



DECISION STATEMENT

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM

1. Tanworth-in-Arden Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 1.1 I confirm that the Tanworth-in-Arden Neighbourhood Development Plan (TNDP), as revised according to the modifications set out below, complies with the legal requirements and Basic Conditions set out in the Localism Act 2011, and with the provision made by or under sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Plan can therefore proceed to referendum. Given current circumstances, it is not currently possible to estimate when a referendum could be held.
- 1.2 I also declare that I have no personal or prejudicial interest in respect of this decision.

Signed

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "JCP Careford". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

John Careford,
Head of Development

1. Background

- 2.1 The District Council confirms that for the purposes of Regulation 5 (1) of The Regulations Tanworth-in-Arden Parish Council is the "Qualifying Body" for their area.
- 2.2 In March 2014, Tanworth-in-Arden Parish Council requested that, in accordance with section 5(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ("The Regulations"), the Parish of Tanworth-in-Arden be designated as a Neighbourhood Area, for which a Neighbourhood Development Plan will be prepared.
- 2.3 In accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, Stratford-on-Avon District Council placed on their website this application, including a Parish boundary map, for a 6 week period between 31 July 2014 and 12 September 2014. In addition, it publicised the application by issuing a

press release. Similarly, the relevant application, together with details of where representations could be sent, and by what date, was advertised within the appropriate Parish via the Parish Council.

- 2.4 The District Council designated the Tanworth-in-Arden Neighbourhood Area by way of approval of The Cabinet on 7 October 2014.
- 2.5 In accordance with Regulation 7 of The Regulations, the decision to designate the Tanworth-in-Arden Neighbourhood Area was advertised on the District Council website together with the name, area covered and map of the area.
- 2.6 The Parish Council consulted on a pre-submission version of their draft Neighbourhood Development Plan between 10 February and 27 March 2020 fulfilling all the obligations set out in Regulation 14 of The Regulations.
- 2.7 The Parish Council submitted their Neighbourhood Development Plan to Stratford-on-Avon District Council in March 2021 in accordance with Regulation 15 of The Regulations.
- 2.8 The District Council publicised the submitted Plan and its supporting documents for 6 weeks between 22 July 2021 and 10 September 2021, in accordance with Regulation 16 of The Regulations.
- 2.9 Andrew Matheson was appointed by the District Council to independently examine the Plan in August 2021, and the Examination took place between October 2021 and February 2022, with the final Examiner's report being issued on 28 February 2022.
- 2.10 The Examiner concluded he was satisfied that the Tanworth-in-Arden Neighbourhood Development Plan was capable of meeting the legal requirements set out in the Localism Act 2011, including meeting the Basic Conditions, subject to the modifications set out in his report, as set out in the table below.
- 2.11 Schedule 4B s.12 to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as inserted by the Localism Act 2011, requires that a Local Authority must consider each of the recommendations made in the Examiner's report and decide what action to take in response to each recommendation. If the Local Authority is satisfied that, subject to the modifications made, the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the legal requirements and Basic Conditions as set out in legislation, a referendum must be held on the 'making' (adoption) of the Plan by the Local Authority. If the Local Authority is not satisfied that the plan meets the basic conditions and legal requirements then it must refuse the proposal. Should a referendum take place, a majority of residents who turn out to vote must vote in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan (50% plus one vote) before it can be 'made'.
- 2.12 The Basic Conditions are:
 1. Have regard to national policy and guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
 2. Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
 3. Be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the Authority (or any part of that area).

4. Does not breach, but is otherwise compatible with EU obligations – this includes the SEA Directive of 2001/42/EC and Human Rights requirements.

- 2.13 Some additional modifications to the Plan are also proposed by SDC in order to correct typographical or factual errors within the Plan, for the purposes of clarity and accuracy. These are detailed within Table 1 (p.4) below, in conjunction with the policies to which they apply. These modifications were not considered to require a further Regulation 17A consultation under the conditions set out by paragraph 13(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Examiner's Recommendations and Local Authority's Response (Regulation 18(1))

