None

			line providing a strong physical edge.	
	6. Developer advised purchasers of properties on development to south that land would remain rural and not be built on.	Delete site	That isn't something the developer could have guaranteed.	None
	7. No development on this land was declared by Council when solicitors completed searches.	Delete site	That would have been the case at the time.	None
	8. Agricultural land provides a stable habitat for many species and evidence on this needs be undertaken.	Delete site	Site hasn't been identified as having any specific ecological value but an assessment would be expected to be produced by any applicant.	None
	9. No traffic plan has been produced to support further development given that existing network is overburdened	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to this site but requires a Transport Assessment to be submitted by any applicant as stipulated in Site Proforma.	None
	10. Local farmer who has tenancy over land has not been contacted and would require compensation.	Delete site	This isn't a planning matter but would need to be resolved between the landowner and tenant.	None
	11. Infrastructure in area is not capable of handling increase in population.	Delete site	Development would be required to make necessary improvements to infrastructure.	None
	12. There is no flood alleviation scheme to deal with flood risk and increased run-off.	Delete site	Applicant will be required to produce a flood risk assessment and ensure that no increase in flood risk on existing properties.	None

<b>Topic: LMAR.A East of Long Marston Road (middle), Long Marston</b>	<b>Support: 4</b>	<b>Object: 13</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Shaun Bredavs John Bredavs Mrs J Beazley Rectory Homes Ltd Jessica Jackson Cllr Manuela Perteghella Maria Ball	1. Allocation of any reserve sites within Long Marston village is inappropriate and contrary to Core Strategy policies CS.15, CS.16 and AS.10 as it has already provided 250% of target set.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
Jennifer Wood-Hill Sandra Ashford Janine Jackson Gordon Jackson Natural England William Tempest	2. Promoter confirms site can be developed quickly but site area stated in Site Proforma is incorrect.	In Site Proforma amend gross area to 0.8 hectares, net site area to at least 0.64 hectares and dwelling capacity to 16 units.	It would be appropriate to amend gross site area but it is doubtful that net site area can be increased significantly due to its narrow depth which will limit dwelling capacity.	In Site Proforma amend Site Area (Gross) to 0.8 hectares, Net Site Area to 0.4 hectares and dwelling capacity to 10.
Melodie Bruce Wychavon District Council CPRE Warwickshire Marston Sicca Parish Council Steve Taylor	3. Site is outside Built-Up Area Boundary so is not consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS.15.	Delete Site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	4. Any more houses would damage fabric and character of village and add to heavy traffic on road through it.	Delete site	Site is small-scale and wouldn't have a significant effect on character of village or on traffic flows.	None
	5. Village has no doctor's surgery, school or infrastructure to support more housing.	Delete site	Although village has limited services it is accessible to other settlements nearby that provide these. There are no known overriding infrastructure constraints.	None
	6. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy	None

	robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.		CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	
	7. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None
	8. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Long Marston due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	9. Parish Council believes that a sympathetic small-scale development would enhance street scene and in keeping with linear settlement pattern.	None	Noted	None
	10. Long Marston is a category 4 – tier 7 village so no further building should be allocated at present.	Delete site	The tiers identified in the Plan relate in part to the number of dwellings already provided in settlements during plan period and Long Marston is in tier 7 in recognition of this. However it isn't a justification for not identifying reserve sites in the village per se.	None
	11. Countryside, open space and wildlife is being destroyed by more development.	Delete site	Site is small-scale and wouldn't have a significant effect on countryside and wildlife.	None
	12. Main road in village is a 'rat run' and is insufficient to cope with more development.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it	None

			requires will need to be achievable.	
	13. Would have an adverse impact on heritage assets.	Delete site	Impact on heritage assets is very small given existing residential nature of site.	None
	14. Site is highly visible on village approaches with little opportunity to mitigate with landscaping.	Delete site	It is accepted that an appropriate layout and design would be required.	None

<b>Topic: LMAR.B North of Barley Fields, Long Marston</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 25</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Kendrick Homes Limited Sam Daubney Vicky Harrison Thiago Pereira James Brookes Cat Price Shaun Bredavs John Bredavs Mrs J Beazley Marcus Pestell Jessica Jackson	1. Site promoter objects to indicative site capacity of 15 dwellings and contends that 30 dwellings per hectare density should be applied.	Net site area and dwelling capacity should be increased to 0.6 hectares and 20 dwellings respectively in Site Proforma.	There are significant issues that need to be addressed through any development of this site including retention of existing balancing pond and need to provide landscaping along outer boundaries. Applying a 25dph density in small villages is appropriate in order to retain their character.	None
Cllr Manuela Perteghella Maria Ball Jennifer Wood-Hill Sandra Ashford Janine Jackson	2. Site area includes play area and open space provided as part of existing Barley Fields development which is owned by Parish Council.	This area should be excluded from the site.	This is accepted and the site area should be amended.	Amend site boundary as shown on accompanying map and reduce dwelling capacity to 13.
Gordon Jackson Kirsty Beckert Debbie Goodwin	3. Allocation of any reserve sites within Long Marston village is inappropriate and	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the	None

Richard Flitton Peter Barrett William Tempest Severn Trent Melodie Bruce Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Wychavon District Council CPRE Warwickshire Marston Sicca Parish Council	contrary to Core Strategy policies CS.15, CS.16 and AS.10 as it has already provided 250% of target set.		allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	
	4. Site is outside Built-Up Area Boundary so is not consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS.15.	Delete Site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	5. Access would be via a private road and would cause disruption to local residents and safety concerns for children.	Delete site	While these points are acknowledged they are not overriding constraints given modest number of dwellings involved.	None
	6. Providing an access and service connections to site would require owners of existing properties on Barley Fields to alter their deed of covenant to allow development to take place.	Delete site	This matter will need to be resolved by promoter of the site.	None
	7. Release of site within Plan period would be unacceptable and unsustainable due to cumulative effects of overdevelopment and lack of infrastructure in village.	Delete site	Scale of development on site is relatively small and there are no known overriding infrastructure constraints.	None
	8. Long Marston is a category 4 – tier 7 village so no further building should be allocated at present.	Delete site	The tiers identified in the Plan relate in part to the number of dwellings already provided in settlements during plan period and Long Marston is in tier 7 in recognition of this. However it isn't a justification for not identifying reserve sites in the village per se.	None

	9. If more houses are constructed the village will become fragmented and its spirit and uniqueness lost.	Delete site	Site is small-scale and wouldn't have a significant effect on character of village.	None
	10. Site has had planning permission refused and an appeal dismissed.	Delete site	Previous decisions were based on circumstances that applied at that time in relation to the Core Strategy and 5 year housing land supply and not on suitability of site for development per se. This does not negate the need to identify suitable reserve housing sites in the SAP.	None
	11. Building more houses could lead to existing balancing pond flooding.	Delete site	Further development would be required to ensure that flood risk wasn't increased.	None
	12. Countryside, open space and wildlife is being destroyed by more development.	Delete site	Site is small-scale and wouldn't have a significant effect on countryside and wildlife.	None
	13. More houses would jeopardise places at Welford primary school for existing families.	Delete site	There is no evidence that Welford primary school is at capacity although it is accepted that places in individual year groups may be limited.	None
	14. Development would cause loss of privacy and light for existing residents.	Delete site	Layout and design of development would need to ensure that impact on existing residents is reasonable.	None
	15. Village does not have infrastructure, shops, services and public transport to support more housing.	Delete site	Although village has limited services it is accessible to other settlements nearby that provide these. There are no known overriding infrastructure constraints.	None

	<p>16. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.</p>	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	<p>17. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed. There appears to be a surface water flow path through site that will need to be considered and managed as part of any development.</p>	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	<p>18. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.</p>	None	Noted	None
	<p>19. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Long Marston due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.</p>	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None

	20. Village has no doctor's surgery, school or infrastructure to support more housing.	Delete site	Although village has limited services it is accessible to other settlements nearby that provide these. There are no known overriding infrastructure constraints.	None
	21. Main road in village is a 'rat run' and is insufficient to cope with more development.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None

<b>Topic: LMAR.C East of Rumer Close, Long Marston</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 14</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Shaun Bredavs John Bredavs Mrs J Beazley Mrs J Beazley Jessica Jackson Cllr Manuela Perteghella Maria Ball	1. Allocation of any reserve sites within Long Marston village is inappropriate and contrary to Core Strategy policies CS.15, CS.16 and AS.10 as it has already provided 250% of target set.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
Jennifer Wood-Hill Sandra Ashford Janine Jackson Gordon Jackson Lagan Homes William Tempest Severn Trent Melodie Bruce	2. Long Marston is a category 4 – tier 7 village so no further building should be allocated at present.	Delete site	The tiers identified in the Plan relate in part to the number of dwellings already provided in settlements during plan period and Long Marston is in tier 7 in recognition of this. However it isn't a justification for not identifying reserve sites in the village per se.	None

Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Wychavon District Council CPRE Warwickshire Marston Sicca Parish Council	3. Site is outside Built-Up Area Boundary so is not consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS.15.	Delete Site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	4. There isn't enough infrastructure to sustain number of houses proposed.	Delete site	Scale of development on site is relatively small and there are no known overriding infrastructure constraints.	None
	5. Village has no doctor's surgery, school or infrastructure to support more housing.	Delete site	Although village has limited services it is accessible to other settlements nearby that provide these. There are no known overriding infrastructure constraints.	None
	6. Countryside, open space and wildlife is being destroyed by more development.	Delete site	Site is small-scale and wouldn't have a significant effect on countryside and wildlife.	None
	7. Main road in village is a 'rat run' and is insufficient to cope with more development.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	8. Landowners and developers support identification of reserve site in the Plan.	None	Noted	None
	9. Site has had planning permission refused and an appeal dismissed.	Delete site	Previous decisions were based on circumstances that applied at that time in relation to the Core Strategy and 5 year housing land supply and not on suitability of site for development per se. This does not negate the need to	None

			identify suitable reserve housing sites in the SAP.	
	10. Village does not have infrastructure, shops, services and public transport to support more housing.	Delete site	Although village has limited services it is accessible to other settlements nearby that provide these. There are no known overriding infrastructure constraints.	None
	11. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	12. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed. There appears to be a surface water flow path through site that will need to be considered and managed as part of any development.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	13. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg.	None	Noted	None

	Evesham, through additional trips and visits.			
	14. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Long Marston due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None

<b>Topic: LMD.A Adjacent former Long Marston Depot</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 6</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Natural England Steve Taylor Jonathan Brown Friends of Meon Vale Woodland Walk Cllr Manuela Perteghella	1. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
Janine Jackson Marston Sicca Parish Council William Tempest	2. Site is not required and in a location which is fundamentally flawed and builds-in car dependency in an area with no jobs or acceptable road or rail connections	Delete site	Site is adjacent to a new community which has a range of local facilities, adjacent employment areas and on a frequent bus route.	None
	3. NPPF asserts that brownfield sites should be fully utilised for development before greenfield sites.	Delete site	In practice reserve sites have to be on greenfield land as principle of housing is acceptable on brownfield land. NPPF doesn't expect	None

			brownfield land to be used first.	
	4. Erodes green space between Meon Vale and Quinton.	Delete site	Impact of development on this gap would not be significant given the site is on opposite site of main road.	None
	5. Reduces agricultural land capacity.	Delete site	Scale of agricultural land loss is relatively modest and it is not of best and most versatile quality.	None
	6. Undermines design integrity of Meon Vale site.	Delete site	This is a detailed matter that would be addressed at the planning application stage.	None
	7. Site would require an additional access onto Station Road and would require footpaths to be provided and improvements to junction with Campden Road. Provision should be made to take access through Meon Vale development to the west so that it is integrated.	None specified	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that acceptable access can be achieved for vehicles and pedestrians. A direct walking/cycling link should be provided to the Meon Vale development as specified in Site Proforma.	None
	8. Site is inappropriate as Long Marston has already significantly exceeded dwelling target set.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	9. Site is outside Built-Up Area Boundary so is not consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS.15.	Delete Site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	10. Reserve sites should be located where road capacity and sustainable transport infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased traffic.	Delete site	Scale of development is relatively modest and should be capable of being accommodated on road	None

			network. A frequent bus service runs close to the site.	
	11. Development would mean that Long Marston would be practically joined up with Meon Vale.	Delete site	Development of site would have no impact on gap between two settlements.	None
	12. Countryside, open spaces and wildlife are being destroyed by development.	Delete site	Scale of development on this site would be relatively modest and have a limited impact on these features.	None
	13. Already problems on Meon Vale with crime and lack of facilities.	Delete site	Meon Vale supports a range of local facilities.	None
	14. Would result in an isolated community that would fail to integrate with rest of village.	Delete site	A direct walking/cycling link should be provided to the Meon Vale development as specified in Site Proforma.	None

<b>Topic: LONG.A East of Marton Road (north), Long Itchington</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 29</b>	<b>Other: 5</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Chris and Sue Hutchins Stratford District Liberal Democrat Group Rosconn Strategic Land Sarah and Gareth Salisbury Zoe Farndon Charlotte Monnington Brian Lenihan Andy Hart	1. Oppose inclusion of Long Itchington in providing any reserve housing sites due to disproportionate amount of development already provided.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. However, scale of development in Long Itchington in recent years is reflected in position of site in tiers for releasing reserve sites.	None

<p>Kate McIlvaney David Buchholz Richard Jackson Mary Briggs Adam Wood Wilfred and Jean Huitson Sonia Washbrook Maureen and Brian Smith Catherine Stansfield Malachy Clarke Katherine Sherring Tim Dunn Les Perry Cllr Louis Adam Severn Trent Water Linda Rose Simon Collyer Stuart Gilks Karen Wells Denise Nunn Chris Hancock Janet Powell David Chinn Warwickshire County Council – Flood Risk Long Itchington Parish Council</p>	2. Lack of service capacity such as drainage, sewerage, roads, school, surgery.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	3. Further development risks changing character of village completely.	Delete site	Site is relatively small scale and would have a limited effect on character of village.	None
	4. Site is outside defined Built-Up Area Boundary so is unacceptable.	Delete site	In practice reserve sites have to be outside BUAB as principle of housing is acceptable inside them.	None
	5. Adjacent development has experienced significant flooding and groundwater and development of surrounding land could meet similar issues and be hard to overcome.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily.	Insert reference to assessing and managing surface water flood risk and drainage in Site Proforma.
	6. Promoter of site supports its identification in Plan and it is capable of being delivered but is capable of providing 25 dwellings	Amend dwelling capacity for site	It is apparent that net developable area is larger than currently indicated in Site Proforma.	Amend net area to 0.8ha and dwelling capacity to 24 dwellings in Site Proforma.
	7. Residents of adjacent Lilac View development pay a management company to maintain road, footpaths, lighting.	Delete site	This isn't an obvious constraint on developing adjacent site.	None
	8. Further development behind Lilac View would increase traffic flow onto busy main road through village.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that acceptable access can be achieved.	None
	9. Would create too big a housing estate in combination with Lilac View.	Delete site	Additional number of dwellings isn't that significant.	None
	10. Loss of greenfield land.	Delete site	In practice reserve sites have to be on greenfield land as principle of development is acceptable on brownfield sites.	None

	11. Unstable ground conditions.	Delete site	This is a matter that developer would have to resolve.	None
	12. Village has already been urbanised by recent large-scale developments that has changed its rural character.	Delete site	Site is relatively small scale and would have a limited effect on character of village.	None
	13. Would create significant temporary and permanent disruption to existing dwellings.	Delete site	Impact of development on existing dwellings would not be unreasonable.	None
	14. There is no access to site as Cox Crescent and Bishop Drive are private roads.	Delete site	This matter will need to be resolved by promoter of the site.	None
	15. There is a public footpath running through the site.	Delete site	Footpath runs along southern boundary of site and would be retained in layout of development.	None
	16. Site doesn't fulfil guidelines in Neighbourhood Plan for further housing as it is greenfield and outside village boundary.	Delete site	Neighbourhood Plan has not reached an advanced stage so it is necessary for the District Council to identify reserve housing sites in accordance with Core Strategy.	None
	17. Development should retain and enhance existing hedgerows and trees.	Delete site	This is specified in Site Proforma.	None
	18. Development should be of a density more suitable to rural environments.	Delete site	Density specified is appropriate for this location.	None
	19. Existing roads are very narrow and development will increase traffic both construction and residential causing greater risk of damage.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that acceptable access can be achieved.	Insert reference to providing footways along private roads within existing estate up to the site in Site Proforma.
	20. Loss of trees and impact on existing wildlife and plants.	Delete site	There would be limited impact on trees and wildlife.	None
	21. Effect of visual amenity, noise and disturbance on	Delete site	Impact on existing properties would not be unreasonable.	None

	existing development and properties adjacent to site.			
	22. Hazardous materials from construction may find their way into soil and water and damage wildlife and ecosystem.	Delete site	These matters would need to be managed satisfactorily by developer.	None
	23. There are no pavements around Cox Crescent which will increase safety risk due to additional traffic.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that acceptable access can be achieved.	Insert reference to providing footways along private roads within existing estate up to the site in Site Proforma.
	24. Light pollution would have a negative impact on wildlife and local residents.	Delete site	Scale of impact would be very modest.	None
	25. Hydraulic flooding is experienced in downstream catchment and Thornyard SPS has existing capacity issues. Further development is not recommended in this catchment until improvement scheme is completed which is currently programmed for delivery in 2024.	None specified	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily. Release of site for development will take capacity constraint into account.	Insert reference to assessing and managing surface water flood risk and drainage in Site Proforma.
	26. Water table in this area is extremely high and further building will exacerbate flooding.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily.	Insert reference to assessing and managing surface water flood risk and drainage in Site Proforma.
	27. Development will affect rural views from Red House listed building.	Delete site	It will be necessary for layout and design of development to take into account impact on listed building. Main rear views from property across countryside would not be directly affected by development of site.	Insert reference to mitigating impact on adjacent listed building in Site Proforma.
	28. Site is entirely high risk to surface water flooding. There	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an	Insert reference to need for Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk

	appears to be a surface water flow path across site that will need to be considered and managed as part of any development. Concerns about increased risk of flooding to existing properties nearby. Need to consider viability of development given required mitigation.		applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Assessment and to manage surface water flood risk and drainage in Site Proforma.
--	---	--	---	--

<b>Topic: LONG.B North of Leamington Road (middle), Long Itchington</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 25</b>	<b>Other: 5</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Severn Trent Water Sonia Washbrook Zoe Farndon	1. Concerned that development will have a high surface water flood risk and increase risk of flooding to existing properties.	None specified	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily.	Insert reference to assessing and managing surface water flood risk and drainage in Site Proforma.
Charlotte Monnington Janet Powell Long Itchington Parish Council Chris and Sue Hutchins Simon Collyer Richard Jackson Karen Wells Cllr Louis Adam Les Perry Linda Rose	2. Hydraulic flooding is experienced in downstream catchment and Thornyard SPS has existing capacity issues. Further development is not recommended in this catchment until improvement scheme is completed which is currently programmed for delivery in 2024.	None specified	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily. Release of site for development will take capacity constraint into account.	Insert reference to assessing and managing surface water flood risk and drainage in Site Proforma.
Chris Hancock Brian Lenihan Andy Hart	3. Would increase traffic on a very busy road with speeding issues.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that	None

<p>Kate McIlvaney David Buchholz Mrs Helen Newbold, Mr Trevor Reeve and Deeley Homes David Chinn Wilfred and Jean Huitson Denise Nunn Stuart Gilks Mr Phillip Claydon Sonia Washbrook Maureen and Brian Smith Jeff and Ann Round Catherine Stansfield Tim Dunn</p>			acceptable access can be achieved.	
	4. Loss of greenfield farmland.	Delete site	In practice reserve sites have to be on greenfield land as principle of development is acceptable on brownfield sites.	None
	5. More housing in village already than should have been.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. However, scale of development in Long Itchington in recent years is reflected in position of site in tiers for releasing reserve sites.	None
	6. School places are not available.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	7. There has been no expansion of local amenities and services despite vast growth in village in recent years.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	8. Oppose inclusion of Long Itchington in providing any reserve housing sites due to disproportionate amount of development already provided.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. However, scale of development in Long Itchington in recent years is reflected in position of site in tiers for releasing reserve sites.	None
9. Need evidence regarding presence of historic well in corner of site	Delete site	Applicant would undertake a heritage assessment to establish situation.	None	

	10. Question appropriateness of accessing site through Russell Close as it would be damaging for residents and remove current cul de sac layout.	Delete site	Access would be provided off Leamington Road.	None
	11. Close to conservation area.	Delete site	Applicant would undertake a heritage assessment to establish nature of impact on conservation area and mitigate it as appropriate.	None
	12. Close to valued landscapes and change aspect of that area of village.	Delete site	Site is relatively small scale and would have a limited effect on character of village.	None
	13. Would encourage further erosion of Built Up Area Boundary.	Delete site	Site is well-contained in landscape by mature hedgerow along western boundary.	None
	14. Further development risks changing character of village completely.	Delete site	Site is relatively small scale and would have a limited effect on character of village.	None
	15. Site is outside defined Built-Up Area Boundary so is unacceptable.	Delete site	In practice reserve sites have to be outside BUAB as principle of housing is acceptable inside them.	None
	16. Retention of hedgerows would be only way to acceptably develop site without severely disrupting local ecology and character and mitigate impact on neighbouring residential amenity.	Delete site	This is specified in Site Proforma.	None
	17. Pedestrian access is an issue given current pavement network and a new crossing would need to be provided.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that acceptable pedestrian access can be achieved.	None

	18. Concerns about ground conditions.	Delete site	Developer would need to be satisfied that ground is suitable for development.	None
	19. Antiquated sewerage system cannot take more development and would be overloaded leading to further flood risk.	Delete site	Severn Trent Water will need to be satisfied that sewerage system can accommodate development..	None
	20. Landowner supports identification of site in the Plan and is suitable for development.	None	Noted	None
	21. Size of plot should be reduced to no deeper than existing development to the east.	Amend area of site identified for development.	Depth of development area identified is reasonable in order to achieve a suitable layout.	None
	22. Development should retain and enhance existing hedgerows and trees.	Delete site	This is specified in Site Proforma.	None
	23. Development should be of a density more suitable to rural environments.	Delete site	Density specified is appropriate for this location.	None
	24. Hedgerow alongside Leamington Road should be retained and reinforced as a natural habitat.	Amend Site Development Considerations	This hedgerow should be retained as much as possible subject to achieving necessary visibility splays at access.	None
	25. Development would increase local noise and disturbance and cause loss of privacy.	Delete site	These matters would be dealt with at planning application stage.	None

