

Appendix 8

Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation (Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, 2012

Comments from Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC) with responses from Hampton Lucy Parish Council (the 'HLPC')

Policy related comments:

Section	Reference/ page	Comment	
Paragraph 1.3	Page 4	Given the time it has taken to progress the Plan, there are concerns that the Residents Survey (2016) is already out of date. By the time the Plan is 'made', the evidence will be 6+ years old. As such, the Parish Council should be aware that this evidence base will likely need revising in the next couple of years.	<p>Noted – we have explained in the Plan that it will be reviewed in two years which should synchronise with reserved housing sites having been confirmed following the Revised SAP Preferred Options 2022 Version, ('the Revised 2022 SAP'). It can then also be revised to refer to progress made on the South Warwickshire Local Plan.</p> <p>HLPC continued to consult with parishioners in 2019 on the 2020 SAP and the Revised 2022 SAP as detailed in its Consultation Statement.</p>
Paragraph 1.5	Page 4	Work has commenced on the South Warwickshire Local Plan which will replace the strategic policies of the Core Strategy once adopted. Reference to the South Warwickshire Local Plan should therefore be included here.	Reference to this has been added.
Figure 2 – Heritage Assets	Page 10	The map should be at a scale appropriate for the reader to understand exactly what they are looking at, at the detail required. The detail on this map	New clearer maps have now been inserted.

Section	Reference/ page	Comment	
		<p>could be split into different maps indicating individual types of asset and their immediate surroundings.</p> <p>The relationship of the village and Charlecote Park (and the joint Conservation Area) is appreciated and should be recognised on a map also indicating the Parish boundary line. However, the map doesn't need to show Alveston Conservation Area and its associated listed buildings, or Scheduled Monuments in other Parishes for example. A separate map showing the locations of individual listed buildings would also be appropriate.</p>	The map showing the wider area and adjoining parishes (other than Charlecote Parish) has now been removed.
Strategic Objectives	Page 11	Built Environment – this SO is rather wordy and somewhat difficult to understand. It states that new development should preserve and enhance the settings of neighbouring parishes. However, the Plan can only be applied to the designated Neighbourhood Area, not neighbouring parishes.	Amended to take incorporate SDC's comments.
Policy BE1	Page 12	<p>Suggest re-wording the first paragraph as follows: "Proposals that would cause unacceptable harm to the special architectural or historic significance of designated heritage assets and their settings, or fail to preserve the character and appearance of the heritage assets will not be supported, unless it can be demonstrated that the public benefits would outweigh the harm."</p> <p>This is to reflect the wording of Historic England guidance on assessing harm to heritage assets and to recognise that some harm can be acceptable, subject to suitable and appropriate mitigation. Suggest removing the fourth paragraph as it is not clear and precise (i.e. it doesn't state how development should be controlled) and is unnecessary since in effect it repeats the first paragraph of the policy.</p>	Re-worded as suggested.
Policy BE2	Page 14	This policy is a mixture of criterion (d) and (k) of Core Strategy policy AS.10, covering residential and business uses, respectively. It is noted that the Plan	Amended to incorporate SDC's comments.

Section	Reference/ page	Comment	
		<p>policy does not require the buildings in question to be listed, or be of historic, architectural or other merit to be suitable for conversion. It is also noted that the policy does not require the building to have been in existence for at least 10 years.</p> <p>These two criteria are set out in CS policy AS.10. Therefore, the policy does not comply with policy AS.10 as currently drafted. The policy does not support such conversions for agricultural workers. This is contrary to criterion (i) of the CS and criterion (a) of paragraph 80 of the NPPF (which the explanatory text to the Plan policy quotes as a relevant policy).</p> <p>It is considered criterion (d) after the first paragraph 'working from home accommodation' is unnecessary – this is, in effect, a permanent dwelling with a study or room for the occupant to work from home, ancillary to the principal use of the property.</p> <p>Suggest amending criterion (d) toward the end of the policy to read: "It will not cause unacceptable harm to the visual and landscape amenity of the area, particularly to valued landscapes and heritage assets".</p>	<p>Amended to incorporate SDC's comments.</p> <p>Amended to incorporate SDC's comments</p>
Policy BE3	Page 15	<p>Suggest changing policy title to read "Lighting and Dark Skies" as the policy does not look to protect skylines.</p> <p>It should be noted that street lighting is generally controlled by the Local Highways Authority. Domestic amenity lighting is normally permitted development.</p>	<p>Changed as suggested.</p> <p>Noted</p>
Policy BE4	Page 16	<p>Propose re-wording policy as follows: "Development proposals resulting in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Agricultural Land Classification Grades 1, 2 and 3a) will only be supported where it is demonstrated that the impact of the loss of the land will not adversely affect the viability of the relevant land holding, and it is demonstrated poorer quality land is not available."</p>	<p>Amended to incorporate SDC's comments.</p>