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Page 8			
On the front cover and any later references amend the Plan period from "2011 – 2031" to '2021 – 2031' and remove references to "Submission Draft".	Front Cover and throughout	<i>Modification Agreed.</i> The proposed modification is required for clarity and accuracy.	Amend Plan period as follows: 2011 2021 – 2031 Remove references to Submission Draft.
Pages 8-9			
<p>In paragraph 1.2 replace "adopted" with 'made' (in inverted commas) and add after the last sentence: 'A Site Allocations Plan (SAP) will also form part of the Development Plan once adopted. Stratford-on-Avon District Council, together with Warwick District Council, has also commenced work on the South Warwickshire Local Plan which will in due course replace the strategic policies of the Core Strategy.'</p> <p>In paragraph 1.5 replace "2019" with '2021'.</p> <p>In paragraph 1.6, to the third bullet point add "The survey was repeated in July 2021 which found similar levels of housing need."; in the last bullet point replace "Each" with 'In the "Report on Identifying Possible Housing Sites" (2017), each'.</p> <p>Correct the heading before paragraph 1.9 to: 'The Parish of Tanworth in Arden' and within paragraph 1.9 replace "landscape" with 'Landscape'.</p> <p>In paragraph 1.10 replace the second sentence with 'The heart of the village is located within a Conservation Area which includes many listed buildings, including the Grade I listed Parish Church of St. Mary Magdalene'. Insert here or hereabouts a map of the village showing the heritage assets, titled as such.</p>	Introduction	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy.</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed</i></p> <p>An additional amendment is proposed by SDC to paragraph 1.18 for the purposes of clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 1.2 as follows:</p> <p>"Once it has undergone independent scrutiny and is approved through a local referendum, this Neighbourhood Development Plan (the 'Plan' or NDP) will be adopted 'made' by Stratford-on-Avon District Council (The District Council). This means that it will become part of the statutory planning framework alongside the District Council's Core Strategy (the 'Core Strategy' [CS]) and therefore must be taken into account by the District Council when determining planning applications and policy decisions in the Neighbourhood Plan Area. <u>A Site Allocations Plan (SAP) will also form part of the Development Plan once adopted. Stratford-on-Avon District Council, together with Warwick District Council, has also commenced work on the South Warwickshire Local Plan which will in due course replace the strategic policies of the Core Strategy.</u>"</p> <p>Amend the first sentence of paragraph 1.5 as follows:</p> <p>"The NDP must be consistent with national and local planning policy. The key documents are the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2019 2021) and the District Council's adopted Core Strategy 2011-2031."</p> <p>Amend third bullet point of paragraph 1.6 as follows:</p> <p>"A report on a Survey of Local Housing Needs in the Parish prepared by the Warwickshire Rural Community Council in 2016. <u>The survey was repeated in July 2021 which found similar levels of housing need.</u>"</p> <p>Amend last bullet point of paragraph 1.6 as follows:</p> <p>"A careful assessment of all possible sites for housing development within or on the edges of the three villages, Tanworth, Earlswood and Wood End. Each <u>In the "Report on Identifying Possible Housing Sites" (2017),</u> each site was assessed against criteria which</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Amend the opening bullet point of paragraph 1.16 by replacing the words before the first comma with 'Three villages (Tanworth, Earlswood and Wood End)'.</p> <p>Amend Paragraph 1.18 to read: 'The Inset Proposals Maps below show the application of the key NDP policies to Earlswood, Tanworth and Wood End. The maps should be read in conjunction with the related Policies and also, in the case of the Valued Views, Appendix C.'</p> <p>Amend Figures 2, 3 & 4 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the notations on the map are the same colours as the key. • Amend the keys (as appropriate) to show: 'Local Housing Site (Policies H1 & H2) Built-up Area Boundary (Policy H3) Non-designated Heritage Assets (Policy BE3) Valued Views (Policy NE1) Local Green Spaces (Policy NE2)' • Amend the map content to accord exactly with the Recommendations below relating to the individual Policies being illustrated. • Provide a source reference for the base map and add north points. • Amend paragraph 1.19 to replace "National Regulations" with 'national policy'. 			<p>emphasised the fundamental aims of the Green Belt, including the avoidance of urban sprawl and coalescence of settlements in the Parish."</p> <p>Amend the heading and first sentence of paragraph 1.9 as follows: "The Parish of Tanworth-in-Arden The Parish is essentially rural and falls wholly within the Arden Special Landscape Area designated in the Core Strategy."</p> <p>Amend paragraph 1.10 as follows:</p> <p>"Tanworth village is located at the southern end of the Parish and has a history that goes back to the 12th century. The heart of the village is a Conservation Area including the parish church. The heart of the village is located within a Conservation Area which includes many listed buildings, including the Grade I listed Parish Church of St. Mary Magdalene. Narrow lanes radiate out from the village, marking it out as a destination within the immediate and wider locale, and are sunken as they approach the village. The village itself is built around a near complete circular road, which includes the village green and former market place at its southern extent, and provides an ancient focal point and communal hub around which civic, commercial and ecclesiastical buildings are interspersed with residential properties."</p> <p>Insert a map of the village showing the heritage assets, titled as such.</p> <p>Amend the opening bullet point of paragraph 1.16 as follows:</p> <p>"Two long established villages (Tanworth and Earlswood), Three villages (Tanworth, Earlswood and Wood End), and other smaller settlements, set within a rural landscape characterised by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - narrow country lanes bounded by hedges; - undulating landscapes with attractive views; - scattered farms and houses in red brick vernacular; and - distinctive field patterns and ancient woodlands associated with the former Arden Forest. <p>Amend paragraph 1.18 as follows:</p> <p>"The Inset Proposals Maps below show the application of the key NDP policies to Earlswood, Tanworth and Wood End particularly in respect of the proposed opportunities for, and constraints on future development. The Inset Proposals Maps below show the application of the key NDP policies to Earlswood, Tanworth and Wood End. The maps should be read in conjunction with the related Policies and also, in the case of the Valued Views, Appendix C."</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>Amend Figures 2, 3 and 4 as indicated in the Recommendations.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 1.19 as follows: “Neighbourhood Plans, in accordance with National Regulations national policy, must focus on land- use related issues, and these are covered by the policies in this document which will apply to development proposals in the Parish.”</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed:</i> Due to the wide geographic spread of the Valued Views in Tanworth-in-Arden, it is considered necessary for an additional map to be included to show these Views for Tanworth-in-Arden so that the Inset Proposal Map can be provided at a clear and readable scale. It is therefore proposed for an additional sentence to be inserted into the revised paragraph 1.18 to read as follows:</p> <p>“The Inset Proposals Maps below show the application of the key NDP policies to Earlswood, Tanworth and Wood End. <u>In the case of Tanworth there is an extra map, Figure 4, showing all the valued views.</u> The maps should be read in conjunction with the related Policies and also, in the case of the Valued Views, Appendix C.”</p> <p>Amendments to the Contents Page to include the addition of this separate Valued Views Map (Figure 4) for Tanworth are also proposed as a further modification.</p>
Pages 11-12			
<p>Under the sub-heading “Background and Objectives”: in paragraph 2.6 replace “2016” with ‘2021’, replace “(28)” with ‘(25)’ and replace “17” with ‘29’.</p> <p>Under the sub-heading “What is the scope for meeting the identified housing needs?”:</p> <p>In paragraph 2.10 replace “145” with ‘149’ and amend the quotation from the NPPF to accord exactly with the 2021 NPPF.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.12 replace “outstanding” with ‘extant’.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After the first three sentences add: ‘Site suitability was also assessed on the basis of traffic impact, flood risk (by use of the Flood Maps at 	Housing section	<p><i>Modification Partially Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p> <p>However, a modification is proposed by SDC to the Examiner's</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 2.6 as follows:</p> <p>“In 20162021 the Parish Council commissioned a survey of housing needs in the Parish. The survey was carried out by the Warwickshire Rural Community Council which identified a small number (28 25) of families either currently living in the Parish (often living with parents) or with other local connections (such as working in the Parish, or with dependents in the Parish) who would like to live in the Parish. In addition, there were 17 29 households on the District Council’s housing waiting list whose registered address is in the parish. There is also evidence of older households in the Parish wanting to downsize having difficulty finding suitable homes that would enable them to remain in the parish.”</p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.10 as follows:</p> <p>“The Core Strategy makes no specific housing allocation for the Parish or any part of it, because it is washed over by the Green Belt. Para-145149 of the NPPF states inter alia that unless there are very special circumstances development in the Green Belt is</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>https://api.warwickshire.gov.uk/documents/WCCC-680-7) and, in consultation with the owners and prospective developers, capacity and deliverability.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace the last three sentences with the following and move this to form a new paragraph 2.15 (replacing the existing): 'The review eliminated the majority of sites because they could not be considered to be consistent with Green Belt Policy. However, two sites were identified which could contribute to a more diverse housing stock whilst respecting the community wish for smaller sites. The 2018 Consultation found support for the development of these, one, adjoining 141, The Common, Earlswood, and one on land behind the Warwickshire Lad on Broad Lane, Wood End. These two sites are included in the Plan (Policies H1 and H2).' In paragraph 2.16 replace "(H6)" with '(H3)' 		<p>suggested paragraph 2.15, for the purposes of factual accuracy.