<b>Topic: MAPP.01A West of Birmingham Road (north), Mappleborough Green</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 20</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Graham Masefield Studley Liberal Democrat Team Dr A Bicknell, Mr Philip Baker, Ms Joan Bicknell Morris Homes Alex JK Cameron Liberal Democrat Group	1. There are watercourses running through site. Modelling of flood waters and surface water flows should be considered and managed appropriately. Watercourses should remain open where possible as culverting is not considered to be flood management.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need to manage flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.
Natural England Ian Burnett Claire Wegrzyn Stratford Climate Action Carolyn Lewis-Villacress	2. Development on this land would lead to any meaningful separation between Redditch and Mappleborough Green being lost.	Delete site	Limited extent of housing development within Stratford District has been identified in order to retain a significant gap between two settlements.	None
Ettington Parish Council Alan Stanford Luisa Blackwell Mr G Judd and Mrs J Judd Taylor Wimpey UK Birmingham City Council Mrs Maureen Berry Mappleborough Green Parish Council	3. Previous landscape assessment produced for District Council identified land as being highly sensitive and in need of protection as it provides a buffer between Mappleborough Green and edge of Redditch.	Delete site	Limited extent of housing development within Stratford District has been identified in order to retain a significant gap between two settlements. Retention of existing mature trees, replacement planting and open space will all contribute to retaining this gap	None
Annette Leyland Mrs Maureen Berry Councillor Neil Edden Justin Kerridge	4. Building on this site would change character of this part of Mappleborough Green.	Delete site	Limited scale of development within Stratford District seeks to retain character of Mappleborough Green.	None
	5. Development would lead to permanent loss of countryside and natural habitat.	Delete site	There is limited loss of countryside given nature of the site. However, development will be expected to mitigate and compensate	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding habitat enhancement and management in Site Proforma.

			for loss of habitats as part of comprehensive approach.	
	6. Infrastructure and local schools are already facing challenges of over-capacity.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	7. Already experience risks to pedestrians and cars due to volume of traffic.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that impact on traffic and pedestrians is acceptable.	None
	8. Already experience severe flooding on A435 and further reduction of natural flood management areas would increase this.	Delete site	This is a critical issue and responsible agencies will need to be satisfied that there would be no increased risk of flooding as a result of development. There may be scope to help alleviate the existing situation.	Insert reference to need to manage flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.
	9. Promoters of site support its identification in the Plan based on its suitability and availability although some flexibility on the number of dwellings will need to be exercised to ensure sound planning and urban design objectives are met	None specified	Noted	None
	10. Any housing will feed onto A435 that is already busy and dangerous.	Delete site	No direct vehicle access onto A435 is proposed.	None
	11. Village has no shops and services, primary school is oversubscribed with no intention to extend it, and medical centre in Studley is unable to accept new patients.	Delete site	Scale of development is relatively small and would have very little impact on capacity of existing services.	None

	12. A management plan would safeguard and enhance natural habitat of area.	Delete site	Management of habitats would form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding habitat enhancement and management in Site Proforma.
	13. Would involve loss of deciduous woodland that serves as an important wildlife corridor to nearby SSSI and further isolate it.	Delete site	This matter needs thorough consideration possibly through the partial retention of existing woodland and replacement with new native trees.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and replacement of trees and woodland in Site Proforma.
	14. Building on the Green Belt will change character of Mappleborough Green.	Delete site	Land involved is outside the Green Belt.	None
	15. Development will remove woodland screen between village and Redditch.	Delete site	Retention and replacement of trees and woodland is expected to form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Stipulate the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and replacement of trees and woodland in Site Proforma.
	16. Loss of woodland due to development and access to Far Moor Lane will diminish carbon capture and storage.	Delete site	Retention and replacement of trees and woodland is expected to form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and replacement of trees and woodland in Site Proforma.
	17. No recognition given to flooding issues including events in 2019 and 2020 that affect residents, businesses and motorists.	Delete site	This is a critical issue and responsible agencies will need to be satisfied that there would be no increased risk of flooding as a result of development. There may be scope to help alleviate the existing situation.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and replacement of trees and woodland in Site Proforma.
	18. There are no bus routes to take children to secondary schools.	Delete site	Scale of development is relatively small and would have very little impact on this issue.	None

	19. Coventry and Warwickshire Green Belt Study identified this land as performing well against five purposes of Green Belt.	Delete site	Land involved is outside the Green Belt so this Study isn't applicable.	None
	20. Mappleborough Green is a Category 4 Local Service Village and there is sufficient potential brownfield and infill sites to meet foreseeable housing needs.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the scope for development on these types of sites.	None
	21. Direct access onto A435 would be unsafe.	Delete site	No direct vehicle access onto A435 is proposed.	None
	22. Land should be given over to village to use as a public recreational area which it currently doesn't have.	Delete site	Provision of public open space is expected to form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need to provide extensive areas of public open space in Site Proforma.
	23. Development would contribute to a feeling of urbanisation between Studley and new employment site at Redditch Gateway.	Delete site	Scale of housing is relatively small and together with comprehensive approach to layout and design of overall area would have very little impact on this issue.	None

<b>Topic: MAPP.01B West of Birmingham Road (middle), Mappleborough Green</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 20</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Graham Masefield Studley Liberal Democrat Team	1. There are watercourses running through site. Modelling of flood waters and surface water flows should be considered and managed	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need to manage flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.

<p>Dr A Bicknell, Mr Philip Baker, Ms Joan Bicknell Morris Homes Alex JK Cameron Liberal Democrat Group Natural England Ian Burnett Claire Wegrzyn Stratford Climate Action Carolyn Lewis-Villacress Ettington Parish Council Alan Stanford Luisa Blackwell Mr G Judd and Mrs J Judd Taylor Wimpey UK Birmingham City Council Mrs Maureen Berry Mappleborough Green Parish Council Annette Leyland Mrs Maureen Berry Councillor Neil Edden Justin Kerridge</p>	appropriately. Watercourses should remain open where possible as culverting is not considered to be flood management.			
	2. Development on this land would lead to any meaningful separation between Redditch and Mappleborough Green being lost.	Delete site	Limited extent of housing development within Stratford District has been identified in order to retain a significant gap between two settlements.	None
	3. Previous landscape assessment produced for District Council identified land as being highly sensitive and in need of protection as it provides a buffer between Mappleborough Green and edge of Redditch.	Delete site	Limited extent of housing development within Stratford District has been identified in order to retain a significant gap between two settlements. Retention of existing mature trees, replacement planting and open space will all contribute to retaining this gap	None
	4. Building on this site would change character of this part of Mappleborough Green.	Delete site	Limited scale of proposed development within Stratford District seeks to retain character of Mappleborough Green.	None
	5. Development would lead to permanent loss of countryside and natural habitat.	Delete site	There is limited loss of countryside given nature of the site. However, development will be expected to mitigate and compensate for loss of habitats as part of comprehensive approach.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding habitat enhancement and management in Site Proforma.
	6. Infrastructure and local schools are already facing challenges of over-capacity.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	7. Already experience risks to pedestrians and cars due to volume of traffic.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that	None

			impact on traffic and pedestrians is acceptable.	
	8. Already experience severe flooding on A435 and further reduction of natural flood management areas would increase this.	Delete site	This is a critical issue and responsible agencies will need to be satisfied that there would be no increased risk of flooding as a result of development. There may be scope to help alleviate the existing situation.	Insert reference to need to manage flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.
	9. Promoters of site support its identification in the Plan based on its suitability and availability although some flexibility on the number of dwellings will need to be exercised to ensure sound planning and urban design objectives are met	None specified	Noted	None
	10. Any housing will feed onto A435 that is already busy and dangerous.	Delete site	No direct vehicle access onto A435 is proposed.	None
	11. Village has no shops and services, primary school is oversubscribed with no intention to extend it, and medical centre in Studley is unable to accept new patients.	Delete site	Scale of development is relatively small and would have very little impact on capacity of existing services.	None
	12. A management plan would safeguard and enhance natural habitat of area.	Delete site	Management of habitats would form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding habitat enhancement and management in Site Proforma.
	13. Would involve loss of deciduous woodland that serves as an important wildlife	Delete site	This matter needs thorough consideration possibly through the partial retention of existing	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and suitable replacement of trees

	corridor to nearby SSSI and further isolate it.		woodland and replacement with new native trees.	and woodland in Site Proforma.
	14. Building on the Green Belt will change character of Mappleborough Green.	Delete site	Land involved is outside the Green Belt.	None
	15. Development will remove woodland screen between village and Redditch.	Delete site	Retention and replacement of trees and woodland is expected to form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and suitable replacement of trees and woodland in Site Proforma.
	16. Loss of woodland due to development and access to Far Moor Lane will diminish carbon capture and storage.	Delete site	Retention and replacement of trees and woodland is expected to form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and suitable replacement of trees and woodland in Site Proforma.
	17. No recognition given to flooding issues including events in 2019 and 2020 that affect residents, businesses and motorists.	Delete site	This is a critical issue and responsible agencies will need to be satisfied that there would be no increased risk of flooding as a result of development. There may be scope to help alleviate the existing situation.	Insert reference to need to manage flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.
	18. There are no bus routes to take children to secondary schools.	Delete site	Scale of development is relatively small and would have very little impact on this issue.	None
	19. Coventry and Warwickshire Green Belt Study identified this land as performing well against five purposes of Green Belt.	Delete site	Land involved is outside the Green Belt so this Study isn't applicable.	None
	20. Mappleborough Green is a Category 4 Local Service Village and there is sufficient potential brownfield and infill	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the scope for development on these types of sites.	None

	sites to meet foreseeable housing needs.			
	21. Direct access onto A435 would be unsafe.	Delete site	No direct vehicle access onto A435 is proposed.	None
	22. Land should be given over to village to use as a public recreational area which it currently doesn't have.	Delete site	Provision of public open space is expected to form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the provision of public open space in Site Proforma.
	23. Development would contribute to a feeling of urbanisation between Studley and new employment site at Redditch Gateway.	Delete site	Scale of housing is relatively small and together with comprehensive approach to layout and design of overall area would have very little impact on this issue.	None

<b>Topic: MAPP.01C West of Birmingham Road (south), Mappleborough Green</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 19</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Graham Masefield Studley Liberal Democrat Team Dr A Bicknell, Mr Philip Baker, Ms Joan Bicknell Morris Homes Alex JK Cameron Liberal Democrat Group	1. There are watercourses running through site. Modelling of flood waters and surface water flows should be considered and managed appropriately. Watercourses should remain open where possible as culverting is not considered to be flood management.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need to manage flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.
Natural England Ian Burnett Claire Wegrzyn	2. Development on this land would lead to any meaningful separation between Redditch	Delete site	Limited extent of housing development within Stratford District has been identified in	None

<p>Stratford Climate Action Carolyn Lewis-Villacress Ettington Parish Council Luisa Blackwell Mr G Judd and Mrs J Judd Taylor Wimpey UK Birmingham City Council Mrs Maureen Berry Mappleborough Green Parish Council Annette Leyland Mrs Maureen Berry Councillor Neil Edden Justin Kerridge</p>	and Mappleborough Green being lost.		order to retain a significant gap between two settlements.	
	3. Previous landscape assessment produced for District Council identified land as being highly sensitive and in need of protection as it provides a buffer between Mappleborough Green and edge of Redditch.	Delete site	Limited extent of housing development within Stratford District has been identified in order to retain a significant gap between two settlements. Retention of existing mature trees, replacement planting and open space will all contribute to retaining this gap	None
	4. Building on this site would change character of this part of Mappleborough Green.	Delete site	Limited scale of development within Stratford District seeks to retain character of Mappleborough Green.	None
	5. Development would lead to permanent loss of countryside and natural habitat.	Delete site	There is limited loss of countryside given nature of the site. However, development will be expected to mitigate and compensate for loss of habitats as part of comprehensive approach.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding habitat enhancement and management in Site Proforma.
	6. Infrastructure and local schools are already facing challenges of over-capacity.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	7. Already experience risks to pedestrians and cars due to volume of traffic.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that impact on traffic and pedestrians is acceptable.	None
	8. Already experience severe flooding on A435 and further reduction of natural flood management areas would increase this.	Delete site	This is a critical issue and responsible agencies will need to be satisfied that there would be no increased risk of flooding as a result of development. There may be scope to help alleviate the existing situation.	Insert reference to need to manage flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.

	9. Promoters of site support its identification in the Plan based on its suitability and availability although some flexibility on the number of dwellings will need to be exercised to ensure sound planning and urban design objectives are met	None specified	Noted	None
	10. Any housing will feed onto A435 that is already busy and dangerous.	Delete site	No direct vehicle access onto A435 is proposed.	None
	11. Village has no shops and services, primary school is oversubscribed with no intention to extend it, and medical centre in Studley is unable to accept new patients.	Delete site	Scale of development is relatively small and would have very little impact on capacity of existing services.	None
	12. A management plan would safeguard and enhance natural habitat of area.	Delete site	Management of habitats would form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding habitat enhancement and management in Site Proforma.
	13. Would involve loss of deciduous woodland that serves as an important wildlife corridor to nearby SSSI and further isolate it.	Delete site	This matter needs thorough consideration possibly through the partial retention of existing woodland and replacement with new native trees.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and replacement of trees and woodland in Site Proforma.
	14. Building on the Green Belt will change character of Mappleborough Green.	Delete site	Land involved is outside the Green Belt.	None
	15. Development will remove woodland screen between village and Redditch.	Delete site	Retention and replacement of trees and woodland is expected to form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and replacement of trees and woodland in Site Proforma.

	16. Loss of woodland due to development and access to Far Moor Lane will diminish carbon capture and storage.	Delete site	Retention and replacement of trees and woodland is expected to form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need for a comprehensive approach regarding the retention and replacement of trees and woodland in Site Proforma.
	17. No recognition given to flooding issues including events in 2019 and 2020 that affect residents, businesses and motorists.	Delete site	This is a critical issue and responsible agencies will need to be satisfied that there would be no increased risk of flooding as a result of development. There may be scope to help alleviate the existing situation.	Insert reference to need to manage flood waters and surface water flows in Site Proforma.
	18. There are no bus routes to take children to secondary schools.	Delete site	Scale of development is relatively small and would have very little impact on this issue.	None
	19. Coventry and Warwickshire Green Belt Study identified this land as performing well against five purposes of Green Belt.	Delete site	Land involved is outside the Green Belt so this Study isn't applicable.	None
	20. Mappleborough Green is a Category 4 Local Service Village and there is sufficient potential brownfield and infill sites to meet foreseeable housing needs.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the scope for development on these types of sites.	None
	21. Direct access onto A435 would be unsafe.	Delete site	No direct vehicle access onto A435 is proposed.	None
	22. Land should be given over to village to use as a public recreational area which it currently doesn't have.	Delete site	Provision of public open space is expected to form an integral part of comprehensive approach to overall site.	Insert reference to the need to provide extensive areas of public open space in Site Proforma.
	23. Development would contribute to a feeling of urbanisation between Studley	Delete site	Scale of housing is relatively small and together with comprehensive approach to layout and design of overall	None

	and new employment site at Redditch Gateway.		area would have very little impact on this issue.	
--	--	--	---	--

<b>Topic: MM.A North of Brook Lane, Moreton Morrell</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk CPRE Warwickshire Environment Agency Cllr Anne Parry	1. Site has a high risk of surface water flooding so any application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed.	None specified	This is a critical issue that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need for a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	2. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Moreton Morrell due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	3. Detailed hydraulic modelling should be undertaken to establish impact of flood risk from watercourse.	None specified	This is a critical issue that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need for hydraulic modelling to establish impact on flood risk from watercourse in Site Proforma.
	4. Recognised that there is a need for some development in village which reflects local requirements indicated in Housing Needs Survey and preference is for small-scale	None specified	Reserve housing sites are intended to meet the wider housing requirements of the District and can't be restricted to meeting local needs.	None

	development and not large executive homes.			
--	--	--	--	--

<b>Topic: MM.B South of Brook Lane (east), Moreton Morrell</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
CPRE Warwickshire Cllr Anne Parry	1. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Moreton Morrell due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	2. Recognised that there is a need for some development in village which reflects local requirements indicated in Housing Needs Survey and preference is for small-scale development and not large executive homes.	None specified	Reserve housing sites are intended to meet the wider housing requirements of the District and can't be restricted to meeting local needs.	None

<b>Topic: MM.C South of John Davis Drive, Moreton Morrell</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

CPRE Warwickshire Warwickshire College Group Cllr Anne Parry	1. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Moreton Morrell due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	2. Landowners support reserve allocation status of site which has no ownership or environmental constraints.	None	Noted	None
	3. Recognised that there is a need for some development in village which reflects local requirements indicated in Housing Needs Survey and preference is for small-scale development and not large executive homes.	None specified	Reserve housing sites are intended to meet the wider housing requirements of the District and can't be restricted to meeting local needs.	None
	4. Important that retention of playing field is adhered to as Parish Council has invested in new equipment.	None specified	This matter is outside the scope of the reserve housing site but is recognised to be an important issue for the local community.	None

<b>Topic: NAP.A East of Butt Hill (south), Napton-on-the-Hill</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 6</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Stratford District Council Liberal Democrat Group Jayne Holland	1. Site would expand village into open countryside within Special Landscape Area.	Delete site	Scale of development would have a very limited impact on landscape.	None

<p>Napton-on-the-Hill Parish Council  CPRE Warwickshire  Historic England  Historic England  Mr Bernard Alsop  Mr James Sleight  Cllr Nigel Rock</p>	<p>2. Access to site is on a bend close to brow of hill which have impact on highway safety.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but would need to be satisfied that acceptable access can be provided.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>3. Site is prominent in landscape and close to one of the important views identified in Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Site is very small and capable of being designed to minimise impact on landscape and views.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>4. Development could have negative impact on setting/curtilage of Manor Farm listed building.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>This issue is identified in Site Proforma and heritage assessment would need to show that level of impact on listed building is acceptable.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>5. Uncertainty over quality of agricultural land that would be lost and is part of a large field which is suitable for farming.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Site is not of best and most versatile quality and forms a very small part of field.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>6. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Napton due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>7. Need to be satisfied that impact on non-designated heritage asset will be appropriately addressed.</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>This is specified in Site Proforma.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>8. Site is some distance from village centre and various facilities.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>This isn't an overriding reason for deleting site as distances are not significant.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>9. Detrimental impact on main entrance to village.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Design of development can ensure that impact isn't detrimental.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>10. Would encourage more development on east side of Butt Hill.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Site is proposed in its own right and need not lead to</p>	<p>None</p>

			further development to east of Butt Hill.	
	11. Site is outside Built-Up Area Boundary.	Delete site	Reserve sites have to be outside BUAB as a matter of principle.	None
	12. Adjacent to a working farm which has livestock and agricultural machinery which could lead to complaints.	Delete site	It would be appropriate to specify this issue in Site Proforma.	Insert reference to assessing impact of adjacent farm in Site Proforma.

