



DECISION STATEMENT

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM

1. Long Itchington, Bascote and Bascote Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 1.1 I confirm that the Long Itchington, Bascote and Bascote Heath Neighbourhood Development Plan (LNDP), 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 long horizontal line underneath.

John Careford,
Head of Development

1. Background

- 2.1 The District Council confirms that for the purposes of Regulation 5 (1) of The Regulations Long Itchington Parish Council is the "Qualifying Body" for their area.
- 2.2 In July 2014, Long Itchington Parish Council requested that, in accordance with section 5(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ("The Regulations"), the Parish of Long Itchington 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 Long Itchington 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 Long Itchington 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 5 October 2020 and 13 November 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 June 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 September 2021 and May 2022, with the final Examiner's report being issued on 16 May 2022.
- 2.10 The Examiner concluded he was satisfied that the Long Itchington, Bascote and Bascote Heath 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 In a small number of instances, some additional modifications to the Plan are also proposed by the District Council for reasons of clarity or accuracy. These are detailed within Table 1 (p.4) below, in conjunction with the policies to which they apply. These modifications are 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/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 1, Page 8			
<p>On the front cover and any later references amend the Plan period from "2011 – 2031" to '2021 – 2031' and remove references to "Submission Version".</p> <p>Review the Table of Contents in the light of my Recommendations, deleted content in particular.</p> <p>Under the heading "1. Introduction", from paragraph 1.7 replace "The relationship between this Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging SAP is set out in detail in Section 2 of this document" with 'The timescales for the SAP are currently being reviewed' and include a link to the SAP website.</p> <p>Amend the title of Figure 1 to read 'Designated Neighbourhood Area'.</p>	Front Cover and throughout	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p>The proposed modification is required for clarity and accuracy.</p>	<p>Amend front cover as follows: 20112021-2031</p> <p>Remove references to submission version.</p> <p>Correct Table of Contents.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 1.7 as follows: "The relationship between this Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging SAP is set out in detail in Section 2 of this document"<u>"The timescales for the SAP are currently being reviewed"</u> and include a link to the SAP website.</p> <p>Amend the title of Figure 1 as follows: "Long Itchington Neighbourhood Plan Area"<u>Designated Neighbourhood Area"</u></p>
Recommendation 2, Page 9			
Delete Section 2 "Statement on the Emerging Site Allocations Plan (SAP)" and amend the numbering of subsequent sections accordingly.	Introduction	<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and to meet Basic Condition</p>	Delete Section 2. mend the numbering of subsequent sections accordingly.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
		1	
Recommendation 3, Page 9			
Under the heading "3. Location and Geographic Context of the Long Itchington Neighbourhood Area" delete "The frequency of service was reduced in January 2019."	Section 3	<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy	Amend Section 3 as follows, under 'Bus Service': "The frequency of service was reduced in January 2019"
Recommendation 4, Page 9			
<p>Under the heading "4. The Origins and Growth of the Long Itchington Neighbourhood Area":</p> <p>In paragraph 4.4 delete "and introduced housing which is a considerable distance from amenities and services".</p> <p>Ensure that Figure 2 is a complete record for the Neighbourhood Area; amend the title to 'Designated Heritage Assets Location Map'.</p> <p>Correct the data in Figure 3 and provide a data source reference or references for Figures 3 and 3a.</p>	Section 4	<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy	<p>Amend the second sentence of paragraph 4.4 as follows: "The most recent developments along the Marton Road (Lilac View), next to and opposite the school on Stockton Road (Spinney Fields and Keeper's Meadow) have expanded the village footprint and introduced housing which is a considerable distance from amenities and services."</p> <p>Amend Figure 2 and amend the title as follows: "Designated Heritage Assets Location Map"</p> <p>Correct the data in Figure 3 and provide a data source reference or references for Figures 3 and 3a.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 5, Page 10			
Under the heading "5. The Vision for the Long Itchington Neighbourhood Area", in paragraph 5.6 replace "For example" with 'For example the residents believe they have experienced'.	Section 5	<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy	Amend paragraph 5.6 as follows: "For example <u>the residents believe they have experienced...</u> ".
Recommendation 6, Page 10			
Under the heading "6. Neighbourhood Plan Policies" renumber paragraphs as 6.1 etc. (that will actually be 5.1 etc after the removal of Section 2). Under the heading "Methodology" add to paragraph (as renumbered) 6.1.1: "All Policies in the Plan should be read together and alongside the Policies in the Core Strategy." Delete the box "Summary Statement – Supported New Housing Development".	Section 6	<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1	Renumber paragraphs 6.1 onwards. Add to paragraph 6.1.1: " <u>All Policies in the Plan should be read together and alongside the Policies in the Core Strategy.</u> " Delete the box "Summary Statement – Supported New Housing Development".
Recommendation 7, Page 12	Policy H1 and Policy H2		

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Change the heading "Policy H1 – Housing Supply and Development" to 'Policy H1 - Housing within the BUAB'.</p> <p>Reword Policy H1 as follows: 'A Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) is established for the village of Long Itchington as defined in Figure 5. All areas outside the BUAB are classed as Countryside (with the exception of the Cemex site identified as Site 3 in Core Strategy Policy AS.11) where new dwellings are strictly controlled in accordance with Policy AS.10 of the Core Strategy. Proposals for new dwellings within the BUAB, preferably reusing previously developed land, are supported provided they are:</p> <p>a) at a small scale and appropriate to their village setting;</p> <p>b) compatible with adjacent uses and the immediate surroundings, and</p> <p>c) lead to an enhancement in the character and appearance of the site.</p> <p>Move Figure 5 to be close to Policy H1.</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for Policy H1 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the second sentence of paragraph 2.5. • In paragraph 3 replace "published in February 2019 and updated in June 2019 		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Amend the heading of Policy H1 as follows: "Policy H1 – Housing Supply and Development <u>Housing within the BUAB</u>"</p> <p><u>Reword Policy H1 as follows:</u> "Proposals for new dwellings within the built up area boundary of Long Itchington village, as defined on Figure 5, will be supported subject to being in accordance with other policies in the Plan. All areas outside this built up area boundary are classed as Countryside with the exception of the Cemex site identified as Site 3 in Core Strategy Policy AS.11. New dwellings within the Countryside will be strictly controlled and limited to Local Needs Schemes, Rural Exception Sites, replacement dwellings and dwellings for rural workers in accordance with policy AS10 criterion (i) of the Core Strategy <u>A Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) is established for the village of Long Itchington as defined in</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>(Section 2)" with '(2021)'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for Policy H1 as follows: Insert a new paragraph 3 (renumbering subsequent paragraphs accordingly): 'Policy CS.16 in the adopted Core Strategy establishes the principle of using Built-Up Area Boundaries (BUABs) as a mechanism for managing the location of development and that it is appropriate to define BUABs for Local Service Villages to coincide with the physical confines of these settlements as the two are meant to be interchangeable in accordance with Part D in Policy CS.16. The BUAB defined for Long Itchington is derived from the methodology and boundary used in the 2020 draft Stratford on Avon Site Allocations Plan.' In the existing paragraph 3, close the brackets after "64" and delete the second sentence. Delete paragraph 4. <p>Delete Policy H2 and its supporting material as its essential element has been incorporated within Policy H1.</p>			<p><u>Figure 5. All areas outside the BUAB are classed as Countryside (with the exception of the Cemex site identified as Site 3 in Core Strategy Policy AS.11) where new dwellings are strictly controlled in accordance with Policy AS.10 of the Core Strategy. Proposals for new dwellings within the BUAB, preferably reusing previously developed land, are supported provided they are:</u></p> <p><u>a) at a small scale and appropriate to their village setting;</u></p> <p><u>b) compatible with adjacent uses and the immediate surroundings, and</u></p> <p><u>c) lead to an enhancement in the character and appearance of the site.</u></p> <p>Move Figure 5 closer to Policy H1</p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.5 as follows: "As a principle, no development other than that specified in the policy will be supported in order to preserve green space between existing settlements and avoid merging of separate settlements. Any approval of development within</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>these areas could incrementally weaken the argument to protect the countryside and lead to the eventual coalescence of the built environment resulting in an urban character for the Neighbourhood Area."</p> <p>Amend the last sentence of paragraph 3 as follows: "Sustainable development is a key principle enshrined in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 published in February 2019 and updated in June 2019 (Section 2).</p> <p>Insert a new paragraph 3: <u>"Policy CS.16 in the adopted Core Strategy establishes the principle of using Built-Up Area Boundaries (BUABs) as a mechanism for managing the location of development and that it is appropriate to define BUABs for Local Service Villages to coincide with the physical confines of these settlements as the two are meant to be interchangeable in accordance with Part D in Policy CS.16. The BUAB defined for Long Itchington is derived from the methodology and</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p><u>boundary used in the 2020 draft Stratford on Avon Site Allocations Plan.</u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 3 as follows:</p> <p>Charts 38 and 39 of the QS results (pages 63 and 64) show the importance respondents place on the natural features surrounding existing settlements in the Neighbourhood Area that contribute to their enjoyment of living here. It is contended this would be prejudiced by inappropriate development outside the built-up area boundary or in open countryside. A specific example is that 81% of respondents considered the rural setting of the Neighbourhood Area to be "extremely" or "very" important to their enjoyment of the Neighbourhood Area environment (Chart 38, page 63)</p> <p>Delete paragraph 4.</p> <p>Delete Policy H2 and supporting sections.</p>
Recommendation 8, Page 13	Policy H5		