</p>	<p>inappropriate except for: a. Buildings for agriculture and forestry. b. Provision of facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries, burial grounds and allotments provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt. c. The extension or alteration of building provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building d. The replacement of a building provided it is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces e. Limited infilling in villages f. Limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (ie the Core Strategy) g. Redevelopment of previously developed land whether redundant or in continuing use provided it does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green belt than the existing development. <u>a) buildings for agriculture and forestry; b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; e) limited infilling in villages; f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>to assess each site are described in the report referred to in para 1.6. Each site was assessed against potential damage to the purposes of the Green Belt and took into account that residents would prefer small scale developments (10 or less homes on each site) – a view expressed in the 2015 Household Survey. Site suitability was also assessed on the basis of traffic impact, flood risk (by use of the Flood Maps at https://api.warwickshire.gov.uk/documents/WCCC-680-7) and, in consultation with the owners and prospective developers, capacity and deliverability. The review identified three sites which could be considered to be broadly consistent with the Green Belt policies and which could contribute to a more diverse housing stock. The 2018 Consultation found support for the development of two of these, one, adjoining 141, The Common, Earlswood, and one on land behind the Warwickshire Lad on Broad Lane, Wood End. These two sites are included in the Plan (Policies H1 and H2)”</p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.16 as follows:</p> <p>“As stated above Green Belt policy allows for limited infill development within villages. The plan defines the boundaries of the three villages (Policy H6 H3). There has been a steady trickle of such development in the last few years, mainly in Wood End, where large plots allow for this. So far such development has been for detached large houses which characterize that settlement. The Plan, through Policy H6 H3, encourages the provision of smaller homes from infill developments where this is compatible with the character of the local environment.”</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Proposed Modification:</i> The Examiner proposes new wording for paragraph 2.15, however, his proposed amendment is factually inaccurate as three, not two sites were originally identified by the NDP Steering Group. These were eventually reduced to two sites following the 2018 consultation. The proposed amendment of SDC to the Examiner's modification for the purposes of accuracy is as follows:</p> <p>Amend to paragraph 2.15 as follows: “The third site, in Butts Lane, Tanworth in Arden, was not supported because of the impact on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt in the vicinity and the impact development on this site would have on the setting of the Conservation Area centred on the St Mary Magdalene Church. This site is not included in the Plan. <u>The review eliminated the majority of sites because they could not be considered to be consistent with the Green Belt Policy. However, three sites were identified which could contribute to a more diverse housing stock whilst respecting the community wish for smaller sites. The 2018 Consultation found support for the development of two of these, one, adjoining 141, The Common, Earlswood, and one on land behind the Warwickshire Lad on Broad Lane, Wood End. These two sites are included in the Plan (Policies H1 and H2)</u>”</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Pages 11-12			
<p>Under the sub-heading "Policy H1 - Meeting Local Housing Needs (1)":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace the opening sentence of Policy H1 with: 'Land adjoining 141 The Common, Earlswood (as identified on the Earlswood Inset Proposals Map) is allocated for development of a small-scale community-led Local Needs Housing Scheme, subject to the following criteria being met:'. • In criterion 1 replace "2016" with '2021' and delete "commissioned by the Parish Council". • Replace criterion 2 with: 'A Section 106 Agreement is concluded that accords with Part S of Stratford-on-Avon District Council's Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document' (or any update of this).' • Delete criterion 3 and renumber criterion 4 accordingly. • Amend criterion 4 by replacing "character of the area as defined within this NDP" with 'the relevant Character Assessment that accompanies this Plan'. <p>To avoid splitting the Policies move paragraph 2.17 to the "Explanation" section after Policy H2 and in paragraph 2.17 delete the content "Currently the conditions are" and the bullet points that follow.</p>	Policy H1	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed</i></p> <p>Amendments are proposed by SDC to Explanation paragraphs 2.18 and 219 for the purposes of clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Amend Policy H1 as follows:</p> <p>"This Plan supports the development of land adjoining 141 The Common, Earlswood (as defined on the Earlswood Inset Proposals Map) for a small scale community led Housing Needs Scheme where all the following criteria are met: <u>Land adjoining 141 The Common, Earlswood (as identified on the Earlswood Inset Proposals Map) is allocated for development of a small-scale community-led Local Needs Housing Scheme, subject to the following criteria being met:</u></p> <p>(1) The scheme will provide exclusively or predominantly affordable housing to contribute towards meeting the local housing needs identified in the Tanworth Housing Needs Survey 2016 2021 or any subsequent update commissioned by the Parish Council;</p> <p>(2) The development itself and the tenure and occupancy of the properties is regulated via a planning obligation including provisions that ensures the following: a. Any properties for sale are marketed in accordance with arrangements intended to prioritise lettings or sale and resale, in perpetuity, to households with a qualifying local connection to the parish as defined in para 2.17 below in the first instance; b. Occupancy of the properties is restricted to households occupying the properties as their sole or principle residence; and c. The occupancy of all properties will be regulated via a planning obligation to ensure a local connection in perpetuity as specified in paragraph 2.17; <u>A Section 106 Agreement is concluded that accords with Part S of Stratford-on-Avon District Council's Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document (or any update of this)</u></p> <p>(3) The development is subject to a condition that limits permitted development rights under the General Development Order by excluding Parts A and B.</p> <p>(4 3) The density, layout and construction of housing is compatible with the character of the area as defined within this NDP <u>the relevant Character Assessment that accompanies this Plan"</u></p> <p>Move paragraph 2.17 to the "Explanation" section after Policy H2 and in paragraph 2.17 delete the content "Currently the conditions are" and the bullet points that follow.</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Proposed Modification:</i> As the Explanation section for both Policies H1 and H2 have been moved to sit beneath both policies, amendments are required to paragraphs 2.18 and 2.19 (renumbered as 2.19 and 2.20) to clarify which sites these paragraphs relate to. The proposed additional modifications of SDC are as follows:</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>“2.18 The aim is that the <u>of the</u> scheme <u>on land adjoining 141 The Common</u>, would be exclusively affordable homes but the financial viability of any scheme may require a small proportion of market homes.</p> <p>2.19 The site, <u>the subject of Policy H2</u>, is at the heart of Wood End. It is adjacent to Wood End station on one side and the public house, the Warwickshire Lad on the other side. It is opposite the medical centre. The Household Survey in 2015 showed that residents considered that if development should be required it should be in small developments with less than 10 new homes with priority for 2 and 3 bedrooms including those suitable for residents wanting to downsize. Much of the immediate local area is characterised by large plots and a sense of openness and any development of the site will need to recognise this.”</p>
Page 12			
<p>Replace the opening sentence of Policy H2 with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Land to the north of The Warwickshire Lad Public House, Wood End (as identified on the Wood End Inset Proposals Map) is allocated for development of a small-scale Local Needs Housing Scheme of 10 or fewer 2 and 3-bedroom dwellings, subject to the following criteria being met:”. <p>Replace criterion 1 with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The scheme will contribute towards meeting the local housing needs identified in the Tanworth 2021 Housing Needs Survey (or any subsequent update) and the need for smaller homes to help rebalance the housing stock in the Neighbourhood Area.” <p>Replace criterion 2 with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “A Section 106 Agreement is concluded that accords with Part S of Stratford-on-Avon District Council's Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document' (or any update of this).” <p>Delete criterion 3 and renumber criterion 4 accordingly.</p>	Policy H2	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p>	<p>Amend Policy H2 as follows:</p> <p>“Development of land to the north of The Warwickshire Lad Public House, Wood End (as defined on the Wood End Inset Proposals Map) for a small scale Local Need housing scheme of 10 or less 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings will be supported where all the following criteria are met: <u>Land to the north of The Warwickshire Lad Public House, Wood End (as identified on the Wood End Inset Proposals Map) is allocated for development of a small-scale Local Needs Housing Scheme of 10 or fewer 2 and 3-bedroom dwellings, subject to the following criteria being met:</u></p> <p>1) The scheme will contribute towards meeting the local housing needs identified in the Tanworth 2016 Housing Needs Survey (or any subsequent update commissioned by the Parish Council) and other housing needs for smaller homes identified in this Plan (see para 2.9); <u>The scheme will contribute towards meeting the local housing needs identified in the Tanworth 2021 Housing Needs Survey (or any subsequent update) and the need for smaller homes to help rebalance the housing stock in the Neighbourhood Area.