<b>Topic: NEWB.A East of Stratford Road, Newbold-on-Stour</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 8</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water CPRE Warwickshire Martin Goodman Historic England Chris Wilson Ettington Estate Ltd Amanda Wilson Ray Channell Stephen Hartley John Gimblett Melissa Maxwell	1. There are historic flooding and pollution incidents in downstream network so hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine impact. Is SUDs and a sustainable surface water outfall are not available site would connect to combined sewer network and cause high risk.	Not specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to need for hydraulic modelling and provision of a sustainable surface water outfall in Site Proforma.
	2. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Newbold-on-Stour due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None

	3. Site would be on edge of Ettington Park designated parkland and impact on its setting should be undertaken prior to it being allocated.	Not specified	This issue has been considered in Heritage Impact Assessment which forms part of evidence base for the Plan.	None
	4. Landowners state that site is deliverable, available and suitable.	None	Noted	None
	5. Newbold has already had more than its share of development and there should be no more.	Delete site	Site is very small and would have little impact on character of village.	None
	6. Further development at Newbold would be detrimental to community and environment.	Delete site	Site is very small and would have little impact on character of village.	None
	7. Additional housing would increase volume of traffic on A3400 and there is an existing issue with traffic failing to observe 30mph speed limit.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	8. Growth in traffic is substantial and caused damaging increase in noise and air pollution.	Delete site	Scale of development on site is relatively modest and wouldn't generate a significant amount of additional traffic and increase its impact.	None
	9. Site is acceptable with a housing density lower than stipulated.	Reduce number of dwellings proposed	Density indicated is indicative and number of dwellings that are suitable on site will be established at planning application stage.	None
	10. Site does not impact on already congested narrow lanes, can be easily accessed off main road and is neglected so would have less impact on surrounding residents.	None	Noted	None

<b>Topic: NEWB.B North of Moss Lane (east), Newbold-on-Stour</b>	<b>Support:</b>	<b>Object:</b>	<b>Other:</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-----------------	----------------	---------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water CPRE Warwickshire Martin Goodman Wendy Hartwell Historic England Chris Wilson Rachel Russell Michael Russell Environment Agency Ettington Estate Ltd Amanda Wilson Ray Channell	1. There are historic flooding and pollution incidents in downstream network so hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine impact. Is SUDs and a sustainable surface water outfall are not available site would connect to combined sewer network and cause high risk.	Not specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert references to need for hydraulic modelling and provision of a sustainable surface water outfall in Site Proforma.
S Bailey Mr Reginald Monk Stephen Hartley John Gimblett Melissa Maxwell	2. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Newbold-on-Stour due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	3. Access to site is near impossible as Moss Lane entrance is narrow and used daily for school runs, posing major safety risk to children. Middlefield Lane access is already heavily congested with parked cars on both sides.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	4. Scale of site would further increase loss of identity of village which has slowly	Delete site	It is acknowledged that Newbold has taken a considerable amount of	None

	diminished with every housing development that has taken place.		housing development in recent years. This is reflected in position of this site in proposed tiers and tranches for release of further sites.	
	5. Field has historically been used as overspill from village green for community events.	Delete site	Extent of proposed housing development has excluded southern part of site which could be suitable for community uses as indicated in Site Proforma.	None
	6. Village Hall is a well-used facility with limited parking adjacent and any additional development would add additional pressure to this area.	Delete site	Housing development on site would be expected to provide sufficient car parking on site.	None
	7. Would reduce dramatically green field space of rural community.	Delete site	Site is in private ownership with no public access available.	None
	8. Additional houses would place additional strain on existing amenities, including drainage and sewerage which already has constant problems.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to services relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	9. Need to be satisfied that non-designated heritage asset will be appropriately addressed through an archaeological evaluation to inform appropriate design in order to avoid and minimise harm.	None specified	This is explicit in the reference to need to undertake archaeological investigation of the site.	None
	10. Residents should be able to enjoy this green open space within a village setting.	Delete site	Acknowledge that field would be lost but village is surrounded by fields so its loss	None

			would have a modest impact on village and its residents.	
	11. Should consider village development plan submitted to the Council which clearly states that paddock should not be developed.	Delete site	Neighbourhood Plan is at an early stage of preparation so cannot be given significant weight at this point in time.	None
	12. Landowners state that site is deliverable, available and suitable.	None	Noted	None
	13. Growth in traffic is substantial and caused damaging increase in noise and air pollution.	Delete site	Scale of development on site is relatively modest and wouldn't generate a significant amount of additional traffic and increase its impact.	None
	14. Access road to A3400 is not adequate without encroaching onto village green.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that appropriate standard of access can be achieved.	None
	15. Additional housing will adversely impact primary school provision.	Delete site	Number of dwellings involved would not have a significant impact on capacity of primary school.	None
	16. Will increase volume of traffic on A4300, existing traffic fails to observe 30mph speed limit and would be close to Crimscote Road junction.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	17. Paddock is medieval ridge and furrow which would be erased by housing.	Delete site	This will considered in the archaeological assessment of site specified in Site Proforma.	None
	18. Paddock formerly used by Newbold cricket and football teams and restrictive covenants exist.	Delete site	This issue will need to be resolved but it isn't a planning matter in itself.	None
	19. Housing density larger than 20dph are completely out	Delete site	Density indicated is indicative and number of dwellings that	None

	of character with rural setting of Newbold.		are suitable on site will be established at planning application stage.	
	20. Newbold has already had 100% more new housing than set out in Core Strategy.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that Newbold has taken a considerable amount of housing development in recent years. This is reflected in position of this site in proposed tiers and tranches for release of further sites.	None
	21. Rapid expansion of village with few amenities, resources and opportunities for employment is unsustainable.	Delete site	Scale of development on site is relatively modest and wouldn't have a significant impact on village.	None

<b>Topic: OXH.A South of Whatcote Road, Oxhill</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
D J Harper Severn Trent Water CPRE Warwickshire Jo Sweby Adrian Stuart	1. Oxhill has already had sufficient number of dwellings built during plan period.	Delete site	Site is very small and would have little impact on character of village.	None
	2. Increased demand for water and sewerage cannot be accommodated.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to services relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	3. Increase in vehicles makes walking unsafe.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None

	4. Development is destroying countryside and causing loss of food production.	Delete site	Site is very small and not in agricultural use.	None
	5. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	6. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Oxhill due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	7. Site is preferable to further building in open area in middle of village as it follows linear pattern.	None	Noted	None

<b>Topic: OXH.B North of Green Lane (west), Oxhill</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
D J Harper Severn Trent Water CPRE Warwickshire	1. Oxhill has already had sufficient number of dwellings built during plan period.	Delete site	Site is very small and would have little impact on character of village.	None

Jo Sweby Simon Grand Adrian Stuart	2. Increased demand for water and sewerage cannot be accommodated.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to services relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	3. Increase in vehicles makes walking unsafe.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	4. Development is destroying countryside and causing loss of food production.	Delete site	Site is very small and not in agricultural use.	None
	5. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	6. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Oxhill due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	7. Site is preferable to further building in open area in middle of village as it follows linear pattern.	None	Noted	None
	8. Development would block views from and overlook existing properties on Green Lane.	Delete site	Layout and design of development will need to ensure overlooking is taken into account.	None

	9. Development should avoid monotony and provide sense of variety.	None specified	This will be addressed by a planning application.	None
--	--	----------------	---	------

<b>Topic: PILL.A East of Kineton Road, Pillerton Priors</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 39</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Butlers Marston Parish Council Pillerton Hersey Parish Council Joanne Wilkinson Christopher Wilkinson Mr M Fox	1. Need to take concerns of local residents into consideration when planning future development. There are concerns that it will increase potential flooding at Pillerton Hersey as water is directed downstream.	None specified	This is a critical issue that will need to be resolved satisfactorily through any planning application.	Refer to managing flood risk downstream to Pillerton Hersey in Site Proforma.
CPRE Warwickshire John and Jennifer Lewthwaite Ettington Parish Council Marcelle Cater	2. Pillerton Hersey is prone to periodic flooding and additional houses will create further flooding issues.	Delete site	This is a critical issue that will need to be resolved satisfactorily through any planning application.	Refer to managing flood risk downstream to Pillerton Hersey in Site Proforma.
Mr and Mrs Brades Clive and Muriel Fidler Deeley Homes Peter Waters	3. Butlers Marston Water Treatment Works has issues with capacity and also reports of leakage and overflowing.	Delete site	Severn Trent Water will need to be satisfied that development of this site can be accommodated by the sewerage network.	None
Dr Deborah Brotherton Susan Doogood Hazel Kingdon-Jones Pillerton Priors Parish Council Pillerton Priors Parish Council	4. Development of site would cause linear development between Pillerton Hersey and Pillerton Priors and reduce gap between them.	Delete site	Site is situated between existing properties so its development would have little impact in reducing gap between two villages.	None
Mrs Hazel Smith Pillerton Priors Parish Council	5. Development would be a disproportionate increase to a	Delete site	Scale of development is comparatively small and	None

<p>Sally Johnson Mr M Fox Pamela Beesley Fiona Young Mr and Mrs S Newton Tim Fillmore Mrs Karen Baldwin Roseanne Sanders David McWhirter Chris Ivin George Stepney Richard Thompson Timothy Cotgrove P J Williams Kathryn Dalgleish Lorna McMaster Dorothy Shenton Jon Shenton Timothy Cotgrove Susan Archer Nichola Sant</p>	village which has very limited facilities.		wouldn't be inappropriate in this settlement.	
	6. Water supply can be affected severe restrictions and reduced pressure.	Delete site	Severn Trent Water will need to be satisfied that development of this site can be accommodated by water supply network.	None
	7. Roads through Pillerton Hersey are very narrow with insufficient room for pedestrian walkways and development will generate more traffic.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	8. Any new housing development should consider how residents would access everyday amenities and local villages do not have suitable access to them.	Delete site	The distribution of reserve housing sites accords with the Core Strategy and the Examination Inspector's Final Report.	None
	9. Village has already provided more housing in recent years than expected to accommodate and cannot support another 11% increase in properties.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	10. 2019 SHLAA identified site as red for its overall deliverability and nothing has changed since then to identify site in Plan.	Delete site	Site was red in 2019 SHLAA solely on the basis that it wasn't available at that time. It has since been confirmed that the site is available.	None
	11. Site is outside Built Up Area Boundary of village and would severely impact on landscape and reduce gap with Pillerton Hersey	Delete site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	12. Will cause more traffic in Pillerton Priors and there is	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of	None

	already a lot of speeding vehicles making it unsafe for children to cross the roads.		site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	
	13. There is no footpath on Kineton Road and it is unlit so there would be road and pedestrian safety issues.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	14. People in village regularly experience poor broadband service and adding more users to network will cause more service issues.	Delete site	This is a matter for broadband providers to address.	None
	15. Classification of Pillerton Priors as a Local Service Village is wrong given lack of services/amenities so basis for allocating housing site is flawed.	Delete site	Pillerton Priors meets the criteria identified in Core Strategy to be a Category 4 Local Service Village.	None
	16. Proposed number of dwellings based on a default average density does not take into account character of settlement and impact on neighbouring properties.	Delete site	Dwelling capacity figure given is indicative and specific number that is suitable on the site would be established through a planning application.	None
	17. Land is a rare ridge and furrow and its permanent loss would be contrary to national and local planning policy.	Delete site	Extent of loss of ridge and furrow is limited and would not be contrary to policy where justified.	None
	18. Steeply sloping nature of site will make it expensive to develop and require extensive groundworks.	Delete site	This is a matter for any developer of site to resolve.	None
	19. Development would rise up the hill creating greater visual impact from nearby roads, public footpaths and properties.	Delete site	Proposed extent of development is on the lower western part of the site for this reason.	None

	20. Area lost from grass will cause more rainwater run-off adding to existing flooding problem on Kineton Road.	Delete site	Development of site would be required to address this issue.	None
	21. Site has been refused planning consent previously.	Delete site	This decision was taken within a different Development Plan context.	None
	22. Impact on rolling rural landscape which would detract from and rural character of village.	Delete site	Modest scale of development would have a very limited impact on nature of landscape and village.	None
	23. Development of site would be contrary to Policies CS.2, CS.15 and AS.10 in Core Strategy.	Delete site	Identification of reserve housing sites is a requirement of the Core Strategy.	None
	24. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Pillerton Priors due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	25. Increased dwellings will impact on Ettington Primary School which is already at capacity.	Delete site	Warwickshire County Council has advised that there is capacity for small housing developments in school's catchment.	None
	26. Audit of site in 2012 identified it as an important area for various protected species.	Delete site	An ecological assessment of site will be sought as part of any planning application to establish whether this is the case.	None
	27. Site is in Radon affected area and should be disclosed in assessment.	Delete site	This isn't an overriding constraint on development.	None
	28. Prospective developer supports identification of site in	Increase capacity to 15 dwellings	Dwelling capacity figure given is indicative and specific number that is suitable on the	None

	the Plan subject to increase of residential units to 15.		site would be established through a planning application.	
	29. Development of this site would open floodgates for further ribbon development between Pillerton Priors and Pillerton Hersey and destroy their individuality.	Delete site	There is no expectation that this would happen.	None
	30. Increased light pollution at night would have detrimental effect on village and wildlife.	Delete site	Scale of development would have a limited impact in this respect and sensitive lighting can be designed into any development.	None
	31. Creating access would involve loss of protected hedgerow along Kineton Road.	Delete site	Hedgerow isn't protected as such and should be retained as far as possible and replaced as appropriate.	None
	32. Bend in road near access to site makes for a blind spot.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	33. Village has a very limited bus service so development will lead to a corresponding increase in car use.	Delete site	Scale of development on site would have a minor impact on traffic increase.	None
	34. Development should be closer to main facilities and/or a good bus service.	Delete site	Scale of development is appropriate in a Category 4 Local Service Village.	None
	35. If site is developed it should include some social houses.	Delete site	Provision of social housing will be based on the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CS.18.	None
	36. Public footpath along edge of site provides an open view of fields and is enjoyed by many local people.	Delete site	Impact of development on footpath and views from it would be very limited.	None

	37. Pillerton Hersey is a conservation area and a beautiful small village and development of site will have impact on this.	Delete site	Distance of site from Pillerton Hersey means that development would have very little impact on it.	None
	38. Warwickshire Rural Community Council survey in 2018 suggested village is too small to support further housing due to lack of facilities.	Delete site	Adopted Core Strategy override findings of this survey which focused on provision of affordable housing in any case.	None

<b>Topic: PM.A South of Byfield Road, Priors Marston</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 6</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Sport England Stratford District Council Liberal Democrat Group Lydia Hatton Propernomics Ltd CPRE Warwickshire Kingacre Estates Ltd Environment Agency Cllr Nigel Rock	1. Layout and design of development should not prejudice use of adjacent playing field	Site Proforma should be amended to cover this issue.	This would be appropriate	Refer to need to ensure that use of adjacent playing field is not prejudiced in Site Proforma.
	2. Priors Marston has no shop or bus service and is accessed by unclassified roads in a remote location so is not sustainable.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is very modest and appropriate to Priors Marston.	None
	3. Site would expand village into open countryside in a special landscape area.	Delete site	Scale of development would have a very limited impact on landscape.	None
	4. Will impact on neighbouring property and views from it across countryside and have negative effect on its value.	Delete site	Layout and design of any development would have to ensure that impact on neighbouring properties is reasonable.	None

	5. Promoters support identification of site in the Plan but flexibility should be given to considering site in its entirety not just hatched area.	Amend extent of development area.	It is expected that the entire site should be considered in a comprehensive manner but south-eastern part extends into open countryside.	None
	6. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Priors Marston due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	7. Uncertainties regarding availability and deliverability of site.	Delete site	Site is being actively promoted apparent that it's available and deliverable.	None
	8. Detailed hydraulic modelling should be undertaken to establish impact of flood risk from watercourse.	None specified	This is an issue that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need for hydraulic modelling to establish impact on flood risk from watercourse in Site Proforma.

<b>Topic: PM.B East of Shuckburgh Road, Priors Marston</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 6</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Liberal Democrat Group CPRE Warwickshire Historic England Kingacre Estates Ltd Cllr Nigel Rock Mr Jonathan Church	1. Priors Marston has no shop or bus service and is accessed by unclassified roads in a remote location so is not sustainable.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is very modest and appropriate to Priors Marston.	None
	2. Site expand village into open countryside in a special landscape area.	Delete site	Scale of development would have a very limited impact on landscape.	None

	3. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Priors Marston due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	4. Need to ensure that satisfied that impact on non-designated heritage asset is appropriately addressed through archaeological evaluation of site.	None specified	This matter is already identified in Site Proforma.	None
	5. Uncertainties regarding availability and deliverability of site.	Delete site	Site is being actively promoted so apparent that it's available and deliverable.	None
	6. Landowner supports identification of site in Plan as it is free from major constraint.	None	Noted	None

<b>Topic: QUIN.A East of Back Lane (north), Quinton</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Paul Milliken Rosconn Strategic Land Natural England Historic England Quinton Parish Council Carys Allen Cllr Edward Fitter	1. Site has restricted road access and is not suitable for extra vehicles.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	2. Would use up valuable farming land.	Delete site	Scale of loss of farmland is very modest.	None

Jane Lockton Environment Agency Helen Kavanagh Wendy Smith Andrew Smith	3. Impact on settlement character due to consolidation of two separate character areas within village.	Delete site	There would be very little impact on historic part of village.	None
	4. Impact on setting of various listed buildings.	Delete site	There would be very little impact on setting of listed buildings.	None
	5. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	6. More housing will place enormous strain on current infrastructure such as roads, education and medical facilities.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	7. Not all recently built housing stock has been sold so need for more accommodation does not exist.	Delete site	Identification of reserve sites is in addition to housing requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	8. Detailed hydraulic modelling should be undertaken to establish impact of flood risk from watercourse.	None specified	This is an issue that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need for hydraulic modelling to establish impact on flood risk from watercourse in Site Proforma.
	9. Would further destroy natural beauty of the area and historic part of Lower Quinton.	Delete site	Size of site will mean that impact on character and setting of village would be very modest.	None
	10. Would affect identity of homes, community and where people live.	Delete site	Size of site will mean that impact on social character of village would be modest.	None
	11. Quinton has already accepted more than its fair share of housing developments.	Delete site	Identification of reserve sites is in addition to housing requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None

	12. There are brownfield sites close by that should be developed.	Delete site	Reserve sites are in addition to nearby brownfield sites that are currently being developed.	None
	13. Would not fit with Neighbourhood Plan currently being drafted.	Delete site	Neighbourhood Plan is at an early stage of preparation and can't be given significant weight at this point in time.	None

<b>Topic: QUIN.B East of Back Lane (south), Quinton</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 9</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Paul Milliken Rosconn Strategic Land Natural England Historic England Quinton Parish Council Carys Allen Cllr Edward Fitter Jane Lockton Environment Agency Helen Kavanagh Andrew Smith	1. Site has restricted road access and is not suitable for extra vehicles.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	2. Would use up valuable farming land.	Delete site	Scale of loss of farmland is very modest.	None
	3. Impact on settlement character due to consolidation of two separate character areas within village.	Delete site	There would be very little impact on historic part of village.	None
	4. Impact on setting of various listed buildings.	Delete site	There would be very little impact on setting of listed buildings.	None
	5. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	6. Site Development Considerations in Site	Amend Site Proforma.	This would be appropriate.	Insert reference to assessing and mitigating impact on

	Proforma should require assessment and mitigation of impact on listed barn within the site.			listed barn within site in Site Proforma.
	7. More housing will place enormous strain on current infrastructure such as roads, education and medical facilities.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	8. Not all recently built housing stock has been sold so need for more accommodation does not exist.	Delete site	Identification of reserve sites is in addition to housing requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	9. Detailed hydraulic modelling should be undertaken to establish impact of flood risk from watercourse.	None specified	This is an issue that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need for hydraulic modelling to establish impact on flood risk from watercourse in Site Proforma.
	10. Would further destroy natural beauty of the area and historic part of Lower Quinton.	Delete site	Size of site will mean that impact on character and setting of village would be very modest.	None
	11. Would affect identity of homes, community and where people live.	Delete site	Size of site will mean that impact on social character of village would be modest.	None
	12. Quinton has already accepted more than its fair share of housing developments.	Delete site	Identification of reserve sites is in addition to housing requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	13. There are brownfield sites close by that should be developed.	Delete site	Reserve sites are in addition to nearby brownfield sites that are currently being developed.	None
	14. Would not fit with Neighbourhood Plan currently being drafted.	Delete site	Neighbourhood Plan is at an early stage of preparation and can't be given significant weight at this point in time.	None

<b>Topic: QUIN.C West of Goose Lane, Quinton</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 16</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Peter Bell Paul Milliken Rosconn Strategic Land Hayfield Homes Ltd Natural England	1. Would serve to join Upper and Lower Quinton reducing their separate identities.	Delete site	Extent of proposed development is defined so as to ensure that gap between Upper and Lower Quinton isn't significantly reduced.	None
Alex Gardner Cotswolds Conservation Board CPRE Warwickshire	2. Increased traffic will intensify damage to Tailors Lane.	Delete site	Proposed access to site is off Goose Lane so there would be no demonstrable impact on Tailors Lane.	None
Historic England Quinton Parish Council Carys Allen Jonathan Brown Cllr Edward Fitter	3. Adjacent to west side of site is a drainage ditch running from Meon Hill which may be affected by development and add to flood risk.	Delete site	This issue would need to be addressed satisfactorily in any development proposal for site.	None
Jane Lockton Redrow Homes	4. Would use up valuable farming land.	Delete site	Scale of loss of farmland is very modest.	None
Alex Gardner David Walker Mrs Ann Wilson David Moore Helen Kavanagh	5. Impact on Cotswolds AONB has not been properly taken into account.	Delete site	Impact on setting of Cotswolds AONB would be very limited and can be satisfactorily mitigated through appropriate landscaping.	None
	6. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	7. More housing will place enormous strain on current infrastructure such as roads,	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to	None

	education and medical facilities.		development of this site will be sought.	
	8. Not all recently built housing stock has been sold so need for more accommodation does not exist.	Delete site	Identification of reserve sites is in addition to housing requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	9. Detailed hydraulic modelling should be undertaken to establish impact of flood risk from watercourse.	None specified	This is an issue that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need for hydraulic modelling to establish impact on flood risk from watercourse in Site Proforma.
	10. Road system within Quinton is at capacity.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of development on this site.	None
	11. Concentration of traffic around medical centre poses a risk to pedestrians and development of site will increase this.	Delete site	This issue will need to be addressed satisfactorily in any development proposal for site.	None
	12. Development will affect wildlife and natural habitats.	Delete site	Site isn't protected for its habitat value and any loss would be minor.	None
	13. Impact on listed buildings in Upper Quinton.	Delete site	Relationship of site to listed buildings means that impact of development on their setting would be minor.	None
	14. Site is located within setting of Cotswolds AONB and development of site should not extend further south than medical centre.	Amend development area shown in cross hatching.	Development in cross-hatched area would be restricted to creating an access off Goose Lane and appropriate landscaping would be provided along southern boundary as specified in Site Proforma.	None
	15. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Upper Quinton due to lack of	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core	None

	housing need and impact on village form and character.		Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	
	16. Should undertake a settings assessment due to proximity to Meon Hill Scheduled Monument.	None specified	It would be appropriate to refer to this issue in Site Proforma.	Insert reference to assessing impact on Meon Vale Scheduled Monument in Site Proforma.
	17. Would increase traffic on single track roads through Upper Quinton causing damage its green's unique environment and amenity value.	Delete site	Increase in traffic through Upper Quinton would be minor given site's relationship to wider road network.	None
	18. Promoter of site broadly supports identification of site in the Plan.	Noted	None	None
	19. Site should be made available for medical centre to expand including its car park.	Delete site	Promoter of site has stated that part of it could be made available for expansion of medical centre. It would be appropriate to refer to this in Site Proforma.	Insert reference to providing land for expansion of Meon Medical Centre in Site Proforma.
	20. Would affect identity of homes, community and where people live.	Delete site	Size of site will mean that impact on social character of village would be modest.	None
	21. Quinton has already accepted more than its fair share of housing developments.	Delete site	Identification of reserve sites is in addition to housing requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	22. There are brownfield sites close by that should be developed.	Delete site	Reserve sites are in addition to nearby brownfield sites that are currently being developed.	None
	23. Flooding is a problem as a result of run-off from this field and more building would make this worse.	Delete site	Development of site would be expected not to increase risk of flooding and may help to improve situation for existing properties.	None

	24. Would not fit with Neighbourhood Plan currently being drafted.	Delete site	Neighbourhood Plan is at an early stage of preparation and can't be given significant weight at this point in time.	None
--	--	-------------	---	------