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Move "Policy H5 – Housing Stock Diversity" and its supporting text to follow Policy H1; renumber the Policy as H2.</p> <p>Reword the renumbered Policy as follows:</p> <p>'a) Development proposals should retain and/or add to the choice of type and tenure of housing, including bungalows, self-build, custom-build and live/work units.</p> <p>b) Developers of new housing are encouraged to build sustainable and flexible living into house design to meet the requirements of people throughout their lives. In particular, accommodation should be easily adaptable to suit changing household needs and circumstances, including to cater for home working, people with disabilities and older residents who may need care and support.</p> <p>c) Single storey living and/or accessible dwellings with a predominance of ground floor accommodation would be supported where an evidenced local need is identified.'</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for Policy H2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the last sentence of paragraph 6 replace "must" with 'should'. • Delete paragraph 7. <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for Policy H2 as</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1&3</p>	<p>Reword renumbered Policy H5 (now Policy H2) as follows:</p> <p>a) Housing development that adds to the choice of type and tenure of housing, including self-build, custom-build and live/work units available to meet the identified needs of local people will be supported in accordance with the appropriate standards set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.19 subject to the proposal meeting all relevant policies in this Plan.</p> <p>b) Developers of new housing are encouraged to build sustainable and flexible living into house design to meet the requirements of people throughout their lives in accordance with the appropriate standards set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.19. In particular, accommodation that can be easily adapted to suit changing household needs and circumstances, including to cater for home working, people with disabilities and older residents who may need care and support.</p> <p>c) Proposals to convert any bungalow into a two storey or more dwelling other than by the creation of additional bedroom</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>follows: In paragraph 1 close the brackets after "62". In the final sentence of paragraph 2 delete "the whole of".</p> <p>Delete paragraphs 5 & 7 and renumber the remaining paragraphs accordingly.</p>			<p>and ancillary accommodation within the existing roof space will not be supported unless facilities for ground floor living are retained to ensure that the choice of single storey living remains available for older people or people with restricted mobility within the Neighbourhood Area. The policy recognises the permitted development rights of homeowners</p> <p><u>a) Development proposals should retain and/or add to the choice of type and tenure of housing, including bungalows, self-build, custom-build and live/work units.</u></p> <p><u>b) Developers of new housing are encouraged to build sustainable and flexible living into house design to meet the requirements of people throughout their lives. In particular, accommodation should be easily adaptable to suit changing household needs and circumstances, including to cater for home working, people with disabilities and older residents who may need care and support.</u></p> <p><u>c) Single storey living and/or accessible dwellings with a predominance of ground floor</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p><u>accommodation would be supported where an evidenced local need is identified.</u></p> <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for Policy H2 as follows:</p> <p>In paragraph 1 close the brackets after "62".</p> <p>In the final sentence of paragraph 2 delete "the whole of": "Long Itchington is, therefore, projected to have an even larger proportion of residents aged over 60 than the whole of Stratford-on-Avon District."</p> <p>Delete paragraph 5 and 7</p>
Recommendation 9, Page 14	Policy H3		
<p>Under the heading "Policy H3 - Affordable Housing":</p> <p>Reword Policy H3 as follows: 'Development proposals for the provision of small-scale affordable housing (as defined in Core Strategy Policy CS.18) are supported either within</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Reword Policy H3 as follows:</p> <p>"This Plan supports the provision of small-scale affordable housing (as defined in Core Strategy Policy CS.18) either on rural exception sites adjacent to the Village Boundaries (as defined on</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. 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 BUAB or as a Local Needs Scheme adjacent to the BUAB when the identified needs of the local community are being addressed. Where appropriate, housing tenures will be secured in perpetuity through a legal agreement.'</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for Policy H3 by, in paragraph 3, replacing ", small scale housing developments" with 'housing'.</p> <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for Policy H3 as follows:</p> <p>Replace paragraph 1 with 'Further Housing Needs Surveys, similar to that undertaken in 2016, will be undertaken to identify unmet needs for affordable housing. These may provide evidence in support of a Local Needs Scheme as provided for in Core Strategy Policy CS.15, or other local initiative.'</p> <p>Delete paragraphs 3 & 4 (since these don't relate to the Neighbourhood Area).</p> <p>Amend the formatting to keep together all the text relating to Policy H3.</p>			<p>the map in Figure 5) or on redevelopment of previously developed sites in accordance with the needs of the local community as identified through a Housing Needs Survey.</p> <p>Appropriate housing tenures will be secured in perpetuity through a Section 106 legal agreement. The criteria for local occupancy are those established by Stratford District Council."</p> <p><u>'Development proposals for the provision of small-scale affordable housing (as defined in Core Strategy Policy CS.18) are supported either within the BUAB or as a Local Needs Scheme adjacent to the BUAB when the identified needs of the local community are being addressed. Where appropriate, housing tenures will be secured in perpetuity through a legal agreement.'</u></p> <p>Revise paragraph 3 of the explanation as follows:</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>"New, small-scale housing developments should provide at least 35% of the total number of units for affordable housing in accordance with the threshold set out in Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy."</p> <p>Replace paragraph 1 of the Evidence section as follows:</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Area Parish Council commissioned Warwickshire Rural Community Council to undertake a Housing Needs Survey. The report was published in October 2016 and received by Stratford District Council. The report is included in Appendix B of this Plan. The report identified a need for 27 new homes from the responses to the survey. Including households registered on Home Choice Plus, it is concluded that there may be a need for a further 35 homes for local people. This total level of identified need for a mix of tenures and housing types has been met and, indeed exceeded, by new housing in the Neighbourhood Area either completed or under construction since 2011.</p> <p><u>'Further Housing Needs Surveys, similar to that undertaken</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p><u>in 2016, will be undertaken to identify unmet needs for affordable housing. These may provide evidence in support of a Local Needs Scheme as provided for in Core Strategy Policy CS.15, or other local initiative.</u></p> <p>Delete paragraphs 3 and 4:</p> <p>3. The Campaign to Protect Rural England's 'Housing Foresight' paper published in September 2017 stressed the importance of focussing on local housing need differentiated from housing demand. This protects local communities from "needless demand" that leads to housing being built in the wrong places.</p> <p>4. The House of Commons Library 'Affordable Housing Briefing' published in September 2018 states "Commentators are increasingly making the point, in addition to a crisis in housing supply, England is in the grip of a crisis of affordability". This supports the objective of providing affordable housing to meet local identified need</p> <p>Amend the formatting to keep together</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			all the text relating to Policy H3.
Recommendation 10, Page 15	Policy H4		
<p>Reword Policy H4 as follows: 'Development proposals for housing on private garden land within the BUAB will be supported providing it can be demonstrated that the proposal: a) preserves or enhances the character of the setting, with particular attention to context if the site is within the Long Itchington Village Conservation Area; b) achieves a good fit with the existing settlement pattern; c) addresses and remedies any potential harm to the amenity of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties; and d) provides satisfactory arrangements for access and off-road parking.'</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for Policy H4 by deleting paragraph 2 and renumbering subsequent paragraphs accordingly.</p> <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for Policy H4 by adding a third paragraph as follows: 'An appropriate and successful example of infill development was provided by Chater's Orchard,</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p> <p><i>Additional Modification Proposed by SDC</i></p> <p>The Qualifying Body (Long Itchington Parish Council) have clarified that Chater's Orchard and infill on the former garden of Lyndhurst are two separate examples.</p> <p>Therefore revised wording to the evidence section is proposed to reflect this.</p>	<p>Reword Policy H4 as follows: "Development on private garden land will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that the proposal will: a) preserve or enhance the character of the area, particularly if the site is within the Long Itchington Village Conservation Area; b) not introduce an inappropriate form of development which is at odds with the existing settlement pattern; c) not significantly and demonstrably harm the amenity of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties; d) provide satisfactory arrangement for access and off road parking; and e) the proposal would not conflict with any other policies in the Plan.</p> <p><u>'Development proposals for housing on private garden land within the BUAB will be supported providing it can be demonstrated that the proposal: a) preserves or enhances the</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
infill on former garden of Lyndhurst (the Birches), Stonebridge Lane.'			<p><u>character of the setting, with particular attention to context if the site is within the Long Itchington Village Conservation Area;</u> <u>b) achieves a good fit with the existing settlement pattern;</u> <u>c) addresses and remedies any potential harm to the amenity of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties; and</u> <u>d) provides satisfactory arrangements for access and off-road parking.'</u></p> <p>Delete paragraph 2 from Explanation: Private garden land excludes land within the curtilage of a dwelling used as a paddock or grazing land.</p> <p>Add third paragraph to Evidence: <u>'Two appropriate and successful examples of infill development were provided by Chater's Orchard and infill on the former garden of Lyndhurst (the Birches) – Short Lane.'</u></p>
Recommendation 11, Page 16	Community Aspiration, Page 26		