</u></p> <p>2) The development itself and the occupancy of the properties is regulated via a planning obligation including provisions that ensure the following: a. all properties for sale are marketed, in perpetuity, in accordance with arrangements intended to prioritise sale and resale to households with a qualifying local connection to the parish as defined in para 2.17 above in the first instance; b. occupancy of the properties is restricted to households occupying the properties as their sole or principle residence; <u>A Section 106 Agreement is concluded that accords with Part S of Stratford-on-Avon District Council's</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Amend criterion 4 by replacing “character of the area as defined within this NDP” with ‘the relevant Character Assessment that accompanies this Plan’.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.20 replace “it is important therefore that the homes built on this site continue to meet this demand. A condition will therefore be attached that limits future extensions to these homes” with ‘the plot sizes should limit the potential for significant extensions’.</p>			<p><u>Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document (or any update of this)</u></p> <p>3) The development is subject to a condition that limits permitted development rights under the General Development Order by excluding Parts A and B.</p> <p>4) The density, layout and construction of housing is compatible with the character of the area as defined within this NDP <u>relevant Character Assessment that accompanies this Plan</u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.20 as follows:</p> <p>“The housing need identified in the Plan includes more smaller 2 and 3-bedroom homes and it is important therefore that the homes built on this site continue to meet this demand. A condition will therefore be attached that limits future extensions to these homes <u>the plot sizes should limit the potential for significant extensions.</u>”</p>
Page 14			
<p>Within the Inset Policy Maps included in Section 1, correct all BUAB boundaries to coincide exactly with the SDC versions but varied as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for Tanworth in Arden to exclude three properties in Vicarage Hill, Tanworth (‘Merryfields’, ‘Tile House’ and ‘Thurlaston’) and the tennis courts adjacent to Local Green Space 2; • for Earlswood to include the whole of the site at Merewood Farm consented by permission reference 21/02771/FUL. 	Inset Maps	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p>	<p>Amend policy maps in section 1 – amending the BUAB boundaries to coincide exactly with those in the SDC SAP Preferred Options 2020, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tanworth in Arden to exclude three properties in Vicarage Hill, Tanworth (‘Merryfields’, ‘Tile House’ and ‘Thurlaston’) and the tennis courts adjacent to Local Green Space 2 • Earlswood to include the whole of the site at Merewood Farm consented by permission reference 21/02771/FUL.
Page 14			
<p>In the first sentence replace “proposals set out in this plan” with ‘Policies set out in this Plan’.</p> <p>In the second sentence replace “145” with ‘149’, “2019” with ‘2021’ and correct “AS10” to ‘CS.10’.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.22 replace the first sentence with ‘Policy CS.15 in the adopted Core Strategy has established the principle of using Built-Up Area Boundaries (BUABs) as a mechanism for managing the</p>	Policy H3	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions</p>	<p>Amend Policy H3 as follows:</p> <p>“Proposals for new dwellings within the village Built up Area Boundaries (BUABs), as defined in the three Inset Proposals Maps under paragraph 1.18, will be supported in principle subject to the <u>Policies set out in this Plan.</u> proposals set out in this plan. Proposals for housing will not be supported outside the BUABs except the schemes allocated under Policies H1 and H2 above, or under the special circumstance allowed under paragraph 145-149 <u>149</u> of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019-2021) and Policy AS10 <u>CS.10</u> of the Core Strategy.”</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>location of development; the boundary can be identified in a NDP or by the Council in its proposed Site Allocations Plan.'</p> <p>In paragraph 2.23 replace "with a very few exceptions" with 'only two exceptions'; replace the last two sentences with: 'The two exceptions relate to a slightly different application of the SDC BUAB criteria, which are set down in Annex 4 to the Site Allocations Plan Preferred Options Consultation Version (October 2020). One difference is at Vicarage Hill, Tanworth where the "physical confines of the settlement" are considered by local people to be tighter than the SDC version. And the other where a tennis court has been excluded from the BUAB, in line with other exclusions of recreation areas. A third alteration relates to a correction to the boundary for a planning consent granted at Merewood Farm, Earlswood.'</p>		<p>1&3</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed</i></p> <p>In addition to the Examiner's proposed modifications, an amendment is proposed by SDC to Explanation paragraph 2.23 for the purposes of clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Amend first sentence of paragraph 2.22:</p> <p>In accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS15 (d), the District Council requires a defined BUAB for each of the LSVs, either identified in an NDP or by the Council in its proposed Site Allocations Plan. <u>Policy CS.15 in the adopted Core Strategy has established the principle of using Built-Up Area Boundaries (BUABs) as a mechanism for managing the location of development; the boundary can be identified in a NDP or by the Council in its proposed Site Allocations Plan."</u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.23 as follows:</p> <p>"The village boundaries in this Plan are with a very few exceptions <u>only two exceptions</u>, the boundaries proposed by the District Council in 2019, and modified in September 2020, for inclusion in its Site Allocations Plan. They are based on the same criteria used by the District Council. The two main exceptions reflect different judgements about the limits of the built-up area: one in Vicarage Hill, Tanworth and one at the southern end of Earlswood Common. In both cases it is considered that the NDP Plan is a more appropriate and reasonable approach to capturing the built form of the respective villages which are in the Green Belt. <u>The two exceptions relate to a slightly different application of the SDC BUAB criteria, which are set down in Annex 4 to the Site Allocations Plan Preferred Options Consultation Version (October 2020). One difference is at Vicarage Hill, Tanworth where the "physical confines of the settlement" are considered by local people to be tighter than the SDC version. And the other where a tennis court has been excluded from the BUAB, in line with other exclusions of recreation areas. A third alteration relates to a correction to the boundary for a planning consent granted at Merewood Farm, Earlswood."</u></p> <p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed:</i></p> <p>In addition to the Examiner's proposed modifications, an amendment is proposed by SDC to Explanation paragraph 2.23 to avoid repetition, for the purposed of clarity. It is proposed to delete the third sentence from this paragraph: "The two main exceptions reflect different judgements about the limits of the built-up area: one in Vicarage Hill, Tanworth and one at the southern end of Earlswood Common", as this point is then repeated later in the same paragraph. The proposed SDC amendment to the paragraph as modified by the Examiner is as follows:</p> <p>"The village boundaries in this Plan are with only two exceptions, the boundaries proposed by the District Council in 2019, and modified in September 2020, for inclusion in its Site Allocations Plan. They are based on the same criteria used by the District Council. The two main exceptions reflect different judgements about the limits of the built-up area: one in Vicarage Hill, Tanworth and one at the southern end of Earlswood</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			Common. The two exceptions relate to a slightly different application of the SDC BUAB criteria, which are set down in Annex 4 to the Site Allocations Plan Preferred Options Consultation Version (October 2020). One difference is at Vicarage Hill, Tanworth where the "physical confines of the settlement" are considered by local people to be tighter than the SDC version. And the other where a tennis court has been excluded from the BUAB, in line with other exclusions of recreation areas. A third alteration relates to a correction to the boundary for a planning consent granted at Merewood Farm, Earlswood."
Page 14			
Delete Policy H4 and paragraphs 2.24 & 2.25; renumber subsequent Policies and paragraphs accordingly.	Policy H4	<i>Modification Agreed</i> The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1	Delete Policy H4 and paragraphs 2.24 & 2.25; renumber subsequent Policies and paragraphs accordingly.
Page 15			
<p>In the opening sentence delete "under paragraph 1.18" since the Policy may be quoted in other documents.</p> <p>In criterion 1 delete "the area" and insert 'its surroundings'.</p> <p>Delete criterion 2.</p> <p>In criterion 4 delete "satisfactory" and insert 'safe', and delete "parking" and insert 'will not result in additional on-road parking'.</p> <p>In paragraphs 2.26 and 2.27 delete "detrimental" and in paragraph 2.27 replace "includes" with 'may include'.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.28 replace "is not acceptable" with 'is generally not appropriate'.</p>	Policy H5 (renumbered Policy H4)	<i>Modification Agreed</i> The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3	<p>Amend Policy H5 (Now Policy H4) as follows:</p> <p>"Development of garden land within the defined BUABs, as defined in the Inset Proposals maps under paragraph 1.18, will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Preserve or enhance the character of the area; its surroundings 2) Do not introduce a form of development which is at odds with the existing settlement character or pattern; 3) Preserve the amenities of neighbouring properties; 4) Provide satisfactory safe-arrangements for access and parking will not result in additional on-road parking." <p>Amend paragraphs 2.26 and 2.27 as follows:</p> <p>"Development within the gardens of existing houses, including the provision of additional car-parking, can have an adverse impact on the character of the area, or on the amenities of neighbouring properties. Access may be inadequate. Unless an adequate land area is available or can be assembled and demonstrated to be accessible</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>and sustainable, without causing detrimental harm to the amenity of neighbouring dwellings or to the character of the area, then development will be resisted.</p> <p>Detrimental Harm to the amenity of a neighbouring property may includes loss of daylight and sunlight (overshadowing), intrusive or overbearing development and loss of privacy (overlooking), and a material increase in vehicle movements."</p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.28 as follows:</p> <p>"Apart from considerations of the above matters, garden development outside the three main villages is not acceptable generally not appropriate because of the Green Belt policies."</p>