<b>Topic: QUIN.D East of Goose Lane (north), Quinton</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 9</b>	<b>Other: 4</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Rosconn Strategic Land Natural England Cotswolds Conservation Board Historic England Quinton Parish Council Carys Allen Jonathan Brown Cllr Edward Fitter Jane Lockton Mr Alexander Little MBE David Walker Mrs Ann Wilson Helen Kavanagh	1. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	2. Impact on Cotswolds AONB has not been properly taken into account.	Delete site	Impact on setting of Cotswolds AONB would be very limited and can be satisfactorily mitigated through appropriate landscaping.	None
	3. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	4. Site is relatively isolated with undeveloped land on three sides.	Should identify field to north of site instead.	The field to north has recently been developed so proposed site is well-related to current extent of urban form of village.	None
	5. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Upper Quinton due to lack of	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach	None

	housing need and impact on village form and character.		established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	
	6. Should undertake a setting assessment due to proximity to Meon Hill Scheduled Monument.	None specified	It would be appropriate to refer to this issue in Site Proforma.	Insert reference to assessing impact on Meon Hill Scheduled Monument in Site Proforma.
	7. Site is intended to be included in Neighbourhood Plan so is supported by Parish Council.	None	Noted	None
	8. More housing will place enormous strain on current infrastructure such as roads, education and medical facilities.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	9. Not all recently built housing stock has been sold so need for more accommodation does not exist.	Delete site	Identification of reserve sites is in addition to housing requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	10. Impact on listed buildings in Upper Quinton.	Delete site	Relationship of site to listed buildings means that impact of development on their setting would be minor.	None
	11. Would serve to join Upper and Lower Quinton reducing their separate identities.	Delete site	Extent of proposed development is defined so as to ensure that gap between Upper and Lower Quinton isn't significantly reduced.	None
	12. Would increase traffic on single track roads through Upper Quinton causing damage its green's unique environment and amenity value.	Delete site	Increase in traffic through Upper Quinton would be minor given site's relationship to wider road network.	None

	13. Land is being actively farmed and should not reduce capacity to produce food.	Delete site	Scale of loss of farmland is relatively modest.	None
	14. Development will affect wildlife and natural habitats.	Delete site	Site isn't protected for its habitat value and any loss would be minor.	None
	15. Number of dwellings proposed should be reduced to protect character and tranquillity of Quinton towards Meon Hill.	Reduce dwelling numbers specified for site.	Doing so would have very little effect as the scale of impact in this respect is very modest in any case.	None
	16. Would affect identity of homes, community and where people live.	Delete site	Size of site will mean that impact on social character of village would be modest.	None
	17. Quinton has already accepted more than its fair share of housing developments.	Delete site	Identification of reserve sites is in addition to housing requirement set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	18. There are brownfield sites close by that should be developed.	Delete site	Reserve sites are in addition to nearby brownfield sites that are currently being developed.	None
	19. Flooding is a problem and more building would make this worse.	Delete site	Development of site would be expected not to increase risk of flooding and may help to improve situation for existing properties.	None
	20. Would not fit with Neighbourhood Plan currently being drafted.	Delete site	Neighbourhood Plan is at an early stage of preparation and can't be given significant weight at this point in time.	None

<b>Topic: SALF.A North of Bomford Way, Salford Priors</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 33</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Oliver Hawker Adam and Helen Hunter Oliver Hawker Sandra Tappin Clare Barton	1. Site is prone to flooding and risk that further development will affect existing properties.	Delete site	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
Jenny Basnett Laura White Alamo Manufacturing Services (UK) Ltd Anthony Shale Mr Alan Clayton Karen Kempton K Austin J Mole	2. Flood risk and drainage strategy for adjacent development states that this site would be utilised for surface water attenuation and sustainable urban drainage features. Development will disrupt complex flood defences built for existing site.	Delete site	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
Lyn Homans Leslie Simon Mike & Hayley Wood Robert Poole Tony Sharpe and Jill Staples-Grantham	3. Increase in traffic during construction and once occupied which will cause disruption, noise and danger to children and pets.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of this site being developed although construction traffic will need to be regulated.	None
Clive Hickman Clive Hickman Dave Thompson Jon Parker Lydia Fisher	4. Balancing pond associated with previous development has established a natural habitat for wildlife which would be destroyed by further development.	Delete site	Existing balancing pond will need to be retained.	None
Stefanie Holmes-Arnold Oliver Hawker Mr James Truscott	5. New houses would reduce privacy of current houses	Delete site	This matter would be addressed at planning application stage.	None
Deborah Poole Ian Rutherford John Bradfield Nigel Ward Wychavon District Council	6. Village is expanding at a rate that will dilute its character.	Delete site	Scale of development proposed is relatively modest and wouldn't have a significant impact on character of village.	None
James Spreckley Steven Higgins and Sarah Dainter	7. Road is very narrow with a lot of on-street parking which causes problems for bin	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of this site being developed but	None

<p>Jamie and Claire Kingdon Redvers Carr Walter Thomson Salford Priors Parish Council Environment Agency</p>	lorries, fire engines and deliveries.		standard of access will need to be achievable.	
	8. Road is unadopted which means residents are responsible for its maintenance.	Delete site	This matter will need to be addressed between developer and County Highway Authority at planning application stage.	None
	9. Field is last one in village that has not been used for agriculture and its loss will destroy habitats of native animals, including many species of birds on conservation Red List, that cannot be replicated elsewhere.	Delete site	Site isn't designated for its wildlife value but an ecological assessment should be produced by an applicant to address this issue.	None
	10. Landowners support identification of site in the Plan.	None	Noted	None
	11. Salford Priors has already far exceeded the required housing in Core Strategy so inclusion of site will lead to over development of village to detriment of its character.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	12. Would create a huge amount of additional traffic noise, pollution and danger through village.	Delete site	Scale of development on site is relatively modest and would have minimal impact on these matters.	None
	13. Area is a well-used walking route for residents and these open spaces have proved vital for health and well-being.	Delete site	Route is not a public footpath so there is no requirement for this to be retained.	None
	14. Village doesn't have the infrastructure such as at primary school for additional people.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None

	15. Derelict areas should be developed instead of green fields.	Delete site	In practice reserve sites have to be on greenfield land as principle of development is acceptable on brownfield sites.	None
	16. Local infrastructure such as electricity and water has been disrupted by level of construction works in village.	Delete site	This matter would need to be addressed at the development stage in conjunction with utility providers.	None
	17. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None
	18. Development of site would extend built form of Salford Priors into open countryside.	Delete site	In practice reserve sites have to be outside existing village as principle of housing is acceptable inside it.	None
	19. Before site is taken further forward a full Flood Risk Assessment should be completed.	Delete site	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	20. Site is best and most versatile agricultural land, contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy.	Delete site	The site doesn't fall within this category of agricultural land.	None
	21. Site would impact on local distinctiveness and rural character and adjoins Salford Priors Conservation Area, contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy.	Delete site	Site is some distance from Conservation Area and would have a relatively modest impact on character of local area.	None
	22. Site could affect retention and growth of existing	Delete site	Site would have no effect on existing business.	None

	business, contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy.			
	23. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.	Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Level 2 SFRA, Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.

<b>Topic: SOU.A East of Galanos House, Southam</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Historic England Aldi Stores Ltd Rockspring Barwood Southam Ltd Southam Town Council	1. Need to ensure that satisfied that impact on non-designated heritage asset is appropriately addressed through archaeological evaluation of site.	Should include requirement for an archaeological investigation and be satisfied that impact on non-designated heritage assets is appropriately addressed.	It would be appropriate to refer to this issue in Site Proforma.	Insert reference to undertaking an archaeological investigation in Site Proforma.
	2. Site is suitable, immediately available and viable.	None	Noted	None
	3. Site is severed from town centre due to the bypass and lack of safe crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists.	Delete site	Site is close to toucan crossing at southern end of bypass although shared footway/cycleway would need to be provided.	Insert reference to provision of footway/cycleway between site and toucan crossing at southern end of bypass in Site Proforma.
	4. Development to east of bypass would produce a separate community from main town without appropriate connections.	Delete site	This issue is acknowledged which makes provision of a footway/cycleway route between site and existing urban area critical.	Insert reference to provision of footway/cycleway between site and toucan crossing at southern end of bypass in Site Proforma.

	5. Lack of capacity at Southam College and traffic impact of any future expansion.	Delete site	Capacity issue at Southam College is acknowledged although there may be scope to accommodate this relatively small site.	None
--	--	-------------	--	------

<b>Topic: SOU.B West of Banbury Road, Southam</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Severn Trent Water Sport England Historic England Bloor Homes South Midlands Southam Town Council	1. Site is within fluvial flood zone so proposed development should be in consultation with Environment Agency.	None specified	Proposed development area is outside fluvial flood zone.	None
	2. Site is high risk to surface water flooding.	None specified	This issue is already specified in Site Proforma.	None
	3. Further development is not recommended in this catchment until improvement scheme to Itchen Bank Wastewater Treatment Works is completed which is currently programmed for delivery in 2024.	None specified	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily. Release of site for development will take WaWTW capacity constraint into account.	None
	4. Site Proforma as worded does not require equivalent quantity of playing field lost to development to be provided elsewhere.	Site Proforma should be amended to read 'Provide replacement playing field equivalent or greater in quantity and quality than that proposed to be lost.'	This would be appropriate	Amend Site Proforma to read 'Provide replacement playing fields on southern part of the equivalent or greater in quantity and quality than those that would be lost.'
	5. Need to ensure that satisfied that impact on non-	None specified	This issue is already specified in Site Proforma.	None

	designated heritage asset is appropriately addressed through archaeological evaluation of site.			
	6. Site is suitable for development due to provisions of Proposal SOU.1 in Core Strategy.	Status of site should be clarified in Site Allocations Plan.	This is a matter that can be resolved outside the Site Allocations Plan process.	None
	7. Lack of capacity at Southam College and traffic impact of any future expansion.	Delete site	Capacity issue at Southam College is acknowledged although there may be scope to accommodate this site.	None
	8. Access to site through recent development is not satisfactory.	Delete site	It is anticipated that a new access would be provided off Banbury Road to serve this development.	None
	9. Site is crossed by a number of public footpaths which would lose their informal green infrastructure.	Delete site	Site Proforma specifies that existing public footpath should be incorporated into development although its existing character would be affected.	None

<b>Topic: SOU.C North of Daventry Road, Southam</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Severn Trent Water Vistry Group PLC Historic England	1. Site has areas of high risk to surface water flooding at southern boundary. Any future application must be accompanied with a Flood	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.

Rockspring Barwood Southam Ltd Environment Agency John Drain P J Shillcock Southam Town Council	Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.			
	2. Further development is not recommended in this catchment until improvement scheme to Itchen Bank Wastewater Treatment Works is completed which is currently programmed for delivery in 2024.	None specified	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily. Release of site for development will take WaWTW capacity constraint into account.	None
	3. Promoters support identification of site but of the view that it can accommodate a higher number of dwellings.	Amend extent of development area and increase dwelling capacity of site to 500 to 550.	Assessment has identified significant landscape impact if development was to take place on north-eastern parts of the site because it is elevated with views over it from various directions including approach to Southam along Daventry Road.	None
	4. Parts of site are affected by ridge and furrow and need to be satisfied that impact is addressed through requirement for an archaeological evaluation to inform appropriate design to avoid and minimise harm.	None specified	Need for an archaeological assessment is already identified in Site Proforma.	None
	5. Site is severed from town centre due to the bypass and lack of safe crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists.	Delete site	Site Proforma specifies the need to provide a signalised pedestrian/cycle crossing of the bypass between site and existing urban area.	None
	6. Part of site is located within floodplain so a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test and Exception Test are required.	Evidence is required to support inclusion of site in the Plan.	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Level 2 SFRA, Sequential Test and Exception Test in Site Proforma.

	7. Additional development will not contribute to social well-being of town and place further strain on local services.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	8. Additional development will greatly impact biodiversity of area.	Delete site	Important biodiversity features of the site will be retained in layout of development.	None
	9. River Stowe regularly floods fields within site which acts as a buffer to reduce flooding in properties in town.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily.	None
	10. Bridle and footpaths running through site are one of few places where local people can walk alongside River Stowe.	Delete site	Public Right of Way will be retained alongside river on southern part of site as specified in Site Proforma.	None
	11. Should amend existing large scale housing developments instead of destroying unspoilt areas.	Delete site	Reserve housing sites are in addition to existing provision of housing identified in Core Strategy.	None
	12. Traffic flow along A425 Daventry Road has increased considerably following large housing developments and a further junction will add to current issues of speeding and congestion.	Delete site	Primary vehicle access to site is to be off Southam Bypass which will help to manage increase in traffic on Daventry Road.	None
	13. Site is outside Built Up Area Boundary for Southam.	Delete site	Reserve housing sites have to be outside BUABs as a matter of principle.	None
	14. Bypass creates a natural boundary to town and site would cause an overspill into greenfield area.	Delete site	This is acknowledged but development has already extended to east of bypass in any case.	None
	15. Southam has had its fair share of new development.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that Southam has taken a considerable amount of	None

			development in recent years but reserve housing sites are in addition to allocations in Core Strategy.	
	16. Will increase surface water runoff and cause flooding of existing properties.	Delete site	This issue will need to be addressed satisfactorily by any development proposal.	None
	17. Lack of capacity at Southam College and traffic impact of any future expansion.	Delete site	Capacity issue at Southam College is acknowledged and situation would need to be resolved if this site is to be developed.	None
	18. Loss of informal green infrastructure associated with public footpaths that cross site.	Delete site	Existing green infrastructure and public footpath alongside river at southern end of site will be retained and enhanced as specified in Site Proforma.	None

<b>Topic: SOU.D East of Bypass, Southam</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water Rockspring Barwood Southam Ltd Southam Town Council	1. Further development is not recommended in this catchment until improvement scheme to Itchen Bank Wastewater Treatment Works is completed which is currently programmed for delivery in 2024.	None specified	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily. Release of site for development will take WaWTW capacity constraint into account.	None
	2. Site is severed from town centre due to the bypass and	Delete site	Site Proforma specifies the need to provide a signalised pedestrian/cycle crossing of	None

	lack of safe crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists.		the bypass between site and existing urban area.	
	3. Lack of capacity at Southam College and traffic impact of any future expansion.	Delete site	Capacity issue at Southam College is acknowledged and situation would need to be resolved if this site is to be developed.	None
	4. Loss of informal green infrastructure associated with public footpaths that cross site.	Delete site	Site Proforma specifies that Public Right of Way which crosses site should be retained and set within a wide public open space corridor.	None

<b>Topic: SOU.E East of Banbury Road, Southam</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Severn Trent L&Q Estates Historic England Rockspring Barwood Southam Ltd Southam Town Council	1. Site is within fluvial flood zone so proposed development should be in consultation with Environment Agency.	None specified	Proposed development area is outside fluvial flood zone.	None
	2. Further development is not recommended in this catchment until improvement scheme to Itchen Bank Wastewater Treatment Works is completed which is currently programmed for delivery in 2024.	None specified	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily. Release of site for development will take WaWTW capacity constraint into account.	None
	3. Site promoters support identification of site and scale of development proposed.	None	Noted	None

	4. Parts of site are affected by ridge and furrow and need to be satisfied that impact is addressed through requirement for an archaeological evaluation to inform appropriate design to avoid and minimise harm.	None specified	Need for an archaeological assessment is already identified in Site Proforma.	None
	5. Site is severed from town centre due to the bypass and lack of safe crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists.	Delete site	Site Proforma specifies the need to provide a signalised pedestrian/cycle crossing of the bypass between site and existing urban area.	None
	6. Lack of capacity at Southam College and traffic impact of any future expansion.	Delete site	Capacity issue at Southam College is acknowledged and situation would need to be resolved if this site is to be developed.	None
	7. Access through Galanos House care home is unacceptable.	Delete site	Vehicle access would be provided off roundabout at southern end of bypass with an emergency access off Banbury Road.	None

<b>Topic: STOC.A South of Napton Road (east), Stockton</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water Cllr Louis Adam Historic England	1. Hydraulic flooding incidents in immediate downstream network so alternative connection to south would be preferred.	None specified	This matter can be addressed at planning application stage.	None

	2. Number of dwellings should be as small as possible as Stockton has already seen a significant amount of housing.	None specified	This point is noted but it's necessary to use land that is suitable for development in an efficient manner.	None
--	---	----------------	---	------

<b>Topic: STOC.B East of Jubilee Fields, Stockton</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Coventry Diocesan Board of Finance Ltd Severn Trent Water Cllr Louis Adam Historic England Phillip Spark Nicola Fielder	1. Landowner confirms that site is available, suitable and deliverable.	None	Noted	None
	2. Flooding and pollution risks associated with New Zealand Farm.	None specified	This matter will need to be resolved satisfactorily through planning application process.	Insert reference to assessing impact of flooding and pollution associated with New Zealand Farm in Site Proforma
	3. Further development is not recommended in this catchment until improvement scheme to Itchen Bank Wastewater Treatment Works is completed which is currently programmed for delivery in 2024.	None specified	It is acknowledged that this is an important issue that would need to be resolved satisfactorily. Release of site for development will take WaWTW capacity constraint into account.	None
	4. Number of dwellings should be as small as possible as Stockton has already seen a significant amount of housing.	None specified	This point is noted but it's necessary to use land that is suitable for development in an efficient manner.	None
	5. Site may have iron-age ditches and enclosures and need to be satisfied that	None specified	Need for an archaeological assessment is already identified in Site Proforma.	None

	impact is addressed through requirement for an archaeological evaluation to inform appropriate design to avoid and minimise harm.			
	6. Access is down a series of winding narrow residential streets.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	7. Development will destroy view, tranquillity, privacy and quality of life.	Delete site	The layout and design of any development would have to ensure that impact on adjacent existing properties is reasonable.	None

<b>Topic: STR.A North of Evesham Road, Stratford-upon-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Stratford Liberal Democrat Group CEG and Mixed Farms Ltd Natural England Grevayne Properties Ltd CPRE Warwickshire Councillor Gill Cleeve Historic England Stratford upon Avon Town Transport Group Stratford Town Council Planning Consultative Committee	1. Providing an access to site on Bordon Hill would be dangerous and add to congestion in town.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	2. Previous application refused on a number of grounds in particular urbanising an important edge of town and visual impact.	Delete site	Appeal Inspector was concerned about these issues at a time when implementation of West of Shottery development was uncertain.	None
	3. Infrastructure needs of town must be met before site is developed.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to	None

			development of this site will be sought.	
	4. Site is detached from existing settlement and would appear as a significant incursion into countryside.	Delete site	This will not be the case once adjacent West of Shottery development is implemented.	None
	5. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	6. Site is remote from town centre and range of services required to support residential development.	Delete site	Distances involved are not that significant for an edge of town site.	None
	7. Site is likely to contain significant remains of Romano-British settlement and should be assessed prior to allocation of site.	None specified	Need for an archaeological assessment is already identified in Site Proforma.	None
	8. Impact on road network are not acceptable without additional mitigation and/or infrastructure provision.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None

<b>Topic: STR.B East of Shipston Road, Stratford-upon-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 5</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
CEG and Mixed Farms Ltd Natural England	1. Site is detached from existing settlement and would	Delete site	Site is reasonably well-related to existing urban form being	None

<p>Bloor Homes Limited Grevayne Properties Ltd CPRE Warwickshire Stratford upon Avon Town Transport Group Stratford Town Council Planning Consultative Committee Eric and Pauline Lewis</p>	<p>result in a significant incursion into countryside and create an isolated community that is highly car dependent.</p>		<p>adjacent to retail area and a large elderly persons' residential complex.</p>	
	<p>2. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>3. Envisaged that 210 homes can be delivered within years 1 to 5.</p>	<p>Amend Site Proforma to reflect this.</p>	<p>Figures stated in Site Proforma are a realistic reflection as to when development would commence on site if released.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>4. Promoters state that site is deliverable in the short term and there are no land ownership, legal or other constraints.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>5. Site is remote from town centre and range of services required to support residential development.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>Distances involved are not that significant for an edge of town site.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>6. Impact on road network are not acceptable without additional mitigation and/or infrastructure provision.</p>	<p>Delete site</p>	<p>County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>7. Needs to be a full traffic and transport assessment for development on this site along with other planned sites.</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>This would be undertaken through submission of a planning application.</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>8. Infrastructure to support housing development would need to be provided in parallel.</p>	<p>None specified</p>	<p>Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.</p>	<p>None</p>

<b>Topic: TIDD.A South of Sid Courtney Road, Tiddington</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 14</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water Natural England Mr Mark Wilson Tiddington Village Residents Association Sport England Jason Strain Miss Claire Thomas Neil Stannard Mark Loosmore Carol Crabb Dr Craig Joyce	1. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
The Home Guard Club Cllr Kate Rolfe and Cllr Ian Fradgley Alison Hawkes Susan Hewitt Stratford Town Council	2. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
Planning Consultative Committee Ron Swift Natasha Murphy	3. Would require road access through existing development which is currently quiet and safe for children to play.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	4. Adjacent development benefits from open aspect and views which would be lost.	Delete site	The layout and design of any development would have to ensure that impact on adjacent existing properties is reasonable.	None

	5. Sports field is used by a number of groups and should remain available.	Delete site	Site Proforma specifies that playing field would need to be replaced on adjacent land to a comparable specification.	None
	6. A number of properties on recent developments have not been sold so no demand for further development.	Delete site	Reserve sites are identified in case further housing is required.	None
	7. Tiddington has already exceeded Core Strategy housing allocation.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16.	None
	8. Services in village are already at capacity such as primary school.	Delete site	Any necessary improvement to infrastructure relating to development of this site will be sought.	None
	9. Increasing village population further will be detriment of existing and new residents.	Delete site	Scale of development on site would be relatively modest and not cause undue harm to community.	None
	10. Further development in Tiddington would generate more traffic on Clopton Bridge which is at capacity.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	11. Imperative that replacement playing field is adjacent to existing site due to access to ancillary facilities at Home Guard Club.	None specified	Site Proforma specifies that playing field would need to be replaced on adjacent land to a comparable specification.	None
	12. Allocation should incorporate land for replacement playing field.	Amend extent of site identified in the Plan.	Site Proforma specifies need to replace playing field but it cannot be assumed precisely where this should be located at this stage.	None
	13. Replacement playing field should be delivered in	Amend Site Proforma to specify this.	It would be appropriate to specify this.	Amend Site Proforma to refer to requirement that replacement playing field is

	advance of loss of existing facility.			provided in advance of existing facility being lost.
	14. Would increase amount of traffic through Tiddington which is already very busy.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	15. Owner of site supports allocation as it would provide certainty over long term future of sports and social club.	None	Noted	None