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Under the heading "Community Aspiration: Access to a Range of Housing and a Sustainable Community" amend references to "H5" to read 'H2'.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy	Amend reference from 'H5' to 'H2' under the heading "Community Aspiration: Access to a Range of Housing and a Sustainable Community"
Recommendation 12, Page 16	Policy BE1		
Delete the heading "Policy BE1 - New Development" and the related text.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Delete Policy BE1 and related Evidence/Explanation and text.
Recommendation 13, Page 17	Policy BE2		
<p>Renumber and reword the heading "Policy BE2 – Scale, Form, Layout and Design" as 'Policy BE1 – Design Standards'.</p> <p>Reword the renumbered Policy BE1 as follows: 'Development proposals must demonstrate that their scale, form, layout and design are consistent with and sympathetically reflect the rural setting of the Neighbourhood Area. The architectural character and distinctiveness of buildings and structures should be the inspiration for new buildings. Innovative design proposals will be supported providing that they add to and do not detract from the distinctive character of their location. Further guidance is available in the Village Design Statement (for Long Itchington)</p>		<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	<p>Renumber and reword the heading "Policy BE2 – Scale, Form, Layout and Design" as 'Policy BE1 – Design Standards'.</p> <p>Reword Policy BE1 as follows: Any proposed new development must demonstrate that its scale, form, layout and design is consistent with and sympathetically reflects the rural setting of the Neighbourhood Area and the architectural character and distinctiveness of buildings and structures within its settlements. This will be achieved by reflecting the recommendations of the Village</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. 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 Stratford-upon-Avon's Supplementary Planning Document 'How to Achieve Good Design'.</p> <p>In particular, proposals should be prepared against each of the following key recommendations (also contained in the Village Design Statement 2000):</p> <p>a) Maintain the open, rural character of settlements by protecting all existing open spaces including green verges forming part of the adopted highway within the BUAB;</p> <p>b) The characteristics of new buildings should reflect the scale and form of the settlement;</p> <p>c) Tree planting and landscaping must be an integral part of the design and construction of any development;</p> <p>d) Healthy, mature, native trees and hedges must be protected and supplemented by new planting of indigenous species;</p> <p>e) Integration of any new development should be strengthened by connections to existing footpaths and cycleways where appropriate;</p> <p>f) Adequate, off-road parking should be incorporated in accordance with Part O of the adopted Development Requirements SPD. Depending on the location of the development site, its relationship with neighbouring properties and the extent of existing on-street parking, additional parking provision may be appropriate.</p>			<p>Design Statement and meeting the standards set out in Part A, 'How to Achieve Good Design' of Stratford-on-Avon's Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document 2019"</p> <p><u>Development proposals must demonstrate that their scale, form, layout and design are consistent with and sympathetically reflect the rural setting of the Neighbourhood Area. The architectural character and distinctiveness of buildings and structures should be the inspiration for new buildings. Innovative design proposals will be supported providing that they add to and do not detract from the distinctive character of their location. Further guidance is available in the Village Design Statement (for Long Itchington) and Stratford-upon-Avon's Supplementary Planning Document 'How to Achieve Good Design'</u></p> <p><u>In particular, proposals should be prepared against each of the following key recommendations</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Vehicle parking should be screened from public view as far as is practicable; large expanses of hard surfacing should be avoided.</p> <p>g) All new dwellings should incorporate cycle storage wherever practicable in order to promote sustainable transport.</p> <p>h) Design features should be incorporated to protect and enhance wildlife corridors within and between the sites of buildings, green spaces and, where applicable, the adjoining countryside.</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for the renumbered Policy BE1 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the last sentence of paragraph 2. • Revise paragraph 5 to, in the first sentence replace "will" with 'should'; in the last sentence replace "published in February 2019 and updated in June 2019" with 'as revised in 2021'. • Replace paragraph 6 with 'Current design guidance for the Stratford on Avon District is provided by Part A, 'How to Achieve Good Design' of Stratford on Avon's Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document 2020.' <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for the renumbered Policy BE1 by using the "Evidence" content from Policy BE4.</p>			<p><u>(also contained in the Village Design Statement 2000):</u></p> <p><u>a) Maintain the open, rural character of settlements by protecting all existing open spaces including green verges forming part of the adopted highway within the BUAB;</u></p> <p><u>b) The characteristics of new buildings should reflect the scale and form of the settlement;</u></p> <p><u>c) Tree planting and landscaping must be an integral part of the design and construction of any development;</u></p> <p><u>d) Healthy, mature, native trees and hedges must be protected and supplemented by new planting of indigenous species;</u></p> <p><u>e) Integration of any new development should be strengthened by connections to existing footpaths and cycleways where appropriate;</u></p> <p><u>f) Adequate, off-road parking should be incorporated in accordance with Part O of the adopted Development Requirements SPD. Depending on the location of the development site, its relationship with neighbouring</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p><u>properties and the extent of existing on-street parking, additional parking provision may be appropriate. Vehicle parking should be screened from public view as far as is practicable; large expanses of hard surfacing should be avoided.</u></p> <p><u>g) All new dwellings should incorporate cycle storage wherever practicable in order to promote sustainable transport.</u></p> <p><u>h) Design features should be incorporated to protect and enhance wildlife corridors within and between the sites of buildings, green spaces and, where applicable, the adjoining countryside.</u></p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for the renumbered Policy BE1 as follows:</p> <p>Delete the last sentence of paragraph 2 "To allow incremental urbanisation would be to deny the views that have been clearly expressed."</p> <p>Revise paragraph 5 to, in the first sentence replace "will" with 'should'; in the last sentence replace "published in</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>February 2019 and updated in June 2019" with 'as revised in 2021'.</p> <p>Replace paragraph 6 with '<u>Current design guidance for the Stratford on Avon District is provided by Part A, 'How to Achieve Good Design' of Stratford on Avon's Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document 2020.</u>'</p> <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for the renumbered Policy BE1 by using the "Evidence" content from Policy BE4.</p>
Recommendation 14, Page 18	Policy BE3		
Delete the heading "Policy BE3 – Assessment of the Impact of Development on the Neighbourhood Area" and the related text.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Delete Policy BE3, Explanation, Evidence and related text.
Recommendation 15, Page 18	Policy BE4		
Delete the heading "Policy BE4 - Design Standards" and the related text (although some has been reused for Policy BE1).		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Delete Policy BE4, Explanation, Evidence and related text.
Recommendation 16, Page 19	Policy BE5		