Page 16			
<p>Amend Policy H6 (renumbered as Policy H5) to accord with the below:</p> <p>'In order that future development of the housing stock of the Parish best meets the specific needs of the local community:</p> <p>1) Infilling with smaller dwellings will be supported where the design and layout is compatible with the character of the surroundings (see Policies H4 and BE1);</p> <p>2) Where a planning consent is required, the loss of smaller dwellings through replacement will be resisted.'</p> <p>In paragraph 2.32 delete "That said, given the extent of opposition, this NDP sets a high bar to overcome as to the implications and hence acceptability of the development or conversion of existing dwellings to flats or apartments" with 'Core Strategy Policies'.</p> <p>Delete paragraphs 2.33 & 2.34.</p>	<p>Policy H6 (renumbered Policy H5)</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed</i></p> <p>An additional modification is proposed by SDC to paragraph 2.31 for the purposes of clarity and accuracy,</p>	<p>Amend renumbered Policy H5 as follows:</p> <p>"In order that future development of the housing stock of the Parish best meets the specific needs of the local community, the following approach will be taken: 1) Smaller dwellings on infill sites will be supported where the design and layout is compatible with the character of the local area (see Policy BE 1); 2) Extensions to, or replacement of, existing dwellings will normally only be supported where the volume of the extension is no more than 30% of the dwelling as it existed in 1975 or when built if that is after 1975</p> <p><u>'In order that future development of the housing stock of the Parish best meets the specific needs of the local community:</u></p> <p><u>1) Infilling with smaller dwellings will be supported where the design and layout is compatible with the character of the surroundings (see Policies H4 and BE1);</u></p> <p><u>2) Where a planning consent is required, the loss of smaller dwellings through replacement will be resisted."</u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.32:</p> <p>That said, given the extent of opposition, this NDP sets a high bar to overcome as to the implications and hence acceptability of the development or conversion of existing dwellings to flats or apartments. Core Strategy Policies CS5, CS9, CS10 and CS12 are concerned with preserving the character of the local area, the green belt and the amenity of neighbours. This is in respect of scale and design of the building and the impact of resulting potential increases in car parking and movements. Such safeguards are adequately covered within the Core Strategy policies and NDP policies BE1 – Local character and design principles, and BE2 – car parking.</p> <p>Delete paragraphs 2.33 and 2.34:</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>"In the interests of maintaining the openness of the Green Belt the NPPF and the Core Strategy impose constraints on the size of extensions to existing dwellings and of replacement dwellings. (see para 2.10c and) Such constraints could have the additional benefit of helping to prevent the loss of existing smaller dwellings, if the constraint is strictly applied. For this reason the Policy H6 specifies a percentage limit on such extensions or replacements. This was the limit applied in the previous Local Plan.</p> <p>It is recognized that the Green Belt policy is concerned with environmental aims but these are only one of the three elements of sustainability as set out in the NPPF. One of the others are social; aims: in particular"</p> <p>Additional SDC Modification Proposed: An additional modification is proposed to paragraph 2.31 as modified by the Examiner, for the purposes of clarity and accuracy. This is as the paragraph references a Policy deleted by the Examiner, Policy BE2 – car parking. The proposed amended paragraph is as follows:</p> <p>"Core Strategy Policies CS5, CS9, CS10 and CS12 are concerned with preserving the character of the local area, the green belt and the amenity of neighbours. This is in respect of scale and design of the building and the impact of resulting potential increases in car parking and movements. Such safeguards are adequately covered within the Core Strategy policies and NDP policies <u>policy</u> BE1 – Local character and design principles, and BE2 – car parking."</p>
Page 17			
<p>Revise Policy E1:</p> <p>Between "supported" and "provide" add ', in principle,; capitalise 'Green Belt Policy'.</p> <p>Delete the second sentence.</p>	Policy E1	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p>	<p>Amend Policy E1 as follows:</p> <p>"Proposals for small scale expansion or redevelopment of existing business premises will be supported in principle provided that they comply with Green Belt Policy; do not have a detrimental impact on the local character or neighbouring residential amenity; and do not adversely impact on the operation and capacity of the local highway network. The development of greenfield land for business uses will however not be supported"</p>
Page 17			
<p>Reword Policy E2 as: 'To ensure their retention wherever possible, where a planning consent is required, proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of land or premises from</p>	Policy E2	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed</p>	<p>Amend Policy E2 as follows:</p> <p>"Proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of land or premises providing Local Services will be supported provided the applicant can demonstrate that:</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>which Local Services are provided must assess and address their impact on local service delivery and any appropriate mitigation. If business viability is a factor, compelling supporting evidence must be provided.'</p> <p>Amend paragraph 3.7 to delete "criteria" from the third sentence.</p>		<p>modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p>	<p>1) There is a sufficient alternative supply of services within the Parish to meet local needs; 2) The site is no longer capable of providing the service for which it is used 3) Redevelopment of the site will facilitate the relocation of the business within the parish to a more suitable site; and 4) There is no reasonable economic or physical prospect of the site being used for its existing purpose</p> <p><u>To ensure their retention wherever possible, where a planning consent is required, proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of land or premises from which Local Services are provided must assess and address their impact on local service delivery and any appropriate mitigation. If business viability is a factor, compelling supporting evidence must be provided."</u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 3.7 as follows:</p> <p>"Applicants will need to provide evidence to show that they meet the policy criteria set out above such as marketing results and economic viability assessments, which will be site and business specific, before the loss of an existing service can be supported and the site redeveloped."</p>
<p>Page 17</p>			
<p>Delete criterion 1 and amend criterion 2 by adding ', including on-street parking' after "amenity".</p> <p>Replace criterion 3 with 'Green Belt Policy is complied with.'</p>	<p>Policy E3</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p>	<p>Amend Policy E3 as follows:</p> <p>"Where planning permission is required, proposals for the small-scale adaptation of homes for the benefit of home working will be supported subject to the following criteria:</p> <p>1) Provision of an appropriate level of off-street parking to align with domestic provisions set out within the Core Strategy, and to cater for perceived additional business need; 2) Any changes will not have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the Parish or neighbouring residential amenity including on-street parking; and 3) In the case of a conversion of an existing building, that building should be of a permanent or substantial construction and capable of conversion without major rebuild or extension Green Belt Policy is complied with. It should also comply with Green Belt policy."</p>
<p>Pages 17-18</p>			
<p>Reword Policy E4 as: 'Small scale expansion of local tourism and leisure uses, which might include enhancement of buildings, additional car parking, or additional facilities, will be supported in principle</p>	<p>Policy E4</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed</p>	<p>Amend Policy E4 as follows:</p> <p>"Small scale expansion and enhancement of buildings, including the provision of additional car parking and associated landscaping, in connection with local tourism and</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
where it is proportionate, compatible with neighbouring uses, can be shown to maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the immediate surroundings, and complies with Green Belt Policy.'		modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3	leisure uses will be supported where they are compatible with neighbouring uses and can be shown to maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the immediate surroundings, and comply with Green Belt Policy. <u>Small scale expansion of local tourism and leisure uses, which might include enhancement of buildings, additional car parking, or additional facilities, will be supported in principle where it is proportionate, compatible with neighbouring uses, can be shown to maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the immediate surroundings, and complies with Green Belt Policy.</u>
Page 18			
Within Policy I1 replace "modest" with 'proportionate' and after "supported" add 'in principle, subject to appropriate screening and additional planting".	Policy I1	<i>Modification Agreed</i> The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1	Amend Policy I1: "Proposals for modest <u>proportionate</u> additional car parking to serve the requirements of the railway stations in the Parish will be supported <u>in principle, subject to appropriate screening and additional planting.</u> "
Page 18			
Delete Policies I2 and I3 and the related "Explanation" paragraphs 4.8 & 4.9; renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.	Policies I2 and I3	<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1	Delete policies I2 and I3 and para 4.8 and 4.9
Page 19			
Throughout the Policy section improve the contrast between the land use and non-land use elements by putting the Policy wording in shaded boxes and making the Policy numbers/titles more prominent.	Policy section	<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic	Amend policy layout by using shaded boxes for the policies and make the numbering/titles more prominent