<b>Topic: TRED.A South of Blackwell Road, Tredington</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 4</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water CPRE Warwickshire Historic England Piper Homes John Gimblett Sally Ward	1. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	2. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Tredington due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was	None

			endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	
	3. Site is affected by ridge and furrow and need to be satisfied that impact is addressed through requirement for an archaeological evaluation to inform appropriate design to avoid and minimise harm.	None specified	Need for an archaeological assessment is already identified in Site Proforma.	None
	4. Site is close to boundary of Conservation Area and assessment of impact and mitigation should be undertaken.	Add reference to assessing impact on Conservation Area as a Site Development Consideration.	This would be appropriate.	Insert reference to assessing impact on Conservation Area in Site Proforma.
	5. Promoter supports allocation of site in the Plan as it is viable, available and deliverable	None	Noted	None
	6. Conflicts with valued landscape identified by local residents.	Delete site	Scale of development is relatively modest and would have limited impact on landscape.	None
	7. Housing density should be less than 20dph to protect character and nature of village.	Delete site	Density applied is indicative and actual dwelling number that is suitable for site will be established at planning application stage.	None
	8. Would affect views from Blackwell Road towards Brailes Hill and Tredington hills.	Delete site	It is accepted that views from a short section of Blackwell Road would be affected but this impact is relatively modest.	None
	9. Development would lead to loss of views from public footpath towards church.	Delete site	Impact on views from footpath referred to would be very limited.	None

<b>Topic: TYS.A West of Sandpits Lane, Tysoe</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 6</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water Tysoe Parish Council Mr and Mrs G Reed CPRE Warwickshire Historic England Mr and Mrs Dean Judith Slinger Digby and Bridget Norton	1. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	2. Site is allocated in Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan so should not be identified as a reserve site.	Delete site	It is acknowledged that NDP identifies a reserve housing site. That being the case the District Council's current position is not to identify further reserve sites in the SAP if NDP is made.	Dependent on District Council reviewing its approach on this matter.
	3. Northern part of site should be excluded because within Conservation Area, close to listed buildings and an important green space at heart of village	Amend site boundary to exclude northern part.	Site Proforma makes it clear that housing development should be restricted to southern part of site as shown by cross-hatching. Including remainder of site provides scope for a more positive management of open space which would preserve character of Conservation Area and setting of listed buildings. It would be	Insert reference to retaining and managing northern part of site as open space in a manner which preserves the character of the Conservation Area and setting of adjacent listed buildings in Site Proforma.

			appropriate to clarify this in Site Proforma if it is retained as a reserve site.	
	4. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Tysoe due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	5. Parts of site are affected by ridge and furrow and need to be satisfied that impact is addressed through requirement for an archaeological evaluation to inform appropriate design to avoid and minimise harm.	None specified	Need for an archaeological assessment is already identified in Site Proforma.	None
	6. This field has been degraded enough by recent development with many mature trees having been felled and loss of habitat.	Delete site	Scale of impact on trees and habitats would be relatively modest.	None
	7. Site has a tendency to flood and has had historic presence of newts and other wildlife that would be lost.	Delete site	All these matters can be addressed at planning application stage.	None
	8. Sandpits Road and Oxhill Road suffer from traffic and extra traffic would cause more danger at junction with Main Street.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	9. Boundary does not match that of corresponding allocated site in Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan.	Delete site	This site would not be identified in Site Allocations Plan if confirmed in made NDP.	None

<b>Topic: TYS.B North of Saddledon Street, Tysoe</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 4</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk CPRE Warwickshire Mr Roland Cherry Steve Taylor Environment Agency Mark Lynch Tysoe Parish Council	1. High risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	2. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Tysoe due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	3. Site lies partially within Conservation Area and in proximity to heritage and listed assets.	Delete site	Need to assess impact of development on heritage assets is specified in Site Proforma.	None
	4. Would build on one of few remaining farms at heart of the village thus changing its character irreparably.	Delete site	County Council that owns farm is proposing to relocate farm complex to a new site outside village for operational reasons.	None
	5. Chronic access issue from Back Lane and Saddledon Street with width of road being inadequate.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	6. Severe impact on pedestrian safety given	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of	None

	footpath is a main access for schoolchildren and families.		site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	
	7. Would exacerbate flood risk on development and surrounding properties.	Delete site	This is an important matter that would have to be addressed in any planning application.	None
	8. Nature flourishes in farmyard which is a natural asset for whole community.	Delete site	Consideration would need to be given to impact on habitats particularly those of protected species in any planning application.	None
	9. Farmyard is location of 'Happy Herefords' which is a popular new facility for village by providing locally grown produce.	Delete site	County Council that owns farm is proposing to relocate farm complex to a new site outside village for operational reasons.	None
	10. Saddledon Street is incapable of accommodating refuse vehicles in terms of width, turning head and visibility.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	11. Detailed hydraulic modelling should be undertaken to establish impact of flood risk from watercourse.	None specified	This is an issue that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to need for hydraulic modelling to establish impact on flood risk from watercourse in Site Proforma.
	12. Currently a working farm and would remove current agricultural purpose at a time when domestic food production is increasingly important.	Delete site	County Council that owns farm is proposing to relocate farm complex to a new site outside village for operational reasons.	None
	13. Site is identified as a reserve site in Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan.	None	If site is confirmed as a reserve site in made NDP it would have to be deleted as a reserve site in Site Allocations Plan.	Delete if identified as a reserve site in made NDP.

<b>Topic: WELF.A East of Hunt Hall Lane (north), Welford-on-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 5</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Cllr Manuela Perteghella Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Severn Trent Water CPRE Warwickshire Welford-on-Avon Parish Council Mr John Bishop Wychavon District Council Kerry Williams	1. Site is outside Built-Up Area Boundary of Welford-on-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to what is provided for in the NDP. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	2. Policy CS.15 in Core Strategy states that in Local Service Villages development will only take place on sites identified in NDP or small schemes within BUAB.	Delete site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
	3. Site is quite a distance from local services and use of car will be encouraged.	Delete site	Site is reasonably accessible to various services in the village.	None
	4. In past few years Welford has seen a large increase in built development, more than doubling Core Strategy provision.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. Welford is in tier 7 in recognition of this.	None
	5. Welford has a lack of capacity in its sewerage and drainage system which has not been satisfactorily resolved.	Delete site	This issue will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	None
	6. Village has had recurring episodes of fluvial, pluvial and sewage flooding.	Delete site	This issue will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	None

	7. Small area of site is at high risk of surface water flooding so any planning application must be accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed.	None specified	This is a critical matter that needs to be addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for a Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	8. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.
	9. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Welford-on-Avon due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	10. Local primary school is full with every class bar one oversubscribed and further houses would create a completely unsustainable situation.	Delete site	This matter will have to be addressed at the time of any planning application for the site.	None
	11. There is insufficient capacity on road network and traffic cuts through Welford-on-Avon to reach A46.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	12. Site is accessed via a private unadopted single-track	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of	None

	road with poor visibility and mature trees at junction with Barton Road.		site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	
	13. Impact of noise and pollution on adjacent properties as a result of building work.	Delete site	Such impact would have to be regulated through any eventual planning permission.	None
	14. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None

<b>Topic: WELF.B East of Hunt Hall Lane (south), Welford-on-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: The entries in the proposed revisions column are dependent on the site being retained in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan and any amended approach taken towards the release of reserve housing sites.**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water Saffron Estates CPRE Warwickshire Welford-on-Avon Parish Council Mr John Bishop	1. Site is outside Built-Up Area Boundary of Welford-on-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to what is provided for in the NDP. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None
Susan Bishop Wychavon District Council Cllr Manuela Perteghella Kerry Williams	2. Policy CS.15 in Core Strategy states that in Local Service Villages development will only take place on sites identified in NDP or small schemes within BUAB.	Delete site	Core Strategy doesn't state that reserve housing sites cannot be outside a BUAB. In reality that has to be the case as principle of housing is acceptable inside BUABs.	None

	3. Site is quite a distance from local services and use of car will be encouraged.	Delete site	Site is reasonably accessible to various services in the village.	None
	4. In past few years Welford has seen a large increase in built development, more than doubling Core Strategy provision.	Delete site	Provision of reserve housing sites is in addition to the allocation in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. Welford is in tier 7 in recognition of this.	None
	5. Welford has a lack of capacity in its sewerage and drainage system which has not been satisfactorily resolved.	Delete site	This issue will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	None
	6. Village has had recurring episodes of fluvial, pluvial and sewage flooding.	Delete site	This issue will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the determination of any planning application.	None
	7. Promoter supports allocation of reserve site in the Plan but parts of it are now not available for development so should be removed and move boundary slightly to east to maintain provision of 30 dwellings.	Amend site boundary.	It would be appropriate to consider whether site boundary should be amended in either of these respects.	Amend site boundary as shown on accompanying map.
	8. Site should be amended to incorporate Public Right of way to Barton Road to allow direct and convenient access to primary school and other services.	Amend site boundary.	Public Right of Way would need to be retained in any case so there is no justification for amending site boundary to incorporate it. However, specific reference to PROW should be included in Site Proforma.	Insert reference to providing link from site to Barton Road along existing Public Right of Way in Site Proforma.
	9. Site is at high risk of surface water flooding. In first instance, SuDs should be considered as well as	None specified	Flood risk will need to be thoroughly addressed by an applicant and in the	Insert reference to requirement for Flood Risk Management and Drainage Strategy in Site Proforma.

	availability of local drainage ditches and watercourses. There appears to be no readily available sustainable outfall and if connection to foul sewer network is required it would lead to high risk of flooding.		determination of any planning application.	
	10. No justification for identifying reserve sites in Welford-on-Avon due to lack of housing need and impact on village form and character.	Delete site	Scale and distribution of dwellings on reserve sites accords with approach established in adopted Core Strategy and this was endorsed by Inspector who examined the Plan.	None
	11. Local primary school is full with every class bar one oversubscribed and further houses would create a completely unsustainable situation.	Delete site	This matter will have to be addressed at the time of any planning application for the site.	None
	12. There is insufficient capacity on road network and traffic cuts through Welford-on-Avon to reach A46.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	13. Site is accessed via a private unadopted single-track road with poor visibility and mature trees at junction with Barton Road.	Delete site	County Highway Authority hasn't objected to principle of site but improvements that it requires will need to be achievable.	None
	14. Site is not only outside Built-Up Area Boundary but is not adjacent to it.		While this is acknowledged the site is adjacent to a range of existing buildings and is well-related to built form of the village.	None
	15. Impact of noise and pollution on adjacent	Delete site	Such impact would have to be regulated through any eventual planning permission.	None

	properties as a result of building work.			
	16. Development of site will not have a detrimental impact on housing market area and could help to support higher order settlements, eg. Evesham, through additional trips and visits.	None	Noted	None

<b>Topic: Policies Map Part A Reserve Housing Sites</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: comments on the site boundaries are covered in the schedules for individual sites**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
None				

<b>Topic: Annex 1 Schedule of Proposed Reserve Housing Sites</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: comments on Reserve Housing Sites are covered in the schedules for individual sites or under Omission Sites and are not repeated under this topic**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Miss Alison Gray Mr Robert Sprason Warwickshire Police Graham Nicholson	1. Densities cited in Annex 1 of either 30 or 35 dwellings per hectare are urban densities and inappropriate for smaller villages.	Reduce dwelling densities applied to villages	The densities have been applied to different categories of settlement and 25 dwellings per hectare has been used for sites in Category 3 and 4 Local Service Villages.	None

	2. Warwickshire Police identify scale of Section 106 contributions towards police infrastructure relating to a number of sites.	None specified	This matter will be taken into account at the planning application stage for all sites.	None
--	---	----------------	---	------

<b>Topic: Annex 2 Reserve Housing Site Proformas</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

**Note: comments on Reserve Housing Site Proformas are covered in the schedules for individual sites and are not repeated under this topic**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
None				

<b>Topic: Annex 3 Reserve Housing Sites Tranches</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 17</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
William Davis Ltd Rainier Developments Ltd (x 3) L&Q Estates (x 3) Braemar Property Developments Ltd Shipston-on-Stour Town Council Grevayne Properties Ltd Cllr Louis Adam Follett Property Holdings Ltd Corbally Group (Harbury) Ltd Bloor Homes South Midlands Persimmon Homes	1. No objection to the principle of releasing the reserve sites in tranches, but it should be based on a more suitable tiered system. The objection to the current system is that it favours sites in larger settlements over smaller settlements at the expense of the effectiveness of the Plan. Larger sites have longer delivery times. Sites in smaller settlements can be delivered quickly to aid housing delivery.	Introduce a more efficient tier system to release sites in a mix of larger and smaller settlements simultaneously in order to maintain a steady supply through delivery of sites in smaller settlements.	The matter as to whether or not it would be appropriate to amend or simplify the tiers and tranches for delivering reserve housing sites in accordance with Policy SAP.3 has been reconsidered.	The tiers and tranches listed at Annex 3 and associated with Policy SAP.3 has been reconsidered to take into account a wide range of matters.

<p>Bishops Itchington Parish Council Jonathan Brown Kler Group Rectory Homes Ltd (x 2)</p>	<p>2. Object to the isolation of local service villages within Tier 7. Although accepted some villages have already accommodated a proportion of housing exceeding the numbers in the CS, these settlements should not be overlooked if there are suitable and deliverable sites still available for development since they are likely to be less constrained.</p>	<p>Tier 7 should be removed and sites be re-distributed to higher tiers.</p>		
	<p>3. There is a lack of clarity within the tranches. It is confusing and not clear as to how the tranches, settlements and sites have been prioritised and are intended to come forward.</p>	<p>Hold a workshop session with landowners and developers to draft an appropriately worded approach to delivering reserve sites.</p>		
	<p>4. Object to the inclusion of site HCW.A and its Tier 3 classification. The site is in practical terms an extension to Bishops Itchington. The village has provided 183% of proposed housing as per CS.16 and as such is in Tier 7. This site would further extend the village's delivery position.</p>	<p>None specified, although the representation suggests site HCW.A should be removed from Annex 3.</p>		
	<p>5. The approach to release reserve sites is unduly complex and contrary to the aim of the NPPF to significantly boost housing growth. It would be very difficult to assign a particular site to a particular need.</p>	<p>None specified. However, representation suggests consideration of a simpler approach.</p>		

	<p>6. The location of reserve sites should be consistent with the overall balance of distribution set out in the Core Strategy. This is not the case, with a disproportionate reliance on smaller sites within MRCs.</p>	<p>Alter the tiers and tranches to better reflect the distribution strategy of the Core Strategy.</p>		
	<p>7. The mechanisms proposed do not seem fair or balanced in order to ensure delivery and are skewed to the administrative function of the Council rather than to an understanding of the resources and complications associated with development projects.</p>	<p>The prioritising and bringing forward of reserve sites should be simplified.</p>		
	<p>8. The distribution of reserve sites across the LSVs does not reflect the settlement pattern and overall balance of distribution as set out in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>There should be a re-distribution of reserve sites in LSVs with a far greater proportion in Cat. 1 settlements.</p>		
	<p>9. The tiered release system (particularly Tier 7) is welcome recognition of the overwhelming housing Long Itchington has been subjected to.</p>	<p>None specified.</p>		
	<p>10. Object to the omission of site 'Land to south of Alcester Road, Stratford-upon-Avon' from Annex 3.</p>	<p>That the site be included within Tier 1, Tranche A of Annex 3.</p>		
	<p>11. It is respected that the reserve site for Shipston-on-Stour as nominated in the NDP has been carried over to the</p>	<p>None specified.</p>		

	SAP and that the site would be held in Tranche B.			
	12. By collecting together the larger sites, it appears that the need will have to be quite substantial to allow tranches C1 or C2 to be released. By applying a tranche to larger sites, a 'high bar' for release has been applied. There appears to be no mechanism for the release of a single tranche C1 site.	Apply a mechanism which allows further flexibility for the release of a site within a tranche rather than only release whole tranches at one time.		
	13. The approach to restrict some settlements on the basis of previous provision (i.e. Long Itchington in Tier 7) will see more sustainable sites not being allocated as a result of this approach.	Apply a mechanism which allows further flexibility for the release of a site within a tranche rather than only release whole tranches at one time.		
	14. The reserve sites are to accommodate specific purposes. It is not to meet the existing needs of the District. As such, there should be no disaggregation between those settlements which have already accommodated significant housing growth, since such growth was to meet housing requirement for the District.	None specified. However, representation suggests Tier 7 should be omitted from the Annex and settlements be re-assigned to appropriate 'higher level' tiers.		
	15. The tranche matrix is fundamentally flawed. It is possible all purposes may be triggered releasing land in all defined tranches. There is a huge imbalance in division of	Further sites in Shipston-on-Stour should be included. Site SHIP.10 would sensibly address the imbalance.		

	housing numbers between MRCs. The potential housing numbers for Southam and Bidford would be unfeasible without any commitment to infrastructure improvements.			
--	--	--	--	--

<b>Topic: Appendix 1 Reserve Housing Sites identified in Neighbourhood Plans</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Kineton Parish Council Jan Sherwood	1. Kineton map shows Site 1 East of Lighthorne Road considerably larger than area identified in Kineton Neighbourhood Development Plan.	Amend boundary of Site 1 on Kineton map.	Sites 1 and 2 in Appendix 1 of the SAP are shown as larger than the sites identified as sites B and A respectively, in the 'made' Kineton NDP.	Amend the northern boundary of both sites to accord with the NDP if sites are identified in next version of the SAP.
	2. Should consider identifying that both reserve sites in Kineton will be expected to support delivery of link road around north of village.	Refer to link road around north of Kineton.	This is a matter that is covered in the Kineton Neighbourhood Development Plan and need not be dealt with in the SAP.	None
	3. Area of reserve housing site is larger than that identified in Ilmington Neighbourhood Development Plan.	Amend boundary of Site 1 on Ilmington map.	The site is shown larger in the SAP than as identified in the 'made' Ilmington NDP.	Amend boundary of Site 1 on Ilmington map to accord with the NDP if site is identified in next version of the SAP.

<b>Topic: Appendix 2 Reserve Housing Sites – Site Delivery Assessment Form</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
None				

<b>Topic: Topic Paper 1 Reserve Housing Sites</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 4</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: John Careford</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Taylor Wimpey UK x2 Redrow Homes Miller Homes	1. The document sets out a commentary on the approach to dealing with Neighbourhood Plans within the scope of the SAP process. It re-states the view not to identify reserve sites in settlements with 'made' or 'significantly advanced' NDPs that identify a reserve site. Beyond this the topic paper provides no further explanation or clarity on why the Council has chosen to do this. In effect, the Council has sought to side-step what might, in political terms, involve some difficult or awkward decisions at a local level. National policy provides no support for the approach taken by the Council. There is no planning reason why NDPs and the SAP cannot include allocations covering the same NDP area. Provided no duplication, both plans can co-exist and be applied equally for decision making.	The logic of the Council's approach is questioned. It is not the purpose of the SAP to alter, update or delay the process of neighbourhood planning in the District.	It is thought reasonable not to identify additional reserve housing sites in a settlement with a made NDP that already does so. This is particularly the case given the revised approach to identifying reserve sites which means that additional sites aren't required in those settlements where this situation applies.	None.

## Section 2: Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding

<b>Topic: Section 3 Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding (General)</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Matthew Neal</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Louise Hall, Stuart Garnett – Inspired Villages	1. Deplore the Council's policy of allowing new housing to be built within large gardens of older properties within the boundary of the town of Stratford.	None specified.	There is nothing in the policy to state that self-build and custom housebuilding would be allowed in large gardens of older properties in any settlement. The policy sets out that in principle (as with market dwellings) such proposals would be appropriate, subject to any planning application being acceptable in all other respects (such as impact on neighbour amenity, over-development of a site, impact on the character and appearance of the locality etc).	None.
	2. It is not sound to have a section which seeks to allocate self-build and custom housebuilding sites but fail to allocate sites for extra care/specialist accommodation for older people, for which there is a significant unmet need.	None specified.	This section/policy in the SAP is to meet the specific requirements of the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015. The provision of extra care or other specialist accommodation would be dealt with through existing Core Strategy policies.	None.

<b>Topic: Policy SAP.6 – Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding</b>	<b>Support: 9</b>	<b>Object: 18</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Matthew Neal</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Graham Nicholson Stratford on Avon Town Council Wychavon District Council Mr and Mrs T Wythes Councillor Nigel Rock Welford-on-Avon Parish Council David Wilson Homes Steve Taylor Mrs V Leach Millstrand Properties Ltd Alamo Group Europe Ltd Corbally Group (Harbury) Ltd Follett Property Holdings Ltd CPRE Warwickshire Rosconn Strategic Land Vistry Group Framptons Town Planning Ltd Long Itchington Parish Council Gladmans Liberal Democrat Group Mr M Perry Real Christmas Trees Trustees of F H Harris Will Trust Acres Land & Planning Ltd Severn Trent Water Tanworth-in-Arden Parish Council Chris and Sue Hutchins Stratford Climate Action James Phillips	1. Support the policy 2. Object to a policy where custom and self-build houses are agreed in principle outside the defined BUAB of Stratford-upon-Avon. The BUAB is designed to prevent uncontrolled sprawl. This policy contradicts Policy H1 of the made NDP. The Town Council is supportive of projects as part of an agreed reserve site which would then come within an adjusted BUAB for the town.	None. None specified.	Noted. Policy H1 of the NDP does not mention custom or self-build dwellings as an exception for constructing new dwellings outside the BUABs in the Plan. As such, the NDP is silent on the issue of custom and self-build, just like the Core Strategy is silent on the issue.  Policy H1 states: "New housing within the countryside will be strictly controlled and limited to dwellings for rural workers, rural exception sites, replacement dwellings, conversion of buildings of permanent construction, construction of houses of exceptional design and development of brownfield land". This list of exceptions is similar to the list associated with Policy AS.10 (Countryside and Villages) in the Core Strategy.  Seeing as the NDP does not include or consider self-build and custom housebuilding at all, and Policy SAP.6 is a reaction to the requirement to comply with the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act	None. None.