Section	Reference/ page	Comment	
		It is suggested the second paragraph of the policy is removed – this is not a planning policy matter. This would result in associated paragraphs being removed from the Explanatory text to the policy.	Removed as suggested.
Policy H1	Page 18	<p>Consider amending the policy title to: “Location of new housing development” since it is more than just the boundary of the village. If term ‘village boundary’ is to remain in the Plan, suggest adding appropriate text to the first paragraph of associated Explanatory text to ensure the reader knows the SAP terminology is ‘built-up area boundary’ for clarity.</p> <p>Last paragraph of the Explanatory text – the first sentence is very long and somewhat confusing to understand. Additionally, the SAP Preferred Options 2022 is still due to run to 2031 in conjunction with the Core Strategy, not 2050.</p> <p>Suggest enlarging Figure 5 to ensure the Village Boundary is easily readable.</p>	<p>Amended to incorporate SDC’s comments.</p> <p>Amended to incorporate SDC’s comments.</p> <p>We hope this plan is now clearer.</p>
Policy H2	Page 20	<p>Suggest amending first paragraph of policy to read: “Small-scale community-led housing schemes on sites beyond, but adjacent to ...”.</p> <p>In criterion (a), suggest that ‘and information’ should be deleted.</p>	<p>Amended accordingly.</p> <p>Deleted accordingly.</p>
Policy H3	Page 23	Suggest amending the first paragraph to read: “Development proposals within the Neighbourhood Area that adhere to the following design principles will be supported:”. Suggest deleting the final paragraph referencing the NPPF, as it would appear to be superfluous.	<p>Amended accordingly.</p> <p>Amended accordingly.</p>

Section	Reference/ page	Comment	
		Explanatory text – the District Design Guide is over 20 years old, a more relevant document is the Stratford-on-Avon Development Requirements SPD (adopted in stages from 2018). This is also relevant to paragraph 1.5, page 4.	
Housing	General	<p>The Government has introduced criteria for ‘First Homes’, a specific kind of discounted market sale housing that is also classed as affordable housing: First Homes - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans need to reflect these new requirements, therefore you are advised to incorporate the First Homes requirement within a policy in a Plan</p>	Details now added in.
Figure 6	Page 26	<p>LGS designations – In order to be appropriate for designating as LGS, the parcels of land in question need to comply with the tests set out in paragraph 102 of the NPPF. The LGS assessments should ideally be included as an Appendix to the Plan.</p> <p>It is considered that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that sites 3, 4, 6 and 7 would be classed as ‘demonstrably special’ and it is therefore questioned if they would meet the NPPF tests.</p> <p>It is noted that site 9 forms part of a wider parcel of land that has been assessed as a potential reserve housing site through the District Council’s</p>	<p>We have now added the LGS Assessments into a new Appendix 2.</p> <p>HLPC does consider these areas to be important as LGSs for the reasons set out in the LGS Site Assessments. They are, in the main, small areas of land and HLPC consider they need deserve protection.</p> <p>HLPC agrees – the landowners’ agent has confirmed in a site plan of their current proposal</p>

Section	Reference/ page	Comment	
		<p>emerging Site Allocations Plan (Preferred Options version June 2022). However, the land forming the LGS designation is located to the south of the land earmarked in the SAP as suitable for housing development. Therefore, there appears to be no reason to reject to LGS site 9 on the basis of contradicting a policy in the emerging Plan document.</p>	<p>that their development does include LGS 9 as an open green space so we will not delete this LGS.</p>
Policy NE2	Page 27	<p>Given the thrust of the policy, explanatory text and photos, it is suggested the policy should be re-titled “Valued Views”. The policy as written is conflating a number of issues (i.e. skylines, views and landscape setting/character).</p> <p>Therefore, suggest re-wording the policy as follows: “Development proposals should demonstrate how they integrate appropriately with their setting while conserving or enhancing its character. The Plan identifies the following valued views in the neighbourhood area – [list all views]. New development proposals should take account of the identified valued views and should be designed to respect their significance in the wider neighbourhood area. Proposed developments that would have an unacceptable impact on the character or integrity of a valued view will not be supported. Important views and skylines visible from the village should be safeguarded as should views towards the village (see Figure 7 and photos pages 29–31), particularly when they relate to heritage assets, village approaches and settlement boundaries.”</p> <p>It is noted that three of the views (Nos. 2, 4 and 7) are from outside the Parish boundary. These will need to be removed from the Plan along with the associated photos and remaining views as shown on Figure 7 will need to be re-numbered.</p>	<p>Amended. We haven’t listed the Valued Views but referred to them being within the new Figure 9.</p> <p>Re-worded accordingly.</p> <p>The view from the Snitterfield Memorial (2) has been removed. We consider the others are justified. We believe views 4 and 7 should remain in as a Valued View – part of the Charlecote Mill is within the Parish and the Parish continues along Charlecote over this bridge from this road.</p>