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
		Condition 1	
Page 19			
In paragraph 5.2 replace "125" with '127' and correct the quotation with an opening quotation mark after "that" and then the following: 'Neighbourhood planning groups can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development ...'	Built Environment section	<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1	Amend paragraph 5.2: "Paragraph 125 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework states ' that the Neighbourhood Development Plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development Neighbourhood planning groups can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development... '.
Page 19			
Revise Policy BE1: In the opening sentence replace "will be supported provided that it can be demonstrated" with 'must demonstrate'. In Design Principle 1 replace "retention or provision" with 'use'. In Design Principle 4 relace "local" with 'locally typical'. In Design Principle 6 replace "listed buildings" with 'Listed Buildings' and delete "in line with national criteria". In Design Principle 7 delete "used in line with national criteria". Add a tenth Principle: 'Incorporation within the design of an electric vehicle charging facility, bicycle storage and sufficient, well located parking spaces, in accordance with Part O of the District Council's Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Documents and to help remove the need for any on-road parking'.	Policy BE1	<i>Modification Agreed</i> The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1.	Revise Policy BE1 as follows: "Proposed development will be supported provided that it can be demonstrated must demonstrate that appropriate account has been taken of the local character as described in the Character Assessments summarised in Appendix A. This is in addition to the requirements set out within the planning framework to protect the Green Belt and the Arden Special Landscape Area. The following important design principles should be addressed by all development proposals. 1. The retention or provision use of space between buildings or groups of buildings to preserve the rural nature of the environment and to protect public views of open land beyond; 2. Buildings follow the established building lines and the nature of the road hierarchy ; 3. They reflect traditional building form with roof pitches of generally 40° or more with varied ridge and eaves lines and heights; 4. They use locally typical materials; 5. Incorporate traditional brick detailing to eaves, verges and window and door surrounds; 6. Are sensitive to Listed Buildings and their settings and vistas into and out of the Conservation Area in line with national criteria ; 7. Any proposed building within or adjacent to the Tanworth Conservation Area must be sympathetic in its style, details and materials used in line with national criteria ; 8. Sensitive siting of PV and Solar panels; and 9. Retain where possible mature broadleaf trees and field hedgerows that survive from the enclosure of the former common land. 10. Incorporation within the design of an electric vehicle charging facility, bicycle storage and sufficient, well located parking spaces, in accordance with Part O of the