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
			2015 and looks to provide a form of housing to meet a local need similar to rural exception schemes, it is considered that Policy SAP.6 is not in conflict with Policy H1 of the NDP and the principle of sites being considered for self and custom build purposes on land adjacent to the BUAB for the main town of Stratford is appropriate.	
	3. Supports three-tiered approach to delivery of self-build units. Consider promoting exceptional design to reflect NPPF para 79 criterion e).	Include reference to NPPF para 79 in the policy.	Para 79 of the NPPF relates to the construction of isolated homes in the countryside. Seeing as this policy only looks to support proposals within, or adjacent to BUABs of Stratford, MRCs and LSVs, SAP.6 would not support an isolated site in the open countryside and as such NPPF para 79 is not applicable.	None.
	4. Support the proposal to allocate specific sites to meet some of the identified need for self-build and custom-build housing.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
	5. Self-build can have extended construction periods, with resulting visual harm over many years. As such, there should be some policy controls to cover such issues. Construction Management Plans should be	Amend policy to include controls over lengthy build times.  Amend policy to introducing phasing on larger sites.	It is acknowledged that the very nature of multiple plot self-build or custom-build sites will result in sites with extant outline consents but no control over the timing of subsequent reserve matters applications by individual applicants. The	Insert reference in policy that for schemes comprising over ten plots, the development should be implemented in two or more phases to ensure that the marketing of plots and the impact of construction are

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>standard. A method of assessing likelihood of build being accomplished could be considered. Sites with over 10 plots should be avoided, however, if unavoidable, larger sites should be split into phases, with later phases only being released upon substantial completion of previous phases. Controls and definitions need to be established to avoid abuse of the self-build principle. An annual fee should be introduced to remain on the self-build register. Benchmarking against other LPAs for best practice should be introduced.</p>	<p>Introduce fee charging to remain on the Council's register.</p> <p>Introduce benchmarking.</p>	<p>premise of this type of housebuilding is one of choice, including which plot to purchase and build-out, and when. Therefore, tighter controls may be appropriate through planning applications, but not through the overarching policy. It would not be appropriate for the policy to limit the size of site and number of plots. However, for larger sites, the Council agree that phasing would be appropriate in order to ensure impacts are managed and control the rate of plots being released and built-out. Issues relating to the register and benchmarking are not relevant to the policy in the SAP.</p>	<p>managed in an appropriate manner.</p> <p>For each of the larger proposed allocations for self and custom-build in the SAP (i.e. over 10 plots), introduce a requirement for phasing, with the first phase comprising no more than 10 plots.</p>
	<p>6. The policy does not take account of the policy frameworks of 'made' NDPs. Supporting development outside the BUABs of NDPs is in contravention of NDP policies (in particular policy HE5 of the Welford NDP). The PC considers that many of the dwellings constructed within the settlement in recent years would have met the self-build and custom-build criteria, and as such the village of Welford-on-Avon</p>	<p>Remove site SCB.10 from the SAP.</p>	<p>The Welford-on-Avon NDP does not refer to or consider self-build or custom housebuilding. Policy HE5 of the NDP does not mention custom or self-build dwellings as an exception for constructing new dwellings outside the BUABs in the Plan. As such, the NDP is silent on the issue of custom and self-build, just like the Core Strategy is silent on the issue.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>has already met the need for such housing stock. Therefore, proposed site SCB.10 should be removed from the SAP.</p>		<p>The list of exceptions at Policy HE5 is similar to the list associated with Policy AS.10 (Countryside and Villages) in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Seeing as the NDP does not include or consider self-build and custom housebuilding at all, and Policy SAP.6 is a reaction to the requirement to comply with the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and looks to provide a form of housing to meet a local need similar to rural exception schemes, it is considered that Policy SAP.6 is not in conflict with Policy HE5 of the NDP and the principle of sites being considered for self and custom build purposes on land adjacent to the BUAB for the village is appropriate.</p> <p>Whilst a number of dwellings constructed within the village over recent years may well have met the self and custom build criteria, this does not prevent other sites being promoted. Site SCB.10 had been promoted for such purposes and the Council considers it appropriate for inclusion as an allocated site in the SAP.</p>	

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
	7. The 'zero and low carbon homes' section of the policy should be removed as there is no evidence to support its inclusion in the Plan.	Remove the 'zero and low carbon homes' section from the policy.	The Council's reasoning for including this section in the policy is clearly set out in para's 3.1.17 to 3.1.20 of the SAP. The Council consider the requirement to tackle climate change is imperative. The proposed uplift to the energy standards in the policy mirrors the CO2 emissions reduction set out by government in the Future Homes Standard Consultation. As such the policy wording is deemed to be appropriate and justified.	None.
	8. Policy SAP.6 criterion (h) provides for self-build and custom-build housing on unallocated sites adjacent to BUABs of LSVs solely for this specific purpose. There could be instances where self or custom build plots could be provided as a wider scheme to meet local housing needs by way of a rural exception site. There is no planning reason why land could not be released for a mix of forms of housing on the same site, as otherwise sought by the Core Strategy. The word 'solely' should be removed.	Remove the word 'solely' from Policy SAP.6, section 2, criterion (h).	It is acknowledged that there could be instances where self or custom build plots are provided as a wider scheme on unallocated sites adjacent to BUABs to meet local housing needs by way of a rural exception site. Therefore, it is agreed that the word 'solely' should be removed from criteria (h) of the policy.	Remove 'solely' from criteria (h) of the Policy.
	9. The representation promotes a site west of Blakes Close, Lower Brailes	Include the promoted site as an additional allocated site within	The site being promoted is located in the Cotswolds AONB. The Cotswold	None.

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>as a suitable site for self-build/custom housebuilding plots. The representation states that the Council considers, in terms of supply, that the completion of self-build CIL forms is sufficient evidence to show demand is being met. However, this method of assessment is contrary to a recent appeal decision in Wychavon, where the Inspector concluded it was not sufficient [for the Council] to rely upon CIL exemption forms without further analysis. The respondent considers that the Council's supply does not meet current demand and that the allocations in the SAP are insufficient to meet the level of demand for this purpose. They conclude that the emerging SAP is not sound as it relies upon CIL exemption forms to justify supply.</p>	<p>the SAP in order to meet the demand on the register.</p>	<p>Conservation Board has advised the District Council that SCB schemes lying within the AONB should be to meet a need identified in the local area not a District-wide need. This is made clear in Part 2(ii) in Policy SAP.6. On that basis, it would not be appropriate to allocate this site in the SAP. However, a scheme could be promoted under the provisions of this part of the policy to be considered on its merits.</p>	
	<p>10. Welcomes the policy which is consistent with national policy. Fully supportive of approach to allocate sites specifically for this purpose at a number of settlements throughout the District.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>11. The policy fails to recognise most self-build</p>	<p>In particular, remove the following sites from the SAP:</p>	<p>Government guidance advises that the level of demand for</p>	<p>None.</p>

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>plots are in-fill sites within settlements. The requirement should be revised to account for sites within settlements. It is not desirable to allocate greenfield sites for such houses when they can be constructed within settlements. The demand seems unlikely to exceed the number that would be classed as 'windfall' and as such there is no justification to allocate sites on greenfield land outside existing settlements. The respondent objects to all 11 sites listed in the SAP as unjustified.</p>	<p>SCB2, SCB.3, SCB.5, SCB.6, SCB.9 and SCB.11.</p>	<p>self and custom build housing is established by reference to the number of entries on the Council's register. It is considered that the provision made for in criterion (g) of Policy SAP.6 alone will not adequately meet this demand. It must be remembered that the Register is only an indicator of demand, not the whole picture. Provision of sites needs to be sufficient to cater for anticipated latent demand that the Register will not capture.</p>	
	<p>12. Support the policy and in particular site SCB.6 at Napton-on-the-Hill. The District urgently needs sites such as this to come forward. Their opinion is that the amount of people on the register does not fully represent the demand that is out there. However, please re-consider re-drafting the paragraph stating that all schemes will be offered in the first instance to individuals who have a local connection with the District. The respondent lives half a mile outside the District boundary and is therefore ineligible.</p>	<p>Delete or amend paragraph limiting local connection to Stratford-on-Avon District to allow people living outside, but close to the District boundary an opportunity to apply for a plot.</p>	<p>The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Regulations 2016 state, at Section 5 (Local eligibility conditions):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) A relevant authority may set criteria for eligibility for entry in the register in accordance with this regulation.</li> <li>(2) A relevant authority may set a criterion whereby only individuals who meet such conditions as the authority reasonably considers demonstrate that the individual has sufficient connection with the authority's area, are</li> </ol>	<p>None.</p>

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	They wish this criteria to be amended to give some priority to people living just outside the District.		eligible (“a local connection test”).  The Council considers it appropriate to include such eligibility criteria in line with existing criteria for other housing exception schemes. The administrative boundary of the District is deemed to be entirely appropriate as the outer limits for achieving the necessary local connection criteria.	
	13. Object to the allocation of [greenfield] land for self-build plots. They should happen as natural infill or windfall within existing BUABs.	None specified.	Government guidance advises that the level of demand for self and custom build housing is established by reference to the number of entries on the Council’s register. It is considered that the provision made for in criterion (g) of Policy SAP.6 alone will not adequately meet this demand.	None.
	14. Supportive of the criteria required for sites, but drainage strategies will be piecemeal on individual plots, especially with regards to provision of SuDS. Would encourage the addition of suitable wording alongside criteria (c) that SuDS should be incorporated into design, regardless of the size of the site.	Amend criteria (c) to include reference to including SuDS in all schemes.	It is not considered that all schemes could accommodate SuDS. However, it would be appropriate to promote SuDS on sites of sufficient size within which SuDS could be incorporated.	Amend criteria (c) to read “Provision of suitable arrangements for surface water outfall, including the provision of SUDS where appropriate”.

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>15. The respondent contends that para 3.1.17 is factually incorrect stating that declaring a Climate Emergency is a 'pledge to take local action to contribute to national carbon neutral targets. They contend the Council has committed to achieving carbon neutrality by 2030, ahead of national targets oriented to 2050. In practice, this should mean the Council is committed to outstripping national carbon neutral targets.</p>	<p>Amend para 3.1.17, accordingly.</p>	<p>The Council's Climate Emergency web-page quotes:</p> <p>"The Council [has] declared a 'Climate Emergency' with councillors pledging to take local action to contribute to national carbon neutral targets through the development of practices and policies, with an aim to being carbon neutral in the District by 2030".</p> <p>It is suggested para 3.1.17 be amended to reflect that decision in its entirety.</p>	<p>Amend the first sentence of para 3.1.17 to read:</p> <p>"The Council is committed to tackling climate change, and in July 2019 the Council declared a 'Climate Emergency' as a pledge to take local action to contribute to national carbon neutral targets <u>through the development of practices and policies, with an aim to being carbon neutral in the District by 2030.</u>"</p>
	<p>16. Applications that provide for general market housing on self-build and custom housebuilding sites should not be supported and all new development should include measures that mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>None specified.</p>	<p>It is considered the policy as written adequately covers these two issues.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>17. Policy SAP.6 is timely and welcome. Also welcome the caution expressed regarding the delivery of self and custom build on individual plot applications where the CIL exemption form has been completed. The respondent supports the requirement that such sites do not have to comply with the Core Strategy</p>	<p>None specified.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
	Housing Mix policy or provide affordable housing.			
	18. The SAP makes a commendable attempt to identify a number of sites and provide flexibility for sites on the edge of established larger settlements.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
	19. Support approach, with the following general points: Their experience of most self or custom builders suggests people are looking for either an individual isolated plot or a plot on a small scheme with opportunity to build an individualistically designed house. It remains to be seen whether the carbon emissions reduction proposed will be achievable. Where allocated sites are in close proximity to the District boundary, it would be reasonable to allow people living or working just over the District boundary to be given some priority. Suggest that outline applications be accompanied by a Design Code, which can be conditioned thus allowing the developer to get on and provide the necessary services to the site.	Suggestions as listed in their representation.	Isolated plots in the open countryside would not meet sustainability criteria and would not be supported.  The Council considers it is appropriate to include eligibility criteria in line with existing criteria for other housing exception schemes. The administrative boundary of the District is deemed to be entirely appropriate as the outer limits for achieving the necessary local connection criteria.	None.
	20. Question the need to provide self-build plots grouped together on one land	Amendment to Policy SAP.6 to remove any reference to allocated sites outside, but	The Council cannot rely solely upon CIL exempt windfall sites within settlements to provide	None.

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>parcel. Most plots become available through in-fill sites or re-development within existing settlements. It is undesirable to allocate greenfield land for such houses when they can be accommodated within settlements. Policy SAP.5 of the now withdrawn 2019 version SAP provided for normal windfall provision. Objection is raised to sites SCB.1 to SCB.11, since they are unjustified.</p>	<p>adjacent to BUABs and omission of sites SCB.1 to SCB.11</p>	<p>the number of plots necessary to take account of the number of people on the self-build and custom housebuilding register. It is considered appropriate to allocate a number of sites within the SAP as 'exception' schemes for this specific purpose on sites outside, but adjacent to BUABs of the larger and more sustainable settlements to accommodate the plot numbers necessary to match the numbers on the SCB Register.</p>	
	<p>21. Support approach, but further clarity required on:  a) Legal requirement obliging plots to be offered in the first instance to residents of the District – the policy should clearly set out how long this requirement should last, following which plots can be offered to those outside the District.  b) Policy should clarify what the period of marketing would be and what would happen after that period elapses, should plots not be taken up.  c) Given the legal agreement, it would not be necessary to impose a planning condition restricting the site to custom and self-build use.</p>	<p>a) Amend policy – suggest three months as an adequate time period.  b) Amend policy – suggest six months marketing period, which is generally in line with other authority areas.  c) Remove/amend para 3.1.15 of supporting text.  d) Cross-reference any viability assessment in the supporting text to the policy.  e) Amend policy to refer to Building Regs changes and possible implications for % reduction in carbon emissions quoted in SAP.6.</p>	<p>a) Such issues would be set out in any associated S106 agreement and is not for the policy to determine.  b) Such issues would be set out in any associated S106 agreement and is not for the policy to determine.  c) It is reasonable and appropriate for any planning consent to condition the use of the site for this specific purpose where a legal agreement isn't used to control the nature and occupancy of such sites.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>d) The policy has viability implications that have not been tested through the Core Strategy. The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan-making stage. Any such evidence should be referenced.</p> <p>e) The Government has yet to confirm the final % target reduction in CO2 emissions. If the 31% reduction target is to be retained in SAP.6, it should make it clear that the policy reductions would fall away if and when any corresponding changes to Building Reg's come into effect.</p> <p>f) It is not justified for the SAP to 'pre-empt' the Government's potential changes to Building Regs by requiring a significant uplift in CO2 reductions over and above current standards. Standards should not be in excess of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 (around 19% improvement on current standards). Accordingly, the carbon reduction requirement in SAP.6 is unjustified, contrary to national planning and not sound.</p>	<p>f) Delete carbon reductions requirement in SAP.6 since it is beyond the levels set through the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.</p>	<p>d) Because this policy relates to providing a specific form of housing, it should reasonably be assumed that any scheme that comes forward would be viable at the outset. If the site is not viable it will not be implemented.</p> <p>e) It would be reasonable to acknowledge that national policy could change in this respect.</p> <p>f) Ditto</p>	

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>22. Object to the policy due to lack of clarity as to compliance with the test of soundness. a) The Policy fails to set out what is meant 'to be offered in the first instance'. b) Imposing an unduly onerous period of time for marketing will frustrate delivery and undermine viability of such developments. The policy should quote the period of time in which marketing of plots has to take place in order that the justification for such a limitation can be properly examined. c) The land use planning process cannot reasonably distinguish between close family and family that is not close. The residential qualification should just refer to a family connection. d) The policy does not identify the process that is anticipated for determining whether the first preference of purchasing a plot is satisfied.</p>	<p>a) Amend wording to clarify what is meant by 'to be offered in the first instance'</p> <p>b) Include marketing period within the policy.</p> <p>c) Amend reference to family connection as described.</p> <p>d) Include preference process for 'first preference purchasing'.</p>	<p>a) Definition of this would be established in an associated S106 agreement.</p> <p>b) Marketing timeframes would be set out in any associated S106 agreement and is not for the policy to determine.</p> <p>c) Definition of this would be established in an associated S106 agreement.</p> <p>d) The clauses necessary to confirm whether the provisions of the policy have been met will be dealt with through any associated S106 agreement.</p>	None.
	<p>23. Recommend insertion of a policy mechanism which allows for instances when self-build plots are not taken up and brought forward within a 12 month period, they should revert back to housing</p>	<p>Example wording to be added: "Where plots have been prominently marketed for sale to self and custom builders for at least 12 months, and have not sold, the plot can return to the developer to be developed</p>	<p>It is entirely reasonable to expect that SCB plots that are granted planning permission specifically for this purpose should be developed and occupied for this purpose.</p>	None.

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	<p>as part of the wider market. This will ensure the delivery of much needed housing without significant delay.</p>	<p>and/or sold as open market housing.”</p>	<p>Consideration needs to be given to whether a time period should be specified and, if so, how long that should be. This may have to be reassessed over time based on experience. It is not considered necessary, or appropriate, to include such a mechanism in the policy for this reason.</p>	
	<p>24. The ‘zero and low carbon homes’ section of this policy effectively replicates the provisions of SAP.5(b). This text should be removed as there is no evidence to support its inclusion in the Plan. This is a matter expected to be addressed in changes to Building Regulations.</p>	<p>Remove ‘Zero and Low Carbon Homes’ section from Policy SAP.6.</p>	<p>There is a legitimate reason why the ‘Zero and Low Carbon Homes’ is repeated in SAP.5 and SAP.6 – that being the two policies relate to two different types of housing requirement entirely independent of one another. It is therefore appropriate for this section to remain in both policies.</p> <p>The reasoning for including this section in the policy is clearly set out in paras 3.1.17 to 3.1.20 of the SAP. The Council considers the requirement to tackle climate change is imperative. The proposed uplift to the energy standards in the policy mirrors the CO2 emissions reduction set out by government in the Future Homes Standard Consultation. As such the</p>	<p>None.</p>

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
			policy wording is deemed to be appropriate and justified.	

<b>Topic: SCB.1 North of Allimore Lane, Alcester</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

Respondents	Issues raised	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Stratford Liberal Democrat Group CPRE Warwickshire Malcolm Stephenson (x2) John Horner Mr and Mrs T Wythes Roger Pamment Graham Nicholson	1. Must ensure that trees covered by Tree Preservation Order, heritage assets are protected and ecological harm is mitigated.	None specified	All these matters are identified in Proposal SCB.1 and any planning application will be expected to satisfy them.	None
	2. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	3. Unclear what evidence of demand there is for self-build plots in Alcester.	Delete site	Provision of self-build plots is to meet the demand from across Stratford District as a whole not specifically from individual settlements.	None
	4. Allimore Lane is a single track road which is popular for ramblers, dog walkers and cyclists and increase in vehicles on it would be hazardous to them.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that an appropriate access can be achieved which incorporates safe provision for pedestrians and cyclists. This is specifically referred to in Proposal SCB.1.	None
	5. Site is outside inset boundary of Green Belt and exceptional circumstances	Delete site.	Site is not within the Green Belt so this factor isn't applicable.	None

	have not been evidenced and justified.			
	6. Concerned that development of site will affect wildlife.	None specified	Site Proforma specifies that ecological harm should be avoided or suitably mitigated.	None

<b>Topic: SCB.2 East of Skylark Road, Alderminster</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 25</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water Sarah Russell Lesley Casley Natural England Rosconn Group Karen Jones Janine Bluteau J S Melville Michael and Caroline White	1. There is no obvious surface water connection location. If there is no sustainable surface water drainage option and development connects to combined sewer this would cause a high risk.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
CPRE Warwickshire Ettington Parish Council Historic England James Brooks Claire McCormack Mr Roger Webb David Pearce Sam Donovan & Poppy Hadkinson	2. There are enormous and continuing difficulties arising from development of adjacent site in relation to drains, blocked culverts, sewerage and flooding due to surface water run-off.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
Trevor Storey Pauline Storey T E & R M O'Connor Brenda Lockwood Rebecca Lockwood Carl Butterfield Mathew Crawford	3. Skylark Road is relatively narrow with dwellings facing directly onto it and small children currently play in front of them which would be dangerous due to construction traffic.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.

Gillian Elizabeth Hudspith Alderminster Parish Council Don Lemen			and considered prior to determination.	
	4. Alderminster has contributed 25 dwellings towards District's housing needs and a further 20 dwellings is too much for a village with limited services and infrastructure.	None specified	The site to the south for 25 dwellings (ref: 15/03981/REM) was for open market dwellings. The current proposal for up to 17 self-build plots is to provide housing for a different purpose. The current planning application will need to take account of the provision of appropriate infrastructure.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	5. There is no evidence of any unmet or local need for self-build plots in Alderminster.	None specified	Self-build plots are for a District-wide need.	None
	6. Concern about the viability of multiple plot sites and risk that it will take many years to be built out causing an eyesore in the locality, crime and anti-social behaviour and danger to children.	None specified	Such proposals would be subject to a legal agreement upon approval of planning permission. For proposals over 10 dwellings (such as the scheme at Alderminster), SDC consider it would be appropriate to split the release of the site into two phases for marketing and construction purposes	Insert a reference in SCB.2 to splitting the site into two phases.
	7. Access for construction traffic through Old Stour estate would cause disruption to residents for many years.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
8. Site is subject to flooding due to run-off water from steep hill behind which would	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will	

	need specialist assessment and radical works to be undertaken.		Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	9. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.	None
	10. Total site area and net site area stated are inaccurate.	Amend total site area to read 3.2 hectares and net site area to read 1.8 hectares.	It would be appropriate to check the site areas specified and amend them as appropriate.	Amend site areas.
	11. Concerned that community will not fully benefit from public open space that site is expected to provide.	Proposal should provide assurance that community will benefit from provision of public open space on balance of the site.	Public Open Space is just that – open space for use by the local community.	None
	12. Should delay identification of site in order that an overall Village Plan can be drafted to consider other provisions such as a bypass that might go through or in vicinity of site.	Remove site from SAP.	There is no Parish Plan or Neighbourhood Plan for the area and no indication that any such plans are forthcoming. There is no reason to hold up the SAP for local Plans that may or may not happen in the future.	None.
	13. Landscape Sensitivity Study commissioned by District Council identified site as being high/medium sensitivity and inappropriate for development.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.