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Delete the heading "Policy BE5 - Alternative Use of Land and Buildings" and the related text.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Delete Policy BE5, Explanation, Evidence and related text.
Recommendation 17, Page 19	Policy BE6		
<p>Within the heading "Policy BE6 – Conservation of Heritage Assets" replace "BE6" with 'BE2'.</p> <p>Reword the renumbered Policy BE2 as follows: 'Development proposals that affect a heritage asset (whether or not designated) and/or its setting, an archaeological asset or the Long Itchington Village Conservation Area must assess and address their impacts and any mitigation in accordance with NPPF requirements. Proposals should demonstrate how they will conserve or enhance the historic environment.</p> <p>Proposals, including changes of use, that enable the appropriate and sensitive restoration or conservation of heritage assets will be supported in principle.'</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1</p>	<p>Renumber Policy BE6 as Policy BE2.</p> <p>Reword Policy as follows:</p> <p>Proposals should demonstrate how they will conserve or enhance the Neighbourhood Area's historic environment including archaeological assets. The impact of any development on any heritage asset will be judged against the degree of harm and the significance of the heritage asset affected and weighed against any public benefits.</p> <p>Proposals, including changes of use, that enable the appropriate and sensitive restoration or conservation of listed buildings will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that cause harm to the special architectural or historical interest of listed buildings and their settings will not</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>be supported. Development that fails to conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Long Itchington village Conservation Area will not be supported.</p> <p><u>'Development proposals that affect a heritage asset (whether or not designated) and/or its setting, an archaeological asset or the Long Itchington Village Conservation Area must assess and address their impacts and any mitigation in accordance with NPPF requirements. Proposals should demonstrate how they will conserve or enhance the historic environment.'</u></p> <p><u>Proposals, including changes of use, that enable the appropriate and sensitive restoration or conservation of heritage assets will be supported in principle.'</u></p>
Recommendation 18, Page 19	Policy BE7		
Delete the heading "Policy BE7 – Designing Out Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour" and the related text.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Delete Policy BE7, Explanation, Evidence and related text.

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 19, Page 20	Policy EB1		
<p>Amend the heading "Policy EB1 – Development of Land and Buildings for Business Use" to 'Policy EB1 – Business Uses'.</p> <p>Reword Policy EB1 as follows: 'Development proposals for new business uses appropriate to their location and within the BUAB, or the expansion or redevelopment of existing business sites that will lead to local employment opportunities, are supported in principle providing that their design and impact at their location are assessed and addressed, with mitigation where appropriate.</p> <p>If a change of use is proposed on the basis that an employment site is no longer suitable for any employment/business use, it should be accompanied by a detailed analysis of the reasons why it is unsuitable and evidence of a minimum of 6 months active marketing to attempt to secure a new business occupier on reasonable open market terms. A proposal for an alternative use of part of a site will be supported where it is demonstrated that sustainable economic viability for the retained business or growth of local employment opportunities would be achieved'</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for Policy</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Amend the heading "Policy EB1 – Development of Land and Buildings for Business Use" to 'Policy EB1 – Business Uses'.</p> <p>Reword Policy EB1 as follows:</p> <p>A proposal for the development or redevelopment of land and buildings within the Built Up Area Boundaries identified in Figure 5 or expansion or redevelopment of existing business sites outside these areas that leads to local employment opportunities will be supported providing that it satisfies all relevant policies in this Plan relating to location, scale, form and design.</p> <p><u>'Development proposals for new business uses appropriate to their location and within the BUAB, or the expansion or redevelopment of existing business sites that will lead to local employment opportunities, are supported in principle providing that their design and impact at their location are assessed and addressed, with mitigation where</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>EB1 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the first paragraph delete the last two sentences. Add the second paragraph from the "Evidence" for Policy EB3 to become the third paragraph of the "Evidence" for Policy EB1. Add a fourth paragraph 'Figure 8 identifies the locations of existing key businesses' and move Figure 8 closer to Policy EB1. <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for Policy EB1 by replacing it with the two paragraphs from the "Evidence" section for Policy EB3</p>			<p><u>appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>If a change of use is proposed on the basis that an employment site is no longer suitable for any employment/business use, it should be accompanied by a detailed analysis of the reasons why it is unsuitable and evidence of a minimum of 6 months active marketing to attempt to secure a new business occupier on reasonable open market terms. A proposal for an alternative use of part of a site will be supported where it is demonstrated that sustainable economic viability for the retained business or growth of local employment opportunities would be achieved'</u></p> <p>Amend first paragraph of Explanation as follows: "New development for business use or redevelopment of existing business sites that secures existing jobs or creates new jobs for local people would help to meet the strategic objectives of this section of the Plan. This policy does not apply to proposals for alternative uses of existing</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>or former business/ employment premises. This is addressed in Policy EB3 below."</p> <p>Add the second paragraph from the "Evidence" for Policy EB3 to become the third paragraph of the "Evidence" for Policy EB1:</p> <p><u>"Chart 58 of the QS results (page 65) shows that 63% of respondents agreed that the Plan should make provision for employment opportunities. 46% of respondents agreed that employment sites should be protected from change of use"</u></p> <p>Add a fourth paragraph: <u>'Figure 8 identifies the locations of existing key businesses'</u></p> <p>Move Figure 8 closer to Policy EB1.</p> <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for Policy EB1 by replacing it with the two paragraphs from the "Evidence" section for Policy EB3</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 20, Page 21	Policy EB2		
<p>Under the heading "Policy EB2 – Tourism" reword Policy EB2 as follows: 'Development proposals that encourage or support the growth of the local economy from tourism are supported in principle providing that their design and impact at their location are assessed and addressed, with mitigation where appropriate.'</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Reword Policy EB2 as follows:</p> <p>"A development proposal that encourages or supports the growth of the local economy from tourism will be supported provided that it satisfies all relevant policies in this Plan relating to location, scale form and design. Proposals to provide new, small scale touring caravan and camping sites or improve existing facilities will be supported where they have safe road access, are effectively screened from neighbouring land and property and do not adversely affect residential amenity, the settings of heritage assets or the adjoining character of the landscape including wildlife habitat."</p> <p><u>'Development proposals that encourage or support the growth of the local economy from tourism are supported in principle providing that their design and impact at their location are assessed and addressed, with mitigation where appropriate.'</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 21, Page 21	Policy EB3		
Delete the heading "Policy EB3 – Change of Use of Employment/Business Land and Buildings" and the related text		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Delete Policy EB3, Explanation, Evidence and related text.
Recommendation 22, Page 21	Policy EB4		
Delete the heading "Policy EB4 – Change of Use of Agricultural Buildings to Commercial or Residential Use" and the related text.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Delete Policy EB4, Explanation, Evidence and related text.
Recommendation 23, Page 22	Policy EB5		
Delete the heading "Policy EB5 – Infrastructure" and the related text.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Delete Policy EB5, Explanation, Evidence and related text.
Recommendation 24, Page 22	Policy NE1		
Reword Policy NE1 as follows: 'Development proposals must demonstrate how they are appropriate to and integrate with their landscape setting including locally significant features where appropriate.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 &	Reword Policy NE1 as follows: Development proposals must demonstrate how they are appropriate to and integrate with the landscape setting