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<u>District Council's Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Documents and to help remove the need for any on-road parking"</u>
Page 20			
Delete Policy BE2 and paragraphs 57 & 58 and renumber subsequent Policies and paragraphs accordingly.	Policy BE2	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1.</p>	Delete policy BE2 and paragraphs 57 and 58.
Page 20			
<p>Amend Policy BE3 (now renumbered as Policy BE2) by adding after "Appendix B" 'and located on the Inset Policy Maps' and deleting "and compliance with Core Strategy Policy CS.8".</p> <p>From paragraph 5.12 amend "should be seen as a live document with 'and other non- designated assets could be added in the future".</p> <p>And delete from Appendix B "The list should be regarded as a live document, managed by the Parish Council with amendments made as appropriate at the time."</p> <p>Within Appendix B remove the entry for the "Malt Shovel" under Non-designated Heritage Assets in Tanworth Conservation Area.</p>	Policy BE3 (renumbered as Policy BE2)	<p><i>Modification Partially Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1.</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed</i></p> <p>An additional modification is proposed by SDC for the purposes of clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Amend renumbered Policy BE2:</p> <p>"Where a proposal directly or indirectly affects a non-designated heritage asset, listed in Appendix B and located on the Inset Policy Maps, support for that proposal will depend on a balanced judgement of the scale of any harm or loss, and the significance of the asset and compliance with Policy CS8."</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5.12:</p> <p>"Appendix B sets out the approach used to identifying non-designated heritage assets which contribute to the historic environment and should be protected. The resulting list in Appendix B should be seen as a live document and other non- designated assets could be added in the future."</p> <p>Amend Appendix B:</p> <p>"A 'non-designated' heritage, asset as defined within section 3.7 of the Core Strategy, is "abuilding, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest, but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets". The list provided below is a record of features of historic interest within the Parish that should be given consideration when future development might impact on them. This does not mean that they have become statutorily listed buildings or monuments and therefore subject to the stringent planning constraints that are associated with formal listing. Instead the effect of an application on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset will be taken into account and a balanced judgement made having regard to the scale of any harm or</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>loss and the significance of the asset. The following list was compiled by local residents from a survey of the Parish and from historic records. The following considerations were taken into account when deciding whether the asset should be included. a. Age, but not decisive on its own. b. Aesthetic and design interest relating to local styles, materials or other distinctive local characteristics. c. Historic association with aspects of local and/or national interest. d. Having social and communal value such as a landmark, a source of local identity or distinctiveness, and part of collective memory. The list should be regarded as a live document, managed by the Parish Council with amendments made as appropriate at the time.</p> <p>Remove entry for the 'Malt Shovel' in Appendix B.</p> <p>Additional SDC Modification Proposed: The Examiner's proposed modification to the Policy wording refers to 'Inset Policy Maps', however elsewhere he indicates that these maps should be titled as 'Inset Proposals Maps'. It is therefore proposed that the wording of renumbered policy BE2 should be amended as follows:</p> <p>"Where a proposal directly or indirectly affects a non-designated heritage asset, listed in Appendix B and located on the <u>Inset Proposals Maps</u>, support for that proposal will depend on a balanced judgement of the scale of any harm or loss, and the significance of the asset and compliance with Policy CS8."</p>
Page 21			
<p>Reword Policy NE1 as: 'Development proposals must take full account of the Character & Landscape Assessment Statements summarised in Appendix A and published on the Parish Council website. Applicants will be expected to assess and address the impact of their proposals on the landscape, and in particular on the valued views listed in Appendix C and located on the Inset Proposals Maps and, where appropriate, put forward mitigation proposals.'</p>	Policy NE1	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1.</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed</i></p> <p>An additional amendment</p>	<p>Amends Policy NE1 as follows:</p> <p>"Development proposals will be supported, provided that they take full account of the local landscape character summarised in Appendix 1 and published on the Parish council website. Applicants will be expected to identify the impact of their proposals on the landscape and where necessary put forward mitigation proposals. Proposals which will have a significant adverse impact on the valued views shown in the Inset Proposals Maps will not be supported."</p> <p><u>Development proposals must take full account of the Character & Landscape Assessment Statements summarised in Appendix A and published on the Parish Council website. Applicants will be expected to assess and address the impact of their proposals on the landscape, and in particular on the valued views listed in Appendix C and located on the Inset Proposals Maps and, where appropriate, put forward mitigation proposals."</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
		to the Policy wording and paragraph 6.7 is proposed for the purposes of clarity and accuracy.	<p>Additional SDC Modification Proposed: As detailed previously, it is considered that a Valued Views Map for Tanworth-in-Arden, in addition to the Inset Proposals map, is necessary in order to show the features of the Inset Proposals Map at a clear and readable scale. It is therefore proposed to modify the Examiner's proposed wording for Policy NE1 and paragraph 6.7 as follows:</p> <p>Policy NE1: "Development proposals must take full account of the Character & Landscape Assessment Statements summarised in Appendix A and published on the Parish Council website. Applicants will be expected to assess and address the impact of their proposals on the landscape, and in particular on the valued views listed in Appendix C and located on the Inset Proposals Maps and Figure 4 and, where appropriate, put forward mitigation proposals."</p> <p>Paragraph 6.7: "The valued views are shown in red, and numbered, on the Inset Proposals Maps and Figure 4, with direction of the vista shown with red arrows and are described further in Appendix C."</p>
Page 21			
Delete Policy NE2 and paragraphs 6.8 & 6.9 and amend subsequent Policy and paragraph numbers accordingly.	Policy NE2	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1.</p>	Delete Policy NE2 and paras 6.8 and 6.9
Pages 21-22			
<p>Amend Policy NE3 (renumbered as Policy NE2) as follows:</p> <p>To the opening sentence after "6," insert 'located on the Inset Proposals Maps and described in Appendix D,'.</p> <p>Delete from the list of designated spaces "6.9.4 Field adjacent to the Tanworth- in-Churchyard" and amend</p>	Policy NE3 (renumbered as Policy NE2)	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications are required for clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1</p>	<p>Amend Policy NE3 as follows:</p> <p>"The Plan designates the following areas as Local Green Spaces, as defined in figures 5 and 6 , located on the Inset Proposals Maps and described in Appendix D, where development will not be supported other than in very special circumstances: 6.9.1 LGS1 Tanworth School Playing fields; 6.9.2 LGS2 Muntz Recreation Ground off Bates Lane; 6.9.3 LGS3 Tanworth Village Green; 6.9.4 Field adjacent to the Tanworth- in-Churchyard; and 6.9.5 LGS4 Earlswood leisure park in Malthouse Lane."</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>the numbering of the remaining four as LGS1 – LGS4.</p> <p>On figures 5 & 6 ensure that the numbering of each space corresponds to the numbering in the Policy and that the scale is large enough to ensure that boundaries can be identified unambiguously; in figure 5 redraw the boundary of LGS5 to exclude the surfaced parking area; in figure 6 redraw the LGS2 boundary in line with the revised drawing submitted as Appendix G to their email dated 13/01/22 and redraw the boundary of LGS1 to include only the green space (ie exclude the footprint of the school, hardstanding and related parking).</p> <p>In paragraph 6.10 amend the NPPF paragraph numbers to 101 and 102 respectively.</p> <p>Amend the related Appendix D to remove the content relating to "LGS 4. Field adjacent to Churchyard" and renumber the remaining space to accord with Policy wording and figures 5 & 6.</p>		<p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed</i></p> <p>Amendments to the Figure numbers are proposed for the purposes of clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 6.10 as follows: "Paragraph 99 101 of the NPPF enables local communities to designate land as Local Green Space in order to safeguard these spaces from new development other than in very special circumstances. Paragraph 100 102 of the NPPF sets out the criteria to be met before land can be designated. The effect is that the designated sites will be managed in strict accordance with Green Belt Policies."</p> <p>On figures 5 & 6 ensure that the numbering of each space corresponds to the numbering in the Policy and that the scale is large enough to ensure that boundaries can be identified unambiguously.</p> <p>Figure 5 – redraw boundary to LGS 5 (now LGS 4) to excluded surfaced area.</p> <p>Figure 6 – redraw boundary to LGS 2 in line with drawing appendix G dated 13/01/22 and redraw boundary of LGS 1 to include only the green space.</p> <p>Amend Appendix D to remove LGS 4 and renumber remaining space to accord with figures 5 and 6.</p> <p><i>Additional SDC Modification Proposed:</i> Due to the addition of Figure 4, Valued Views Map for Tanworth, Figures 5 and 6 are renumbered as Figures 6 and 7.</p>

Assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan as a whole, against the three dimensions of sustainable development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Sustainable Development Role (NPPF)	Neighbourhood Development Plan's Contribution
Economic	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to support the local economy through supporting the expansion of existing business premises and local tourism and leisure uses within the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>If implemented these policies will have a positive impact on the local economy, safeguarding jobs and local services.</p>
Social	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets a framework that will help to support the achievement of sustainable social development.</p> <p>The Plan allocates two sites for local housing need developments.</p> <p>The Plan promotes the retention and improvement of local community facilities and services.</p> <p>The Plan looks to safeguard Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Policies seek to promote the local distinctiveness of the area, and conserve and enhance heritage assets.</p>
Environmental	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of policies that support environmental sustainability for the community.</p> <p>The Plan has policies that look to protect heritage assets, natural features, valued landscapes as well as designate areas of Local Green Space.</p> <p>The NDP includes policies to protect the natural environment for future generations which have a positive impact on the environmental sustainability of the plan.</p>

3.1 The District Council concurs with the view of the Examiner that:

- Subject to the modifications above, the Tanworth-in-Arden Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions set out in paragraph 2.12 above; and
- The referendum area should be coterminous with the neighbourhood area.

4. Availability of Decision Statement and Examiner's Report (Regulation 18(2))

This Decision Statement and the Examiners Report can be inspected online at:

<https://www.stratford.gov.uk/planning-building/tanworth-in-arden-neighbourhood-plan.cfm>

And can be viewed in paper form at:

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