	14. Site is within Feldon Parklands Special Landscape Area where development that would have a harmful effect should be resisted.	Remove site from SAP	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	15. Would involve loss of productive agricultural land which is becoming increasingly important.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	16. Site is on rising ground so development will dominate landscape and have a huge visual impact on dwellings in immediate vicinity and further afield.	Remove site from SAP	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	17. Size of development will impact on overstretched schools and doctors' surgeries in locality.	None specified	Assessment of the current planning application will need to take account of infrastructure constraints.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	18. There are few jobs in local area so residents will be forced to travel several miles to places of employment.	None specified	Assessment of the current planning application will need to take account of sustainability objectives.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.

	19. Bus service is limited and little used and there is no evening service.	None specified	Assessment of the current planning application will need to take account of sustainability objectives.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	20. Increase in traffic will be considerable and speeding vehicles and growing number of lorries is already an issue.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	21. Would leave way open to development on remainder of the field.	Remove from SAP	Any future proposals would be assessed on their own merits, should they ever materialise.	None.
	22. Further development of this site will severely affect wildlife in immediate area including an active bat community.	Remove from SAP	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	23. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Remove from SAP	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	24. There is no mention of any requirement to assess impact on heritage assets despite its proximity to several listed buildings.	Include a specific requirement to assess the impact of development on heritage assets	It would be appropriate to include such a requirement in Proposal SCB.2.	Insert a specific requirement to assess the impact on heritage assets.

25. Plot prices at Alderminster will be too high to be worthwhile for a self-builder.	None specified	Comments noted. Not a matter for the policy in the SAP.	None.
26. Highly questionable whether drains have any capacity to manage increased water flow.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
27. Topography and drainage problems will lead to additional costs that would not appear to a self-builder.	None specified	Comments noted. Costs associated with build are not a matter for the policy in the SAP.	None
28. Duty to protect existing properties from flooding which could be exacerbated by development of site.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
29. Deed of Grant relating to adjacent development states that Skylark Road is not to be used for construction traffic unless the Planning Authority insist on it being used for such.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
30. Skylark Road is yet to be adopted by County Council and responsibility for maintenance lies with owners	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will

	of Old Stour development so right of access cannot be assumed.		need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	31. Junction of Skylark Road and A3400 has restricted visibility and traffic on main road doesn't adhere to speed limit so additional vehicles will increase accident risk.	None specified	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	32. Site should not be supported until unanswered questions and issues about Old Stour development have been resolved.	Remove from SAP	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	33. Site lies outside Built-Up Area Boundary of village so should not be considered for development.	Remove from SAP	Sites within BUABs have an automatic 'in principle' acceptance for open-market dwellings. By allocating certain sites specifically for the purpose of self and custom housebuilding adjacent to BUABs, this allows the sites to be controlled for this specific purpose, in accordance with appropriate planning conditions and S106 legal agreements. Self and custom build housing is serving a different purpose to open market housing promoted	None.

			through relevant policies within the Core Strategy.	
	34. Consideration should be given to potential for an entirely different access to site which can accommodate construction and everyday traffic following completion.	Consider alternative vehicular access	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	35. No consideration seems to be made to provision of solar panels and rainwater harvesting which should be done as a matter of course.	Consider sustainability objectives of the proposal	Planning application ref: 21/01197/FUL is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	36. Concerned that such a large number of proposed plots on site will lead to many unsold plots for ten years plus which would blight village.	None specified	Such proposals would be subject to a legal agreement upon approval of planning permission. For proposals over 10 dwellings (such as the scheme at Alderminster), SDC consider it would be appropriate to split the release of the site into two phases for marketing and construction purposes	Insert a reference in SCB.2 to splitting the site into two phases.

<b>Topic: SCB.3 North of Idlicote Road, Halford</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Rosconn Strategic Land CPRE Warwickshire Ettington Parish Council Historic England Graham Nicholson	1. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	2. There is little evidence of need for this category of housing in rural communities.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	3. Risk that slow take-up of plots will create a long-term eyesore.	Delete site	The number of plots proposed is not substantial so it is reasonable to assume that the site will be built out relatively quickly.	None
	4. Impact on Ettington Primary School which is already at capacity.	Delete site	Warwickshire County Council has advised that there is some limited capacity at the primary school.	None
	5. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots.	None
	6. There is no mention of any requirement to assess impact on heritage assets despite its proximity to Conservation Area and a listed building.	Include a specific requirement to assess the impact of development on heritage assets	It would be appropriate to include such a requirement in Proposal SCB.3.	Insert a specific requirement to assess impact on heritage assets.

<b>Topic: SCB.4 West of Bush Heath Lane, Harbury</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Natural England CPRE Warwickshire Historic England Mr and Mrs Hart Graham Nicholson	1. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk.  Planning application ref: 20/02112/OUT for the erection of up to 6 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	None.  The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	2. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	3. There is no mention of any requirement to assess impact on heritage assets despite its proximity to Conservation Area.	Include a specific requirement to assess the impact of development on heritage assets	It would be appropriate to include such a requirement in Proposal SCB.4.  Planning application ref: 20/02112/OUT for the erection of up to 6 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters being fully assessed	Insert a specific requirement to assess the impact on heritage assets.  The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.

			and considered prior to determination.	
	4. Would support this site if reserve housing sites in Harbury are removed from the Plan.	None	Self-Build and Custom-Build sites and reserve housing sites have a different purpose so cannot be treated as alternatives.	None

<b>Topic: SCB.5 North of Collingham Lane, Long Itchington</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>	<b>Object: 45</b>	<b>Other: 5</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Warwickshire County Council - Flood Risk Maureen and Brian Smith David and Rosalyn Tatum Severn Trent Water Zoe Farndon Bruce West Rosconn Strategic Land Charlotte Monnington Stratford Liberal Democrat Group Janet Powell	1. Site includes areas with high surface water flood risk. Overland flow routes will need to be considered, so that flood risk is not increased to nearby dwellings. Any planning application will need to be accompanied by a FRA and Drainage Strategy detailing how water will be managed.	None specified.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
Long Itchington Parish Council Chris and Sue Hutchins Simon Collyer Richard Jackson Karen Wells Christopher Byrne Jodie Bisp CPRE Warwickshire Cllr Louis Adam Alexander Banthien	2. Too many dwellings have been constructed in the settlement in short space of time. There is no requirement for more – already significantly over provided against Core Strategy figures.	Removes site from SAP.	Custom and self-build dwellings serve a different purpose to open market dwellings granted consent on windfall sites or allocations set out within the Core Strategy. They are to fulfil the Council's obligation to meet the Government's aspirations encapsulated within the Self-Build and Custom	None.

<p>Julie Smith and Roger Constable Mark Anderson Les Perry Historic England</p>			<p>Housebuilding Act 2015 and are therefore providing opportunities for development above those set out in the Core Strategy.</p>	
<p>Linda Rose Brian Lenihan Terri du Bois Veronica Dobie Kate McIlvaney David Buchholz Mervyn &amp; Margaret Smith John Hurley Pamela Owen David Reaves Michaela Byrne David Glanville</p>	<p>3. Ongoing and unresolved sewage overflow problems in the Collingham Lane area due to Severn Trent incorrectly recording the storm drain running down Stockton Road as a foul sewer. No further housing developments should be approved until this issue has been resolved.</p>	<p>Remove site from SAP.</p>	<p>Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.</p>	<p>The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.</p>
<p>Susan West N de Luca F de Luca David Chinn Wilfred and Jean Huitson Deborah and Dave Wood Denise Nunn Minnie Chesser Mr Phillip Claydon Tracey de Luca Sue Freeman Bob Freeman</p>	<p>4. The village is within the Southam College catchment area, which SDC said it was trying to avoid due to the school being at capacity.</p>	<p>Remove site from SAP.</p>	<p>Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.</p>	<p>The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.</p>
<p>Jon Venn Sonia Washbrook Catherine Stansfield Graham Nicholson</p>	<p>5. The site is located outside the BUAB and would spread development into the open countryside. The Landscape Sensitivity Study indicates this site to be unsuitable for development due to its particular landscape features.</p>	<p>Remove site from SAP.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the LSS produced in 2011 to inform the production of the Core Strategy identifies the field as a whole as being unsuitable for development due to its particular characteristics. However, this issue needs to be assessed in the current context. Planning</p>	<p>The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.</p>

			application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	
	6. The nearby road junction and local roads are busy and dangerous for pedestrians and car users and unsuitable for additional construction traffic.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	7. The local primary school is full and as such there is no capacity for further development in the village.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	8. Collingham Lane is a narrow road which gets heavily congested at peak	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the

	times of the day, causing traffic build-up, which leads on to Stockton Road. The lane is also frequently used by farm machinery. This proposal would only add to congestion and environmental harm in this area.		build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	9. Building houses along Collingham Lane will result in additional built form in a flood risk area, which will cause more surface water flooding.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	10. The site is important for local wildlife, being grassland that was not intensively farmed. The site is important for birdlife, insects and a variety of flora. The loss of the site would be a disaster for local biodiversity.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	11. Development of this site does not fulfil the guidelines set out in the Neighbourhood Plan for further housing in the village.	Remove site from SAP.	The NDP is silent on the issue of self and custom housebuilding, much like the Core Strategy. Therefore, the NPPF takes precedence on such matters, which actively	None.

			promotes this type of development.	
	12. The village does not have the infrastructure to accommodate more dwellings. There is limited public transport serving the village and there are few services or employment opportunities.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	13. The effect on the value of dwellings opposite the site would be devastating. The noise created from additional dwellings would be unbearable. Lights from any new dwellings would affect residential amenity of neighbouring properties.	Remove site from SAP.	The possible effect of development on house prices is not a policy consideration. The potential impact of development on residential amenity is a material planning consideration through the assessment of a planning application.	None.
	14. The area is hydrologically unstable due to the clay nature of the soil and variable water table and therefore unsuitable for development.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	15. Further dwellings would damage the current character of the village. Development	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the

	would impose yet another area of suburban development, further changing the nature of the rural village.		build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	16. Development of this site would lead to the loss of an historic meadow.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	17. The culvert that runs through the field discharges into the village pond. If houses are built, the pond will dry out in the summer months.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	18. After the refusal of planning permission for development on the adjacent field, it seems unreasonable to allow an estate to be built on this site. It seems absurd that	Remove site from SAP.	Custom and self-built dwellings serve a different purpose to open market dwellings granted consent on windfall sites or allocations set out within the Core Strategy.	None.

	SDC should include this plot in the SAP after opposing the application in the adjoining field.		They are to fulfil the Council's obligation to meet the Government's aspirations encapsulated within the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and are therefore providing opportunities for development above those set out in the Core Strategy.	
	19. The site contains remnant ridge and furrow demonstrating a need to conserve it for its historic importance.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	20. When brownfield sites are available for development within the village boundary, it does not seem reasonable to promote greenfield sites instead.	Remove site from SAP.	Sites within BUABs have an automatic 'in principle' acceptance for open-market dwellings. By allocating certain sites specifically for the purpose of self and custom housebuilding adjacent to BUABs, this allows the sites to be controlled for this specific purpose, in accordance with appropriate planning conditions and S106 legal agreements. Self and custom build housing is serving a different purpose to open market housing promoted	None.

			through relevant policies within the Core Strategy.	
	21. Aerial imaging indicates that the site appears to contain the remains of part of the medieval settlement (the backs of building platforms and garden closes). Concern is raised to the proposal as the physical harm to below ground deposits needs to be considered.	The site should be reviewed in advance of allocation with the Council's archaeological adviser, to further assess whether the allocation is deliverable in accordance with the NPPF.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	22. The development of this site would fail to take account of the District Council's declaration of a climate emergency and its pledge to take local action to contribute toward national carbon neutral targets. Developing greenfield sites will release CO2.	Remove site from SAP.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	23. Whilst supporting the allocation, the site would not be capable of accommodating 21 dwellings due to the nature of the proposal. However, there would be potential to provide up to 14 units on site, in total.	Amend site specific proposal details for SCB.5 to reflect lower density development.	The current planning application promotes up to 9 dwellings on the site.	None.
	24. The site currently experiences flooding due to hydraulic constraints in the network. There are incidents of	Do not grant consent for development of this site prior to completion of proposed drainage improvement	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the

	sewer flooding in the immediate downstream network. A growth scheme has been promoted for Itchen Bank catchment. Development at this location is not recommended until the improvement scheme has been completed (currently planned for 2024).	scheme to be carried out in 2024.	consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	25. Any development should retain existing hedgerows and trees both within the site and on the boundaries and see these features enhanced as wildlife habitat.	Protect and retain existing vegetation for provision of natural habitat for wildlife.	Planning application ref: 21/02854/OUT for the erection of up to 9 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.

<b>Topic: SCB.6 North of Dog Lane, Napton-on-the-Hill</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Acres Land & Planning Ltd Jayne Holland Napton-on-the-Hill Parish Council CPRE Warwickshire Historic England James Phillips Mr James Sleight	1. Promoters support identification of site in the Plan apart from the requirement to incorporate a footpath as it does not cross the site.	Delete reference to incorporating a footpath.	It is correct that the footpath is adjacent to but outside the site so it would be appropriate to delete this requirement.	Delete requirement to incorporate public footpath from Site Proforma.
	2. Will adversely impact on Fells Lane which has	Delete site	Vehicle access will not be onto Fells Lane so	None

Cllr Nigel Rock Graham Nicholson	provided a safe and attractive pedestrian link to the village.		development will not have an impact on its character.	
	3. Significant concern about increase in number of proposed plots from 5 to 15 which is larger than small scale.	Reduce number of plots proposed	Assessment of this site has concluded that the whole area is suitable for development and wouldn't lead to an unacceptable extension of the built form of the village into countryside.  Planning application ref: 21/01175/OUT for the erection of up to 11 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority.	None. However, the decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	4. Concerned that Self-build Register is not up-to-date and does not accurately reflect demand from genuine sources.	None specified	Register is updated regularly although it is accepted that no assessment is made of the nature of parties on it.	None
	5. Proposal does not mirror demand for self-build identified in local Housing Needs Survey.	None specified	Self-Build proposals in the SAP are intended to meet demand for such plots across Stratford District as a whole.	None
	6. Access to the site is on area of road network that is already having traffic issues due to junction of four roads.	None specified	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that a satisfactory access is achievable.	None
	7. Density of 30 dwellings per hectare applied to self-build sites is inappropriate to setting and needs to be revised downwards.	Apply a lower density.	It should be borne in mind that density applied is indicative and a more detailed assessment of what is suitable would be undertaken at planning application stage. Having said that, it would be appropriate to consider whether a lower indicative	Consideration will be given to applying lower density to self-build allocations.

			density should be applied to self-build site proposals identified in the SAP to reflect their nature.	
	8. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	9. There is no mention of any requirement to assess impact on heritage assets despite site forming part of the possible extent of a medieval settlement. This should be done in advance of allocation being made.	Include a specific requirement to assess the impact of development on heritage assets	Such an assessment would be required to be undertaken and submitted with any planning application for the site. It would be appropriate to include such a requirement in Proposal SCB.6.  Planning application ref: 21/01175/OUT for the erection of up to 11 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority.	Insert a specific requirement to assess impact on heritage assets.  The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	10. No objection in principle but number of plots has been increased from 5 to 15 which would extend development into open countryside. Development should be constrained to building plots that border the Built-Up Area Boundary.	Reduce number of plots proposed.	Assessment of this site has concluded that the whole area is suitable for development and wouldn't lead to an unacceptable extension of the built form of the village into countryside. The current planning application is for 11 plots.	None
	11. Detailed investigation by Severn Trent about capacity of the drains connecting site to sewage treatment works is required as there have been	None specified	Such an assessment would be undertaken at the planning application stage.	None.

	historical problems along Dog Lane and in relation to surface drainage issues.		Planning application ref: 21/01175/OUT for the erection of up to 11 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority.	
	12. Time frame to complete development could last for several years with protracted disruption.	Reduce number of plots proposed.	The number of plots proposed is not substantial so it is reasonable to assume that the site will be built out relatively quickly.	None

<b>Topic: SCB.7 West of Evesham Road, Salford Priors</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 36</b>	<b>Other: 3</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Mr M Perry CPRE Warwickshire Historic England Lucy Richardson Anthony Shale Anthony & Marie Wolfe Elizabeth Stenhouse Salford Priors Neighbourhood Development Committee Jane Corbett Mr and Mrs Norris Bomford Karen Kempton B Seabourne J Mole Lyn Homans Leslie Simon Mrs H Kingsbury Hilary Smith	1. Promoters support allocation of site in the Plan.	None	Noted	None
	2. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	3. Wording of proposal should be amended regarding the need to conserve the setting of the Conservation Area and the need for a Heritage Statement to assess impact on this and setting of listed building.	Amend proposal to change 'protect' to 'conserve' setting of Conservation Area and to require a Heritage Statement to be produced.	It would be appropriate to make both these changes to Proposal SCB.7.	Amend 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point from 'protect' to 'conserve' and insert additional bullet to read 'Submit a Heritage Statement which assesses the impact of development on the Conservation Area and the listed Orchards Farmhouse.'
	4. Salford Priors has already reached its housing targets in	Delete site	Provision of self-build dwellings is in addition to	None

<p>Graham and Ann Reed Mike &amp; Hayley Wood Tony Sharpe and Jill Staples-Grantham Dr Coral Milburn-Curtis Isabel Burt Dave Thompson John Bradfield Nigel Ward James Spreckley Ltd Mrs K G Hall Pam and John Seville K E Thomas Mrs A.M. Milward Anthony Greatex Mr M Kriese Jennifer Monks Peter Smith Rory Gray David Shellie John and Lynne Barlow John Parrott Salford Priors Parish Council Graham Nicholson</p>	accordance with Core Strategy.		housing requirements set in Core Strategy.	
	5. Character of village is being destroyed by amount of development.	Delete site	Scale of this site is relatively modest and would not have a significant impact on character of village.	None
	6. Site is outside village envelope and would extend built form into open countryside.	Delete site	It is unavoidable that self-build allocations will be outside the existing extent of settlements in order to make sufficient provision and this site is well-related to built form of village.	None
	7. Site is on high quality agricultural land which should be maintained to produce food to feed the nation.	Delete site	Amount of agricultural land that would be lost is modest.	None
	8. Will lead to Salford Priors and Abbots Salford linking up.	Delete site	There would still be a significant gap between the two settlements.	None
	9. Proposal contravenes a number of policies in Neighbourhood Plan.	Delete site	While it is acknowledged that Neighbourhood Plan doesn't identify this site for development, the District Council is required to make provision for self-build development on suitable sites.	None
	10. Lack of design control for self-build houses poses a risk to character of village.	Delete site	Applicants will be expected to produce a Design Code to establish the appropriate nature of development for this specific site. This should be in liaison with Parish Council.	None
11. Further development will put undue pressure on sewerage, water, drainage, roads, schools, health, power and mobile phone services.	Delete site	Developer will be expected to contribute to any infrastructure requirements as appropriate.	None	

	12. Nature of self-build means that development would be slower than commercial developments creating more disturbance to nearby residents and heavy goods transport through village.	Delete site	This point is acknowledged but size of site is not so substantial that this impact would be unreasonable.	Insert a reference in SCB.7 to splitting the site into two phases.
	13. Site is at gateway to the oldest and most historic area of village.	Delete site	Although site is adjacent to Conservation Area, it doesn't impinge on historic features in the village.	None
	14. Land is a haven for wildlife with an established natural ecosystem which would be destroyed.	Delete site	Impact on wildlife would be very modest and site isn't protected for its ecological value.	None
	15. Impact of development creating increase in traffic through village including noise and vibration on very old dwellings close to road and safety of pedestrians.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that development of site is acceptable.	None
	16. Track adjacent to proposed development is used regularly by walkers as part of a circular walk and views over open fields would be lost.	Delete site	It is accepted that views from this footpath would be affected for a short length but this scale of impact isn't unreasonable.	None
	17. Potential impact on existing house prices due to design of houses, access to site and off-site parking in village.	Delete site	This isn't a valid planning consideration.	None
	18. There must be a strict and managed traffic calming scheme provided at entrance to village.	None specified	This is a matter for the County Highway Authority to consider when a planning application is submitted. However, it would be appropriate to specify this in Proposal SCB.7.	Insert a requirement for consideration to be given to introducing traffic calming measures on Evesham Road at the entrance to the village.