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Development proposals should assess and address their potential impact on the important views of the landscapes shown on the map in Figure 9, particularly to minimise harms to heritage assets, village approaches and the green spaces around and between settlements.'</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for Policy NE1 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the second sentence of paragraph 1. • From paragraph 4 delete "landscapes and". <p>Amend Figure 9 and the related photos to accord with the revised and reduced document (4 views) submitted by the Qualifying Body on 29th March 2022 (omitting new views not the subject of public consultation).</p> <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for Policy NE1 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace "Paragraph 170 (a) of the National Planning Policy Framework published in February 2019 and updated in June 2019" with 'Paragraph 174(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021'. • Add evidence from the "Stratford on Avon District Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 		3	<p>whilst conserving and enhancing the character of the landscape including important local features. Development proposals should ensure that all important views of the valued landscape shown on the map in Figure 9 are maintained and safeguarded, particularly where they relate to heritage assets, village approaches and the green spaces around and between settlements.</p> <p><u>"Development proposals must demonstrate how they are appropriate to and integrate with their landscape setting including locally significant features where appropriate. Development proposals should assess and address their potential impact on the important views of the landscapes shown on the map in Figure 9, particularly to minimise harms to heritage assets, village approaches and the green spaces around and between settlements."</u></p> <p>Revise paragraph 1 of the Explanation section as follows:</p> <p>"The distinctive character and rural</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>for Villages" (2012), if available, ensuring that a full document reference is provided.</p>			<p>setting of the settlements in the Neighbourhood Area fundamentally relies on their physical relationship with surrounding countryside. This reinforces Policies H1 and BE1 preventing development outside the Built-Up Area Boundaries identified in this Plan to ensure that expansion into the adjoining countryside is avoided and the risk of settlements merging through incremental development is eliminated."</p> <p>Revise paragraph 4 as follows:</p> <p>The key landscapes and views identified in Figure 9 are described as follows. A selection of illustrative photographs taken from each view point are included.</p> <p>Amend Figure 9 and the related photos to accord with the revised and reduced document (4 views) submitted by the Qualifying Body on 29th March 2022 (omitting new views not the subject of public consultation).</p> <p>Revise Evidence sub-section as follows:</p> <p>Replace "Paragraph 170 (a) of the</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>National Planning Policy Framework published in February 2019 and updated in June 2019" with 'Paragraph 174(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021'.</p> <p>Add evidence from the "Stratford on Avon District Landscape Sensitivity Assessment for Villages" (2012), if available, ensuring that a full document reference is provided.</p>
Recommendation 25, Page 24	Policy NE2		
<p>Reword Policy NE2 as follows: 'The following areas are designated as Local Green Spaces; these are identified on the map in Figure 10: LGS 1 – Allotment Gardens and Cemetery LGS 2 - Model Village open green space and cricket ground LGS 3 - Communal green space, Beechcroft south of The Green LGS 4 - The Green and Village Pond LGS 5 - Green End recreation ground and playground LGS 6 - LILAC Field</p> <p>Development on these Spaces will not be</p>		<p><i>Modification Partially Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p> <p><i>Proposed Amendment to Examiner's Modification by SDC</i></p> <p>Following the revised numbering of the</p>	<p>Reword Policy NE2 as follows:</p> <p>"This Plan designates the following areas of Local Green Space in the Neighbourhood Area as identified on the map in Figure 10:</p> <p>a) LGS 1: Dale Close estate, play area and open green space, west of Short Lane, Long Itchington.</p> <p>b) LGS 2: Green area south of Galanos/east of Sabin Close, Long Itchington.</p> <p>c) LGS 3: Allotment Gardens, north of Church Road at the junction of Bascote Road, Long Itchington.</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>supported other than in very special circumstances.'</p> <p>Amend Figure 10 and the maps in Appendix C to ensure that the above numbering is used to identify the related spaces and that the scale of each map is useable to identify the boundaries of each space (particularly where sites are split by roads eg LGS4), with absolute clarity in Appendix C. Revise the Site Assessments given in Appendix C to renumber the spaces and separate out the two designation headings and their criteria for designation.</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for Policy NE2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the second sentence of paragraph 1. • Delete paragraph 2. • Reword paragraph 3 as: 'Each designated space meets the requirements of paragraph 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework.' • Delete the second sentence of paragraph 5. <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for Policy NE2 as follows: Reword paragraph 1 as: 'Each area identified in this Policy has been independently assessed and recognised as meeting the NPPF paragraph 102 criteria. In addition, none of the sites preclude</p>		<p>Local Green Spaces and the redesignation of some of the proposed LGS as Incidental Green Spaces (IGS) by the Examiner, the Examiner requested that the spaces were renumbered and separated in their Site Assessments in Appendix C.</p> <p>However, SDC felt it inappropriate to retrospectively amend the evidence base in this way. Therefore, the Site Assessments have retained their original numbering, but it has also been made clear what the new site numbers and designations are.</p> <p>In addition, the IGS and LGS have been</p>	<p>d) LGS 4: Open green space south of Church Road at the junction of Bascote Road, Long Itchington.</p> <p>e) LGS 5: Model Village open green space and cricket ground, west of Southam Road, Long Itchington.</p> <p>f) LGS 6: Communal green space, Beechcroft south of The Green, Long Itchington.</p> <p>g) LGS 7: The Green and Village Pond at the junction of/on Leamington, Church and Stockton Roads.</p> <p>h) LGS 8: Green End recreation ground and playground, north of Green End, Long Itchington</p> <p>i) LGS 9: LILAC Field, west of Marton Road, Long Itchington.</p> <p>j) LGS 10: Green and ponds at Bishops Drive and Cox Crescent, east of Marton Road, Long Itchington.</p> <p>k) LGS 11: Playground and open green space, west of Leigh Crescent, Long Itchington.</p> <p>l) LGS 12: Green space, south west of Leigh Crescent, Long Itchington.</p> <p>m) LGS 13: Cluster of incidental green communal spaces and verges from the junction of Collingham Land and Stockton Road to Leigh Crescent, Long</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>planning for future sustainable development and all are capable of enduring beyond the life of the Plan.'</p> <p>In paragraph 4 replace "access to existing local green spaces is protected" with 'local green spaces are protected'.</p>		<p>provided on two separate maps, for clarity (Figures 10 and 11)</p>	<p>Itchington: n) LGS 14: Green area, Wulfstan Drive, Long Itchington. e) LGS 15: Keepers Meadow green spaces bordering The Grand Union Canal and Stockton Road, Long Itchington. p) LGS 16: Spinney Fields green spaces, north of Stockton Road, Long Itchington. Development that would harm the openness or special character of a Local Green Space or its significance and value to the local community will not be supported unless there are special circumstances that outweigh the harm to the Local Green Space</p> <p><u>"The following areas are designated as Local Green Spaces; these are identified on the map in Figure 10:</u> <u>LGS 1 – Allotment Gardens and Cemetery</u> <u>LGS 2 - Model Village open green space and cricket ground</u> <u>LGS 3 - Communal green space, Beechcroft south of The Green</u> <u>LGS 4 - The Green and Village Pond</u> <u>LGS 5 - Green End recreation ground and playground</u> <u>LGS 6 - LILAC Field</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p><u>Development on these Spaces will not be supported other than in very special circumstances.”</u></p> <p>Amend Figure 10 and the maps in Appendix C to ensure that the above numbering is used to identify the related spaces and that the scale of each map is useable to identify the boundaries of each space (particularly where sites are split by roads eg LGS4), with absolute clarity in Appendix C.</p> <p>Revise the Site Assessments given in Appendix C to make clear the revised numbering and LGS/IGS designations.</p> <p>Revise the “Explanation” sub-section for Policy NE2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the second sentence of paragraph 1: “Each area of Local Green Space listed in the policy is identified on plans included in the independent assessments set out in Appendix C to this Plan. Larger scale plans can be seen by contacting the Parish Council at The Community Centre, Stockton Road, Long Itchington (Tel. 01926 815216) or visiting