Section	Reference/ page	Comment	
		Justification should be provided on p.29-31 as to why the Valued Landscapes have been chosen as suitable for designation. What makes them particularly special to the Neighbourhood Area?	Justification to these views being Valued Views has been added to the descriptions by the photographs.
Policy NE3	Page 32	<p>Suggest the following amendments: Amend first paragraph to read “Development proposals that would cause unacceptable harm to, and would not provide...” to make more precise. Additionally, delete final part of paragraph from “including listed habitats that are...” since it is superfluous.</p> <p>Second paragraph: delete “and/or are adjacent to existing” since these locations will be outside the application site and not in the control of the applicant – therefore, such requirements could not be enforced. Third paragraph: second sentence – replace “preserve” with “retain, where practical to do so” and then delete last part of final sentence from “as, over the years...” since it is superfluous.</p>	<p>Amended accordingly.</p> <p>Deleted and amended accordingly.</p>
Figure 8	Page 34	This Figure refers to Nature Reserves (of which there don't appear to be any) but does not refer to Ancient Woodland (of which there is one). Is this map required/appropriate/necessary given there is no specific policy in the Plan relating to woodland, Nature Reserves or Local Wildlife Sites?	The Figure has been re-labelled to remove reference to correct this.
Policy NE4	Page 35	<p>Suggest amending criterion to read “It is...”, “It does not..” or “It does...” as appropriate in order to follow on from the first paragraph.</p> <p>Criterion (a) delete “unless falling within para’s...of the NPPF”. Criterion (b) delete “demonstrably”.</p>	<p>Amended accordingly.</p> <p>All amended accordingly.</p>

Section	Reference/ page	Comment	
		Delete criterion (d) as it is not necessary to ask for a development to meet the requirements of the NPPF, since any application will be assessed against, and will need to comply with, the NPPF in order to be acceptable. Criterion (e) delete “Under paragraph 162 of the NPPF” and replace “an” with “every” before the word “effort”.	
Policy NE5	Page 37	It is not believed that management of the river is within the scope of a neighbourhood development plan.	HLPC has amended the Policy to refer to the land adjacent to the riverbank to protect such as the Charlecote Mill or the biodiversity and wildlife at the river edge.
Policy LCHW1	Page 39	Suggest adding “in the Neighbourhood Area” at the end of the first paragraph.	Added
Policy LCHW2	Page 40	<p>Suggest amending policy title to read “Community Facilities”.</p> <p>Suggest amending first paragraph to read: “Development proposals that will lead to the loss or partial loss of existing community facilities will not be supported, unless...[to end]” as there is no need to list the facilities within the policy – listing these in the explanatory text is sufficient.</p> <p>The second paragraph should be removed from the policy and added to the explanatory text.</p> <p>Amend third paragraph to read: “Development proposals that would enhance and/or improve existing community facilities will be supported.”</p> <p>Add new fourth paragraph as follows: “Proposals for new leisure and community facilities will be supported provided that they are compatible with existing neighbouring uses.”</p>	<p>Amended accordingly.</p> <p>Amended accordingly.</p> <p>Removed and added accordingly.</p> <p>Amended accordingly.</p> <p>Added</p>

Section	Reference/ page	Comment	
Policy LCHW3	Page 41	Amend first paragraph to read: "Where appropriate, development proposals should demonstrate how walking and cycling opportunities have been incorporated, and where possible, how these connect to existing routes". Amend third paragraph to read: "Proposals which either adversely affect existing walking and cycling routes will not be supported."	Amended accordingly.
Page 42	Page 42	There are two maps on the page, but only one labelled as 'Figure 12' showing the National Cycle Way. The other map appears to show public footpaths and rights of way. Should this be labelled as Fig.12 and the other map be re-labelled a Fig.13?	Re-labelled accordingly.
Policy LCHW4	Page 43	Suggest amending first paragraph to read: "Proposals resulting in new employment opportunities within the Neighbourhood Area will be supported, provided they do not have:" Amend criterion (a) to read: "An unacceptable detrimental impact on residential amenity, the rural landscape or Heritage Assets"; Remove "Have" from criterion (d).	Amended accordingly.
Policy IN1	Page 44	Suggest replacing "residual cumulative impacts on the" with "capacity of the local" as it is considered the current wording is not precise.	Amended accordingly.
Policy IN2	Page 45	The policy as drafted is unnecessarily complicated and includes elements of design. Suggest replacing criteria (a) and (b) of the policy with "New development proposals should provide off-road car parking in accordance with the standards in the District Council's adopted Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document." Move criterion (c) to Policy H3. Retain criteria (d) and (e) but as stand-alone paragraphs 2 and 3 of the policy.	Replaced accordingly.