	19. Self-build sites should have a strict build time so that prolonged construction is not experienced.	None specified	This issue will be covered by a legal agreement that accompanies any grant of planning permission.	None
	20. Seek assurance that a local eligibility test will be applied based on residency, employment or family connection.	None specified	Provision of self-build sites such as this one is to meet the wider needs of the District so it wouldn't be appropriate to apply such a test.	None
	21. Should apply a financial solvency test to assess whether applicant can afford to purchase land and to ensure completion of dwelling.	None specified	This isn't a planning matter but would no doubt be taken into account by developer of site when individual plots are sold.	None

<b>Topic: SCB.8 West of Coventry Road, Southam</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 2</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
CPRE Warwickshire Historic England Southam Town Council Graham Nicholson	1. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	2. Physical harm to below ground deposits needs to be considered by specialist archaeological adviser. This should be done in advance of allocation being made.	None specified	Such an assessment would be required to be undertaken and submitted with any planning application for the site. This should be specified in Proposal SCB.8.	Insert a specific requirement to assess impact on below ground heritage assets.
	3. Supportive of proposal as long as it remained entirely for self-build provision and is aligned with emerging	None	Noted	None

	Neighbourhood Development Plan.			
--	---------------------------------	--	--	--

<b>Topic: SCB.9 West of Jubilee Fields, Stockton</b>	<b>Support: 4</b>	<b>Object: 5</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Acres Land & Planning Ltd Sport England CPRE Warwickshire Cllr Louis Adam Historic England Alexander Hogg Matt Sharples Michael Sharples Mr Tim Sharples Graham Nicholson	1. Development at this location is not recommended until Itchen Bank Water Treatment Works scheme has been completed.	None specified	This is a critical matter and the scope to accommodate this development in advance of the Water Treatment Works being improved would have to be established when a planning application is submitted.  Planning application ref: 21/02330/OUT for the erection of up to 15 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	None.  The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.
	2. Promoters clarify that they will provide the site and services for Scout Hut but provision of building will be responsibility of the local Scouts Group.	None specified	It would be appropriate to make it clear in Proposal SCB.9 that development of site should provide land and services for Scout building but not the building itself.	Amend 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point to read 'Provide land and services for replacement Scout building within the site'

	3. Existing play area is on land adjacent to the site so is not affected and does not need to be replaced.	Delete requirement to replace the existing children's play area.	This would be appropriate in the circumstances.	Delete 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point relating to replacement of children's play area.
	4. Replacement playing field should be capable of being provided on adjacent field.	Make clear in proposal that replacement provision should not be sited on land capable of forming part of a playing pitch.	There is an apparent misunderstanding on this issue as the proposal does not affect a formal playing pitch so there should be no requirement to replace such a facility.	None
	5. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	6. Impact of access through Jubilee Fields must be considered when determining capacity of site and consider cumulative impact with the proposed reserve housing site STOC.B.	None specified.	This matter will need to be assessed by County Highway Authority through the planning application process. See point 1, above.	None
	7. Density of development must take into account the need for significant mitigation measures to protect landscape and heritage assets.	None specified	This issue is acknowledged and will be addressed through the planning application process. See point 1, above.	None
	8. There is no mention of any requirement to assess impact on ridge and furrow on the site.	Include a specific requirement to carry out an archaeological evaluation.	It would be appropriate to include such a requirement in Proposal SCB.9. See point 1, above.	Insert a specific requirement to undertake an archaeological evaluation of the site.
	9. Jubilee Fields is currently a quiet cul-de-sac and development of site would bring significant disruption to residents during construction and once completed.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that an appropriate access can be provided.	None

	10. Neighbouring residents will expect arrangements to be made at the access into the site to provide a replacement parking space.	None specified	This is a matter for the site developer to consider as it relates to private land.	None
	11. Although a new Scout hut is to be provided, development of site will mean the loss of outdoor space.	New site for outdoor activities should be provided.	The land has been used for these activities with the agreement of the landowner and it would be inappropriate to expect it to be replaced. However, the site is adjacent to an existing playing field which can be used for such purposes.	None

<b>Topic: SCB.10 North of Millers Close, Welford-on-Avon</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 8</b>	<b>Other: 2</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Severn Trent Water Mr and Mrs Day Rosconn Strategic Land Natural England CPRE Warwickshire Historic England Richard and Vanessa Brookes Welford-on-Avon Parish Council Richard Ham Cllr Manuela Perteghella Kerry Williams Graham Nicholson	1. There are no known watercourses or surface water sewers in the area. If site can be drained through SuDS there is the potential for surface water betterment but if this is not possible the site will be high risk.	None specified.	This is a critical issue and will need to be thoroughly addressed through any planning application.  Planning application ref: 21/01195/OUT for the erection of up to 10 no. self and custom build dwellings is pending consideration by the Local Planning Authority and will need to follow due process, with all pertinent site specific matters outlined in these representations being	None  The decision on the planning application will have a bearing on how the site will be taken through future versions of the SAP.

			fully assessed and considered prior to determination.	
	2. Appeal Inspector considering a previous development on the site identified a number of concerns about highway safety due to width of Millers Close, limited lengths of pedestrian footways, street lighting and visibility at junction with High Street.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is significantly lower than appeal scheme for up to 30 dwellings so increase in vehicle movements would be less. However, County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that acceptable highway arrangements can be achieved. See point 1, above.	None
	3. Promoters support allocation of site in Site Allocations Plan.	None	Noted	None
	4. Site is within Impact Risk Zone for designated ecological sites. Need for robust water quality and water quantity measures when delivering site.	None specified	This would be expected of development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk. See point 1, above.	None
	5. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	6. Wording of proposal should be amended regarding the need to conserve the setting of the Conservation Area, the need for a Heritage Statement to assess impact on this and setting of listed buildings, and an archaeological evaluation of potential medieval settlement.	Amend proposal to change 'protect' to 'conserve' setting of Conservation Area and to require a Heritage Statement and an archaeological evaluation to be produced.	It would be appropriate to make both these changes to Proposal SCB.10. See point 1 above, re: assessment of planning application.	Amend 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point from 'protect' to 'conserve' and insert additional bullet to read 'Submit a Heritage Statement which assesses the impact of development on the Conservation Area and on listed buildings and an archaeological evaluation'.

	7. Site is frequented by a substantial number of wild animals and birds which have undisturbed access that would not be the case with reinforced boundary hedgerows.	None specified	Reinforcement of boundary hedgerows as specified in Proposal SCB.10 should benefit wildlife generally.	None
	8. Need for self-build dwellings in Welford has already been met through built and committed dwellings.	Delete site	Provision of self-build plots is to meet the demand from across Stratford District as a whole not specifically from individual settlements.	None
	9. Site is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area.	Delete site	Impact of development on the Conservation Area will have to be addressed at planning application stage. See point 1, above.	None
	10. It is of national interest to protect best and most versatile agricultural land for food production.	Delete site	Site is relatively small, occupied by a large glasshouse and separated from wider farming operations which reduces its agricultural quality.	None
	11. Welford-on-Avon has already made a significant contribution to the required housing number.	Delete site	Provision of self-build plots is in addition to housing requirement set by the Core Strategy.	None
	12. Facilities and services in the village are limited or at capacity.	Delete site	Scale of proposed development is relatively small and would not have a significant impact.	None

<b>Topic: SCB.11 North of Walton Road, Wellesbourne</b>	<b>Support: 2</b>	<b>Object: 30</b>	<b>Other: 1</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
<p>Severn Trent Water Trustees of F H Harris Will Trust Donna Mackillop-Turner CPRE Warwickshire Ettington Parish Council Historic England Margaret Henderson Andrew Kerr Richard Brown Judith Brown Wellesbourne and Walton Parish Council Linda Dane Richard Brown Mr and Mrs Roy Clabon Cllr Anne Parry Keith Hudson John Hargis Adrian Cund Garreth Hughes Janice Thompson Roger J Thompson Dr Adrian Boldy Trevor Shaw Andrew Gore Malcolm Ankrett Matt and Rebecca Ball Trevor Shaw Graham Nicholson Roger J Thompson</p>	1. There have been reported flooding incidents in immediate downstream network. Hydraulic modelling would be required to determine the impact.	None specified	It would be appropriate to specify the need for hydraulic modelling in Proposal SCB.11.	Insert a requirement to undertake hydraulic modelling to assess potential impact on drainage network.
	2. Promoters support allocation of site in the Plan.	None	Noted	None
	3. Boundary of site shown in the Plan does not include all the land being promoted.	Amend boundary to include access to Lowes Lane for pedestrians and cyclists.	Given this access is in the ownership of the site promoter there is no need to include it within the site boundary although it would be appropriate to make reference to providing such an access in the wording of Proposal SCB.11.	Insert a reference to providing a walking and cycling route from the site to Lowes Lane.
	4. Land is identified as high sensitivity according to Neighbourhood Plan.	Delete site	Extent of proposed site is relatively small and would not have a significant impact on high sensitivity of wider landscape along valley of River Dene.	None
	5. Walton Road is extremely narrow and it would be dangerous for it to support additional cars.	Delete site	County Highway Authority will need to be satisfied that Walton Road is capable of accommodating extra traffic.	None
	6. Walton Road is a popular route for walkers and cyclists particularly local people and increasing housing along it will serve to make it dangerous and reduce its enjoyment.	Delete site	The extent of development would have a minor impact on the enjoyment of Walton Road for walking and cycling.	None
	6. Would require alteration to the roadside which would impact on mature hedges,	Delete site	While some cutting back of hedgerows may be required this would not have a major	None

	trees, wildlife and possibly garden frontages.		impact. Any improvements to Walton Road would have to avoid taking land from existing properties unless this can be negotiated.	
	7. Proposal is unjustified as those who wish to self-build houses can find suitable plots within existing built-up area boundaries.	Delete site	Evidence indicates that a number of specific sites will need to be identified in order to meet the level of demand for self-build plots in the District.	None
	8. Little evidence of need for this category of housing in Wellesbourne.	Delete site	Provision of self-build plots is to meet the demand from across Stratford District as a whole not specifically from individual settlements.	None
	9. Rate of development would leave village with a long term disused site attracting unsavoury activity and an eyesore.	Delete site	Modest scale of proposed development shouldn't lead to such an outcome.	None
	10. Likely impact on Ettington Primary School which is already at capacity.	Delete site	Site is within catchment of Wellesbourne Primary School.	None
	11. Would increase traffic on A422 through Ettington.	Delete site	Such an increase in traffic from the proposed development would be imperceptible.	None
	12. Development abuts corner of Conservation Area and there is likely below ground archaeology.	Amend proposal to require assessment of impact of development on the Conservation Area and an archaeological evaluation to be produced.	It would be appropriate to make reference to these in Proposal SCB.11.	Insert additional bullet to read 'Assess the impact of development on the Conservation Area and undertake an archaeological evaluation'.
	13. Field is liable to flooding and is an area of water dispersal and storage in the event the River Dene floods.	Delete site	Site is outside Flood Zones 2 and 3 but an applicant may need to produce a Flood Risk Assessment if requested by	None

			Environment Agency or Lead Local Flood Authority.	
	14. Site lies outside built-up area and was rejected for development in Wellesbourne Neighbourhood Plan.	Delete site	While it is acknowledged that Neighbourhood Plan doesn't identify this site for development, the District Council is required to make provision for self-build development on suitable sites.	None
	15. Walton Road is bordered by numerous trees which are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders.	Delete site	Impact on trees protected by TPOs will need to be thoroughly assessed.	None

<b>Topic: Policies Map Part B Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Sites</b>	<b>Support: 1</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Paul Harris</b>
---	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

**Note: comments on the site boundaries are covered in the schedules for individual sites**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Steve Taylor	None	None	N/A	None

## Section 2: Built-Up Area Boundaries

<b>Topic: Chapter 4 Built-Up Area Boundaries (General)</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Object: 0</b>	<b>Other: 0</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Matthew Neal</b>
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
None				

<b>Topic: Policy SAP.7 – Built-up Area Boundaries</b>	<b>Support: 5</b>	<b>Object: 15</b>	<b>Other: 7</b>	<b>Lead Officer: Matthew Neal</b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Changes sought</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Proposed revisions</b>
Graham Nicholson, John Hargis, Stratford Town Council (x 2), Wychavon District Council, Jonathan Church, Mr M Hale, Lockley Homes, Jayne Whitaker, Wellesbourne & Walton Parish Council, John Horner, Rectory Homes, Richborough Estates, Goldfinch Town Planning Services, Canal and River Trust, Follett Property Holdings Ltd, Historic England, CPRE Warwickshire, Councillor Gill Cleeve, Kendrick Homes Ltd,	1. No reference is made to Wellesbourne having an agreed BUAB. The BUAB is shown on p.10 of the 'made' version NDP.  2. Object to a policy where custom/self-build houses are agreed in principle outside the BUAB of Stratford-upon-Avon. This contradicts Policy H1 of the 'made' Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan.	Amend Explanatory text to include mention of Wellesbourne having an agreed BUAB.  None specified.	Para 4.1.8 of the SAP lists the villages which have identified BUABs through 'made' or well-advanced NDPs. The list of villages does not include Wellesbourne, which is an error.  NDP Policy H1 does not mention custom or self-build dwellings as an exception for constructing new dwellings outside the BUABs in the Plan. As such, the NDP is silent on the issue of custom and self-build, just like the Core Strategy is silent on the issue. The Council believe it appropriate for Stratford Town (as the main settlement) to recognise its role in providing for custom and self-build	Amend the list associated with para 4.1.8 of the SAP to include mention of Wellesbourne having an agreed BUAB through the NDP.  None.

Cotswolds Conservation Board, Rainier Developments Ltd (x 3), Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd, Gladmans, Miller Homes.			dwellings. Seeing as Policy H1 is silent on the issue, Policy SAP.7 in not in contradiction.	
	3. Support the principle of drawing settlement boundaries as an effective means of managing development.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
	4. Supports the updating development boundaries as appropriate and acknowledging BUABs when they have been identified in Neighbourhood Plans.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
	5. The Policy should acknowledge that where a reserve site has been released for development, it should be considered as being within the BUAB for the associated settlement.	Amend policy to cover issue raised.	Para 4.1.13 of the SAP acknowledges that future iterations of BUAB maps will take account of any reserve sites that have been released. There is no requirement for this wording to be within the policy itself.	None.
	6. Concern that some settlements have been excluded and overlooked from Policy SAP.7 (for example the village of Broom has not been included). The SAP does not appear to have been supported by an urban capacity study. The policy approach is rigid and inflexible.	The village of Broom should have had a BUAB through the SAP process and the parcel of land north of Mill Lane, Broom being promoted by the respondent should be included within the Broom BUAB since the land is located within the physical confines of the village.	Broom is classified as an 'all other settlement' in the Core Strategy. Therefore, it is not deemed to be a sustainable location for new development. As such, it has not been allocated a BUAB. The land parcel in question is a paddock. Even if Broom was ever allocated a BUAB, under the methodology, the land in question would not be included within any BUAB for the village.	None.

	<p>7. Para 4.1.14 is unreasonable and too restrictive where it looks to exclude intervening land parcels on the edges of villages (between dwellings) when they are deemed to be non-domestic in nature. It fails to allow development of low-quality green spaces as infill.</p>	<p>Replace text in para 4.1.14 referring to the exclusion of intervening land parcels of non-domestic nature from BUABs and replace with text stating that low-quality green spaces (such as paddocks) will be considered favourably for new housing development.</p>	<p>Para 4.1.14 looks to protect greenfield sites on the periphery of villages where development would not be deemed to be acceptable in principle. The current policy stance and wording of the policy and explanatory text is deemed to be acceptable.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>8. The policy should explicitly state that development within the BUABs of villages washed over by the Green Belt are governed by the provisions of para 145 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Amend the policy to refer to the NPPF.</p>	<p>Policy SAP.7 refers to the need to comply with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy AS.10 (Countryside and Villages), which in turn refers to the provisions of Policy CS.10 (Green Belt) which lists the forms of development not inappropriate, in principle. The explanatory text of CS.10 refers to the NPPF, para 145 of which is a list equivalent to that set out in Policy CS.10. As such, there is no requirement to refer to the NPPF in policy SAP.7.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>9. It is counter-intuitive for the Plan to set development limits (BUABs) to restrict further development when additional sites should be allocated for release to address the 3,000+ dwellings required. If further housing is required to meet any additional need, the BUABs would restrict sites from being delivered.</p>	<p>None specified.</p>	<p>The BUABs indicate in a visual format the limit of the built form of villages and the 'line' which separates land that could accommodate appropriate forms of development from land where 'speculative' development would be inappropriate, in principle. BUABs do not restrict other types of housing 'need' listed in other Core</p>	<p>None.</p>

			Strategy or SAP policies and would not prevent additional reserve housing sites to be added to the existing list of sites, should they be deemed appropriate in all other circumstances. No change required.	
	10. Objection to the definition of the BUAB for Stockton.	A modification is required for the land west of Sycamore Close, Stockton to be included within the BUAB for Stockton and identified as a Reserve Housing Site.	This objection relates to a specific site, and whether or not it should be included as a Reserve Housing Site in the SAP. The comments do not relate to the purpose or wording of Policy SAP.7 specifically.	None.
	11. Objection is raised to footnote 4 of the SAP excluding 'Area 2' at Wellesbourne has been excluded as a Reserve Site since it is identified in the 'made' Wellesbourne and Walton NDP.	The site should be identified as a Reserve Housing Site in the SAP.	This objection relates to a specific site, and whether or not it should be included as a Reserve Housing Site in the SAP. The comments do not relate to the purpose or wording of Policy SAP.7 specifically.	None.
	12. The representation is promoting land at Clifford Chambers as a potential Reserve Housing Site.	The site should be identified as a Reserve Housing Site in the SAP.	This objection relates to a specific site, and whether or not it should be included as a Reserve Housing Site in the SAP. The comments do not relate to the purpose or wording of Policy SAP.7 specifically.	None.
	13. The policy is considered to be consistent with national policy and it is noted that self-build and custom building schemes adjacent to BUABs	None.	Comments noted.	None.

	of Stratford, MRCs and LSVs are supported in principle.			
	14. The principle of development in the Cotswolds AONB being restricted to meeting local needs only is strongly supported. To give the principle appropriate weight, appropriate wording to this effect should be incorporated into Policy SAP.7.	Include wording used in Policy CE12 of the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan 2018-2023 (re: development in the AONB needing to be based on robust evidence of local need).	Policy SAP.7 is merely establishing the built extent of settlements and the acceptance of development, in principle, within those settlements. There is no need or requirement to make a distinction for land washed over by national designations such as AONB or Green Belt. Applications for development in such locations would need to be assessed against other Development Plan policies, taking into account evidence submitted.	None.
	15. Supportive of the principle of defining BUABs for Local Service Villages where no such boundary has been previously identified, under policy SAP.7, as a means of effectively managing development.	None in terms of the policy wording.	Comments noted re: Policy SAP.7. The representation refers in the main to the BUAB for Long Marston village and a request for the inclusion of a site within the BUAB. This will be covered in the schedule for the village BUAB.	None.
	16. Small rural villages should not have BUABs. A previous District Local Plan determined that BUABs were undesirable where villages were set in the open countryside since they tended to attract pressure for development within the boundary.	Remove BUABs drawn for smaller villages (N.B. it is assumed this relates to LSVs, since the representation states that BUABs are justified for large villages and towns).	The reasons why SDC consider BUABs to be appropriate for all villages deemed as sustainable locations for development (i.e. MRCs and LSVs in the Core Strategy) are set out in the Explanatory text accompanying SAP.7 and do not need to be repeated here. BUABs are an effective	None.

			means of managing development.	
	17. It should be ensured that the implications of proposed extensions to BUABs are considered in terms of the potential impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets, particularly in relation to certain settlements (list of villages provided).	Recommend that further assessment of the potential impact of proposed extensions to BUABs is undertaken.	What land parcels sit within or outside a settlement BUABs is dependent upon an assessment against the criteria set out in Annex 4 of the SAP. Any future extensions to BUABs will be due to the approval of planning applications, whether in relation to Reserve Housing Sites or speculative 'windfall' sites on the edges of settlements. The assessment of potential harm to all heritage assets within, or within the setting of any site will be one of the many planning considerations in each instance.	None.
	18. In defining settlement boundaries, it is critical that they are drawn logically and consistently and that they reflect the wider policy intent of the Core Strategy and NPPF. However, the BUAB for Bishops Itchington excludes an area of land which is located within the built confines of the village, which is contrary to the BUAB policy.	The BUAB for Bishops Itchington should be amended to include the parcel of land to which the representation relates.	The comments are noted. No changes are proposed to the policy itself. The issue relating to the Bishops Itchington BUAB has been considered on the topic area covering that specific BUAB.	None.
	19. The definition of BUABs through the SAP will provide a definitive answer to land and home owners as to whether a site lies within the physical	None.	Comments noted.	None.

	confines of a village or not and therefore the forms of development which would be acceptable in principle. The policy provides clarity for all and is therefore supported.			
	20. The proposed BUAB for Earlswood includes land up to the boundary with existing reservoirs. Any proposals for policies relating to this area should have full regard for the likely impact they would have on infrastructure in this location. Similarly, policies will need to take account of the impact of development on the Oxford Canal at Long Itchington.	None specified.	Comments noted. The BUABs include land that meet the methodology set out at Annex 4 to the SAP, which includes garden land backing on to water bodies. The BUAB itself will not have any impact on infrastructure.	None.
	21. A criteria based policy should be used instead of SAP.7 to enable sustainable sites on the edges of BUABs to be approved should the land supply position, or housing requirement require it. A failure to do so would mean the imposition of rigid, inflexible boundaries which do not allow the plan to respond to rapid change.	Replace Policy SAP. 7 with a 'criteria-based' policy (example not provided).	The current policy allows for development in sustainable locations within the settlements hierarchy set by the Core Strategy. Should the land supply situation dictate, Reserve Housing Sites on the edges of settlements could be released.  Reserve sites need to remain outside the settlement boundaries due to the fact the land should only be released in accordance with the specific circumstances set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16 D. If reserve sites were included within the BUABs, the principle of development	None.

			would be established and the sites could be the subject of speculative applications, thus negating the reason for the classification of the site as 'reserve' for the specific purposes set out in the Core Strategy.	
	22. The supporting text to SAP.7 explains that BUABs for settlements within 'made' or well-advanced Neighbourhood Plans will be defined through the NDPs, not the SAP. Concern is raised over potential inconsistency of approach, since the NDPs may not apply the same criteria as SDC through the SAP. This could result in unsustainable patterns of development through the allocation of reserve sites.	None specified.	Invariably, the Parish Councils have utilised the SAP methodology for determining settlement BUABs. SDC has an opportunity to comment on each NDP at Reg.14 and Reg.16 consultation stage of the NDP process. The NDPs are independently examined and must be consistent with Development Plan policies. The use of BUABs is established through the Core Strategy. Whilst some BUABs within NDPs may end up having slight differences to what SDC may have proposed, any 'made' NDP would have passed the Basic Conditions test and deemed to be acceptable in terms of sustainability criteria set out in the NPPF.	None.
	23. To avoid confusion, settlements covered by a 'made' NDP should still have settlement boundaries covered by the SAP. The Bidford-on-Avon BUAB does not include proposed reserve	To include NDP BUABs within the SAP and then amend the NDP BUABs to include Reserve Housing sites.	Para 4.1.5 explains that certain MRCs (including Bidford-on-Avon) have 'made' NDPs including a BUAB for the settlement. Seeing as the NDPs have already been assessed and approved	None.

	<p>sites within it, which is unsound.</p>		<p>through independent examination, there is no requirement for the SAP to revisit the BUABs associated with those settlements.</p> <p>BUABs are not meant to include Reserve Housing Sites within them. Reserve sites need to remain outside the settlement boundaries due to the fact the land should only be released in accordance with the specific circumstances set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.16 D. If reserve sites were included within the BUABs, the principle of development would be established and the sites could be the subject of speculative applications, thus negating the reason for the classification of the site as 'reserve' for the specific purposes set out in the Core Strategy.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