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. 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://www.longitchington.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/local-green-spaces/.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete paragraph 2. “Each assessment includes the following, detailed information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Site description and current land use – Relevant planning history – Site ownership – Site constraints – Public access – Photographs – Ecological significance – Special qualities and local significance – Summary of assessed suitability for Designation as Local Green Space” • Reword paragraph 3 as: <u>“Each designated space meets the requirements of paragraph 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework.”</u> <p>Amend paragraph 1 of the Evidence section as follows: <u>Each area identified in this Policy has been independently assessed and recognised as meeting the NPPF paragraph 102 criteria. In addition,</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p><u>none of the sites preclude planning for future sustainable development and all are capable of enduring beyond the life of the Plan.</u></p> <p>Delete the second sentence of paragraph 5: "The wide distribution of village greens and other open amenity land throughout the Neighbourhood Area is a key feature of the character and distinctiveness of the area. This policy seeks to ensure that these features are maintained and promoted in accordance with paragraph 91 (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework published in February 2019 and updated in June 2019."</p> <p>Reword paragraph 1 of Evidence as: <u>'Each area identified in this Policy has been independently assessed and recognised as meeting the NPPF paragraph 102 criteria. In addition, none of the sites preclude planning for future sustainable development and all are capable of enduring beyond the life of the Plan.'</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. 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 paragraph 4 of Evidence as follows: "The Houses of Parliament POSTnote 538 published in October 2016 entitled 'Green Space and Health' contends that "Local green spaces may provide important areas for social interaction and integration that can indirectly increase public wellbeing. Access to green spaces may also have more direct and immediate benefits for mental health and wellbeing". It is, therefore, important that access to existing local green spaces is are protected and wherever possible enhanced."</p>
Recommendation 26, Page 25	New Policy Inserted After Policy NE2		
<p>Add a new heading and Policy after the text for Policy NE2 as follows: 'Policy NE3 – Incidental Green Spaces The following areas are designated as Incidental Green Spaces which are open areas considered vital to the rural and green character of the community in which they are situated: IGS 1 - Dale Close estate, play area and open green space IGS 2 - Green area south of Galanos / east of</p>		<p><i>Modification Partially Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p> <p><i>Proposed Amendment to</i></p>	<p>Add new Policy after Policy NE2 as follows:</p> <p><u>"Policy NE3 – Incidental Green Spaces</u></p> <p><u>The following areas are designated as Incidental Green Spaces which are open areas considered vital to the rural and green character of the</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Sabin Close IGS 3 - Open green space south of Church Road IGS 4 – Green and ponds at Bishops Drive and Cox Crescent IGS 5 - Playground and open green space west of Leigh Crescent IGS 6 – Green space southwest of Leigh Crescent IGS 7 – Cluster of incidental green communal spaces and verges from the junction of Collingham Lane and Stockton Road to Leigh Crescent IGS 8 – Green space Wulfstan Drive IGS 9 – Keepers Meadow green spaces IGS 10 – Spinney Fields green spaces</p> <p>These spaces and their cumulative effect are of particular value in areas where dwellings do not provide garden space. Inclusion of incidental green space is vital to all new housing proposals, at a scale appropriate to the size of the site. Development proposals must demonstrate, dependent on their scale, use and location, how they are maintaining, enhancing and adding Incidental Green Spaces.'</p> <p>Renumber subsequent Policies accordingly.</p> <p>Amend Figure 10 and the maps in Appendix C to ensure that the above numbering is used to identify the related spaces and that the scale of each map is useable to identify the boundaries of</p>		<p><i>Examiner's Modification by SDC</i></p> <p>Following the revised numbering of the Local Green Spaces and the redesignation of some of the proposed LGS as Incidental Green Spaces (IGS) by the Examiner, the Examiner requested that the spaces were renumbered and separated in their Site Assessments in Appendix C.</p> <p>However, SDC felt it inappropriate to retrospectively amend the evidence base in this way. Therefore, the Site Assessments have retained their original numbering, but it has also been made clear what the new site</p>	<p><u>community in which they are situated:</u> <u>IGS 1 - Dale Close estate, play area and open green space</u> <u>IGS 2 - Green area south of Galanos / east of Sabin Close</u> <u>IGS 3 - Open green space south of Church Road</u> <u>IGS 4 – Green and ponds at Bishops Drive and Cox Crescent</u> <u>IGS 5 - Playground and open green space west of Leigh Crescent</u> <u>IGS 6 – Green space southwest of Leigh Crescent</u> <u>IGS 7 – Cluster of incidental green communal spaces and verges from the junction of Collingham Lane and Stockton Road to Leigh Crescent</u> <u>IGS 8 – Green space Wulfstan Drive</u> <u>IGS 9 – Keepers Meadow green spaces</u> <u>IGS 10 – Spinney Fields green spaces</u> <u>These spaces and their cumulative effect are of particular value in areas where dwellings do not provide garden space. Inclusion of incidental green space is vital to all new housing proposals, at a scale appropriate to the size of the site.</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>each space, with absolute clarity in Appendix C. Use a different colour or pattern to distinguish IGS from LGS designations. Revise the Site Assessments given in Appendix C to renumber the spaces and separate out the two designation headings and their criteria for designation.</p> <p>Add an "Explanation" sub-heading with the following text: 'Each area of Incidental Green Space listed in the Policy, recognised as an important feature in a village setting, is identified on plans included in the independent assessments set out in Appendix C to this Plan.'</p> <p>Add an "Evidence" sub-heading with the following text: '1. Each area identified in this policy has been independently assessed and recognised as contributing significantly to the character of the Neighbourhood Area. 2. Chart 38 of the QS results shows that 76% of respondents consider that open spaces within built up areas are 'Extremely' or 'Very' important to their enjoyment of the Neighbourhood Area environment. 3. The Houses of Parliament POSTnote 538 published in October 2016 entitled 'Green Space and Health' contends that 'Local green spaces may</p>		<p>numbers and designations are.</p> <p>In addition, the IGS and LGS have been provided on two separate maps, for clarity (Figures 10 and 11)</p>	<p><u>Development proposals must demonstrate, dependent on their scale, use and location, how they are maintaining, enhancing and adding Incidental Green Spaces."</u></p> <p>Renumber subsequent Policies accordingly.</p> <p>Amend maps to ensure that the correct numbering is used to identify the related spaces and that the scale of each map is useable to identify the boundaries of each space, with absolute clarity in Appendix C.</p> <p>Add an "Explanation" sub-heading with the following text: <u>'Each area of Incidental Green Space listed in the Policy, recognised as an important feature in a village setting, is identified on plans included in the independent assessments set out in Appendix C to this Plan.'</u></p> <p>Add an "Evidence" sub-heading with the following text: <u>"1. Each area identified in this policy has been independently assessed</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>provide important areas for social interaction and integration ...and ...may also have more immediate benefits for mental health and wellbeing’.</p> <p>4. Policy CS.7 of the Core Strategy states that: - ‘The availability of open spaces, waterways and other green infrastructure features will be maintained and improved as a contribution towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality of life and attractive communities • biodiversity and the provision of habitats • landscape character and quality.’ 			<p><u>and recognised as contributing significantly to the character of the Neighbourhood Area.</u></p> <p><u>2. Chart 38 of the QS results shows that 76% of respondents consider that open spaces within built up areas are ‘Extremely’ or ‘Very’ important to their enjoyment of the Neighbourhood Area</u></p> <p><u>3. The Houses of Parliament POSTnote 538 published in October 2016 entitled ‘Green Space and Health’ contends that ‘Local green spaces may provide important areas for social interaction and integration ...and ...may also have more immediate benefits for mental health and wellbeing’.</u></p> <p><u>4. Policy CS.7 of the Core Strategy states that: - ‘The availability of open spaces, waterways and other green infrastructure features will be maintained and improved as a contribution towards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• quality of life and attractive communities</u> <u>• biodiversity and the provision of habitats</u> <u>• landscape character and quality.”</u>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
Recommendation 27, Page 27	Policy NE4		
<p>Under the renumbered heading "Policy NE4 – Wildlife Habitats and Biodiversity" reword Policy NE4 as follows:</p> <p>'Development proposals should protect and, where possible, enhance the natural environment including valued landscapes, natural features, wildlife corridors and other biodiversity-rich areas. Inclusion of proposals to create, enhance and restore adjacent habitats for biodiversity is encouraged. When constructing boundaries, hedges should be used in preference to walls and close-boarded fences; where used, the latter should incorporate suitable ground-level access to protect and enhance wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Development proposals should ensure that the natural features and functions of watercourses and their wider corridors are retained and, where relevant, reinstated. Appropriate habitat buffers should also be assured.</p> <p>All landscaping proposals should incorporate the planting of native tree and hedge species as well as nectar-rich plants.'</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Reword Policy NE4 as follows:</p> <p>Under the renumbered heading "Policy NE4 – Wildlife Habitats and Biodiversity" reword Policy NE4 as follows:</p> <p><u>'Development proposals should protect and, where possible, enhance the natural environment including valued landscapes, natural features, wildlife corridors and other biodiversity-rich areas. Inclusion of proposals to create, enhance and restore adjacent habitats for biodiversity is encouraged. When constructing boundaries, hedges should be used in preference to walls and close-boarded fences; where used, the latter should incorporate suitable ground-level access to protect and enhance wildlife corridors.</u></p> <p><u>Development proposals should ensure that the natural features and functions of watercourses and their wider corridors are retained and, where relevant, reinstated.</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p><u>Appropriate habitat buffers should also be assured.</u></p> <p><u>All landscaping proposals should incorporate the planting of native tree and hedge species as well as nectar-rich plants.'</u></p>
Recommendation 28, Page 28	Policy NE5		
<p>Under the renumbered heading "Policy NE5 - Flooding and Water Management":</p> <p>Reword Policy NE5 as follows: 'Development proposals should meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS.4 and be sensitive to the impact of Climate Change. In particular, proposals should be designed to reduce the risk of flooding. A site-specific flood risk assessment may be required dependent on the scale, use and location of proposals, in line with the requirements of national policy and guidance, but may also be required based on locally available evidence.</p> <p>Proposals that improve or enhance existing flood defence works benefitting land or properties in proximity to the River Itchen and its associated watercourses will be supported. No proposal should have an adverse impact on the</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Reword Policy NE5 as follows: <u>"Development proposals should meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS.4 and be sensitive to the impact of Climate Change. In particular, proposals should be designed to reduce the risk of flooding. A site-specific flood risk assessment may be required dependent on the scale, use and location of proposals, in line with the requirements of national policy and guidance, but may also be required based on locally available evidence.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals that improve or enhance existing flood defence works benefitting land or properties in proximity to the River Itchen and its</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>effectiveness of existing flood defence works, including restriction of essential access to watercourses or flood defence structures for maintenance purposes. No development should be undertaken within a minimum of 8.0 metres of any point either along the banks of the River Itchen or the toe of any flood defence structure.</p> <p>Information accompanying the proposals should demonstrate how any mitigation measures will be satisfactorily integrated into the design and layout of the development.</p> <p>Dependent on the scale and nature of any development proposal, appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be incorporated into new developments following the SuDS hierarchy. This should maximise any opportunities to enhance biodiversity, create amenity and contribute towards green infrastructure. Infiltration SuDS and above ground SuDS attenuation, such as swales, ponds and other water based ecological systems, should be used wherever feasible. Where it can be demonstrated that these are not practicable, development proposals are encouraged to maximise opportunities to use SuDS measures which require no additional land take, such as green roofs. Surface water drainage schemes should have regard to Warwickshire's Surface Water</p>			<p><u>associated watercourses will be supported. No proposal should have an adverse impact on the effectiveness of existing flood defence works, including restriction of essential access to watercourses or flood defence structures for maintenance purposes. No development should be undertaken within a minimum of 8.0 metres of any point either along the banks of the River Itchen or the toe of any flood defence structure.</u></p> <p><u>Information accompanying the proposals should demonstrate how any mitigation measures will be satisfactorily integrated into the design and layout of the development.</u></p> <p><u>Dependent on the scale and nature of any development proposal, appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be incorporated into new developments following the SuDS hierarchy. This should maximise any opportunities to enhance biodiversity, create amenity and contribute towards</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Management Plan (SWMP).</p> <p>All development proposals are encouraged to control discharge runoff generated on site to the Greenfield runoff rate for all periods up to the 1 in 100 years plus climate change critical storm event using above ground sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p>The reuse and recycling of water within developments is encouraged including the use of water butts.'</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for the renumbered Policy NE5 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to paragraph 1: 'In the light of historical issues, the Parish Council encourages positive discussions between all parties and, where appropriate, the undertaking of hydrology surveys at an early stage.' • Amend paragraph 3 by replacing "help to achieve the standard set out in this Policy by minimising run-off" with 'help to minimise run-off'. • In paragraph 5 replace "should be provided with" with 'are encouraged to install'. <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for the renumbered Policy NE5 by replacing paragraph 2 with: 'Paragraph 159 of the National Planning</p>			<p><u>green infrastructure. Infiltration SuDS and above ground SuDS attenuation, such as swales, ponds and other water based ecological systems, should be used wherever feasible. Where it can be demonstrated that these are not practicable, development proposals are encouraged to maximise opportunities to use SuDS measures which require no additional land take, such as green roofs. Surface water drainage schemes should have regard to Warwickshire's Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP).</u></p> <p><u>All development proposals are encouraged to control discharge runoff generated on site to the Greenfield runoff rate for all periods up to the 1 in 100 years plus climate change critical storm event using above ground sustainable drainage systems.</u></p> <p><u>The reuse and recycling of water within developments is encouraged including the use of water butts."</u></p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Policy Framework 2021 states that "Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future)". Paragraph 160 states that in determining the suitability of proposals, authorities should "... should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities."</p>			<p>the renumbered Policy NE5 as follows:</p> <p>Amend paragraph 1: "Flooding has occurred in the Neighbourhood Area, particularly in the centre of Long Itchington village, on numerous occasions over many years. Although works have been carried out in recent years to alleviate the risk it remains a significant issue of concern to local people most likely to be affected. "help to achieve the standard set out in this Policy by minimising run-off" with 'help to minimise run-off'. <u>In the light of historical issues, the Parish Council encourages positive discussions between all parties and, where appropriate, the undertaking of hydrology surveys at an early stage.</u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 3: "Proposals that incorporate driveways and hard-standing areas constructed of permeable surface will help to achieve the standard set out in this Policy by minimising minimise run-off"</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5 as follows:</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p>All new dwellings should be provided with are encouraged to install a minimum of 250 litre rainwater collection facility to help minimise discharge of water to the drainage system and help water conservation and management in order to help achieve the aims of this policy.</p> <p>Revise the "Evidence" sub-section for the renumbered Policy NE5 by replacing paragraph 2 with:</p> <p><u>"Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 states that "Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future)". Paragraph 160 states that in determining the suitability of proposals, authorities should "... should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<u>relevant flood risk management authorities."</u>
Recommendation 29, Page 29	Policy NE5		
Delete the heading "Policy NE5 – Environmental Pollution" and the related text.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	Delete Policy NE5, Explanation, Evidence and related text.
Recommendation 30, Page 29	Policy NE6		
<p>Reword Policy NE6 as follows: 'Dependent on their scale and nature, development proposals are encouraged to contribute to environmental sustainability through the inclusion of on-site renewable or low carbon producing technologies with the aim of maximising as far as practicable their contribution to the development's energy demands.</p> <p>Proposals for renewable energy generation schemes will be supported providing that: a) they have no adverse impact on the Valued Landscapes and Views identified in Policy NE1; b) the design, scale and form of the proposal meets all other relevant policies set out in the Development Plan. New dwellings must be constructed to a high</p>		<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3	<p>Reword Policy NE6 as follows: Proposals for new development should contribute to environmental sustainability through the inclusion of on-site renewable or low carbon producing technologies with the aim of maximising as far as practicable their contribution to the development's energy demands. Proposals for renewable energy generation schemes will be supported providing that: a) they have no adverse impact on the Valued Landscapes and Views identified in Policy NE1; b) the design, scale and form of the proposal meets all other relevant policies set out in this Plan. Any new</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>standard of energy efficiency and thermal insulation in accordance with Building Regulations and have regard to Stratford on Avon's Development Requirements SPD 2020, Part V Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation.'</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for Policy NE6 by deleting "to prove" from paragraph 2.</p>			<p>dwelling must be constructed to a high standard of energy efficiency and thermal insulation in accordance with Building Regulations and have regard to Stratford on Avon's Development Requirements SPD 2020, Part V Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation</p> <p><u>Dependent on their scale and nature, development proposals are encouraged to contribute to environmental sustainability through the inclusion of on-site renewable or low carbon producing technologies with the aim of maximising as far as practicable their contribution to the development's energy demands.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals for renewable energy generation schemes will be supported providing that:</u></p> <p><u>a) they have no adverse impact on the Valued Landscapes and Views identified in Policy NE1;</u></p> <p><u>b) the design, scale and form of the proposal meets all other relevant policies set out in the Development Plan.</u></p> <p><u>New dwellings must be constructed to a high standard of energy</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p><u>efficiency and thermal insulation in accordance with Building Regulations and have regard to Stratford on Avon's Development Requirements SPD 2020, Part V Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation.</u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 2 of the Explanation as follows:</p> <p>"Proposals will only be supported where there is evidence to prove that there is no unsustainable, adverse impact on the rural setting and character of the Neighbourhood Area and its settlements."</p>
Recommendation 31, Page 30	Policy C1		
<p>Under the heading "Policy C1 – Protection of Existing Community Facilities":</p> <p>31.1 Reword Policy C1 as follows:</p> <p>'To be supported, proposals that affect an existing community facility must:</p> <p>a) Evidence that the altered facility will better meet the needs of the community; or</p> <p>b) Provide a replacement in an equivalent location and form.</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Reword Policy C1 as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals that result in the complete or partial loss of a community facility will only be supported if;</p> <p>a) Evidence is provided to prove that the facility is either not used or needed by the community; or</p> <p>b) The facility is to be replaced at the expense of the party promoting the</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Development proposals should not result in the complete or partial loss of a community facility.'</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for the renumbered Policy C1 by adding 'non-commercial' between "supports a" and "service"</p>			<p>development in a location and form acceptable to the community and in compliance with all relevant policies contained in this Plan.</p> <p><u>To be supported, proposals that affect an existing community facility must:</u></p> <p><u>a) Evidence that the altered facility will better meet the needs of the community; or</u></p> <p><u>b) Provide a replacement in an equivalent location and form.</u></p> <p><u>Development proposals should not result in the complete or partial loss of a community facility"</u></p> <p>Revise Explanation as follows:</p> <p>"For the purpose of this policy: 'Community facilities' is defined as any land, building or structure that supports a non-commercial service or activity used, or capable of use by local people"</p>
<p>Recommendation 32, Page 30</p>	<p>Policy C2</p>		

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>Under the heading "Policy C2 Support for New Community Facilities" reword Policy C2 as follows: 'In principle, development proposals that support the retention of community hubs and community assets or facilitate the expansion of their use are supported.'</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Reword Policy C2 as follows:</p> <p>"Any proposal to develop land, buildings or structures that results in facilities for better or more effective community service, activity or engagement will be supported subject to it:</p> <p>a) Meeting identified needs or aspirations of local people; and</p> <p>b) Complying with all relevant policies contained in this Plan relating to location, scale, form and design.</p> <p><u>In principle, development proposals that support the retention of community hubs and community assets or facilitate the expansion of their use are supported."</u></p>
<p>Recommendation 33, Page 31</p>	<p>Policy SLR1</p>		
<p>Under the heading "Policy SLR1 – Sports Grounds and Children's Play Areas":</p> <p>'In principle, proposals for the development of new sports grounds and children's play areas or improvements to existing facilities will be supported.</p> <p>To be supported, proposals that affect an existing facility must:</p> <p>a) Establish that the proposed development meets an identified need of local people, for instance for</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Reword Policy SLR1 as follows:</p> <p>"Any proposal for development of new sports grounds and children's play areas or improvements to existing facilities will be supported subject to all relevant policies contained in this Plan relating to location, scale, form and design being met. Any proposal for development that adversely affects existing sports grounds</p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
<p>housing, social or community facilities; and b) Include for the replacement of the existing facility in an equivalent location and to a standard at least equivalent to the one affected.</p> <p>Development proposals should not result in the complete or partial loss of a sports ground or children's play area.'</p>			<p>or children's play areas will not be supported unless: a) The proposed development meets an identified need of local people for housing, social or community facilities; and b) The proposal includes the replacement of the facility in a location and to a standard at least equivalent to the one affected and acceptable to the community.</p> <p><u>"In principle, proposals for the development of new sports grounds and children's play areas or improvements to existing facilities will be supported.</u></p> <p><u>To be supported, proposals that affect an existing facility must:</u> <u>a) Establish that the proposed development meets an identified need of local people, for instance for housing, social or community facilities; and</u> <u>b) Include for the replacement of the existing facility in an equivalent location and to a standard at least equivalent to the one affected.</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<u>Development proposals should not result in the complete or partial loss of a sports ground or children's play area."</u>
Recommendation 34, Pages 31	Policy SLR2		
<p>Reword Policy SLR2 as follows: 'In principle, development proposals that create new public rights of way, provide a link between existing ones or improve access to the network for people with special needs will be supported.</p> <p>To be supported, development proposals should assess and address, with mitigation where appropriate, their potential to impact on access to, or enjoyment of the network of public footpaths, bridleways, the 'SUSTRANS' disused railway route and the canal towpath.'</p> <p>Revise the "Explanation" sub-section for Policy SLR2 by deleting paragraph 6 (and amending subsequent paragraph numbers accordingly).</p>		<p><i>Modification Agreed</i></p> <p>For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3</p>	<p>Reword Policy SLR2 as follows:</p> <p>"Any proposal that creates new public rights of way, provides a link between existing ones or improves access to the network for people with special needs will be supported subject to it meeting all relevant policies in this Plan relating to location, scale, form and design. Any proposal that has an adverse impact on access to, or enjoyment of the network of public footpaths, bridleways, the 'SUSTRANS' disused railway route and canal towpath throughout the Neighbourhood Area or will not be supported.</p> <p><u>In principle, development proposals that create new public rights of way, provide a link between existing ones or improve access to the network for people with special needs will be supported.</u></p>

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
			<p><u>To be supported, development proposals should assess and address, with mitigation where appropriate, their potential to impact on access to, or enjoyment of the network of public footpaths, bridleways, the 'Sustrans' disused railway route and the canal towpath'</u></p> <p>Delete paragraph 6 from Explanation:</p> <p>Opportunities will be sought from section 106 Agreements arising from development sites throughout the Neighbourhood Area, where appropriate, to support improvements to the public rights of way network or access to it.</p>
Recommendation 35, Page 32	Policy SLR3		
Delete the heading "Policy SLR3 – Allotment Gardens" and the related text.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> To meet Basic Condition 1	Delete Policy SLR3, Explanation, Evidence and related text.
Recommendation 36, Page 32	Glossary		
Under the heading "Glossary" amend the reference to the NPPF to refer to the 2021 version. Ensure that the listing is complete eg SuDS.		<i>Modification Agreed</i> For clarity and	Under the heading "Glossary" amend the reference to the NPPF to refer to the 2021 version. Ensure that the listing is

Examiner's Recommendation (incl. page number in the report)	Section/page no. in submission draft NDP	SDC Decision and reason	New text or amendment to original text, as applicable – as shown in Referendum version NDP
		accuracy	complete eg SuDS.

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 new employment sites/opportunities within the BUAB and the expansion or redevelopment of existing businesses.</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 promotes the retention and improvement of local community facilities.</p> <p>The Plan supports the creation and enhancement of community facilities for local people.</p> <p>The Plan supports the provision of new sports and leisure facilities and the improvement and retention of existing facilities.</p> <p>The Plan looks to safeguard and promote improvements of locally important sites.</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, biodiversity, valued landscapes as well as designate areas of Local Green Space and Incidental 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 Long Itchington 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/long-itchington-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