

## Marston Sicca Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Submission Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation (Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, 2012)

#### Appendix 1 - Comments from Stratford-on-Avon District Council

Page number/ Policy/ Topic	Representation	New Comment since Regulation 14 Consultation?
Policy L&E 2	The boundaries of the local gap match those of the BUAB except for one small patch immediately north of the public footpath. The reason for this is not clear.	Yes
Policy L&E 4	Criterion a) – surprised that diverting a PROW has been put on the same level as enhancing. I would have assumed enhancing would be the first choice, with diverting a last resort.	Yes
Policy L&E 4	Criterion d) – As currently worded, this criterion appears to apply to areas outside of the development boundary, and thus outside of the control of the developer.	Yes
Policy L&E 4	Criterion e) – Will all types of new development reasonably be able to encourage walking and cycling? The second sentence of this criterion feels overly restrictive.	Yes
Policy L&E 5	Criterion e) – the wording is convoluted	Yes
Policy L&E5	Criterion f) – this criterion does not relate specifically to the climate emergency – it should be moved to a design policy.	No
COM 1	Criterion C – the words “or this plan” do not relate to the rest of the sentence	
COM 1	Criterion C – There is a full stop missing at the end of the sentence.	Yes
INF 1	Criterion a – Is this appropriate in all locations in the neighbourhood area? For example if Meon Vale businesses wanted to expand to the north?	
INF 1	Sub criteria under part c – suggest these are numbered rather than labelled a-c, to avoid confusion	
INF 3	Criterion b) remove ‘appropriate’ as all SUDs will have to met government guidance anyway.	Yes
INF 3	Criterion e) – This won’t be possible or appropriate in all situations. Add “Where appropriate” at the beginning of the first sentence.	
INF 3	Criterion h) – appears to duplicate the contents of criteria b) and c)	
DEV 1	Criterion f) reads a bit wordy.	Yes

Page number/ Policy/ Topic	Representation	New Comment since Regulation 14 Consultation?
DEV 2	Criteria b and c – Criterion c) is presumably intended as a moderator to criterion b), but has the appearance of directly contracting it. C is also not appropriate in all cases – for example as currently worded, a single dwelling development would be required to use more than one architectural style.	
DEV 3	This policy should cross reference DEV 4.	
DEV 4	Add lettering / numbering for criteria	
DEV 4	<p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point concerning ‘Low-cost Affordable Home Ownership’ appears unclear in terms of its role since the stock and tenure profile of any scheme should, by definition, be responding to whatever the current identified local need is. I do, however, support the requirement for a minimum discount of 40% for any Discounted Market Sale and First Homes.</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point – delete extraneous word “which” (“...including products which for first time buyers...”)</p>	
DEV 5	Criterion a) – This requirement is significantly in excess of what is required in SDC’s Development Requirements SPD Part O, for larger dwellings. If, for example, a 5-bed house were required to provide 5 parking spaces, there would be a significant negative impact on biodiversity, surface water flooding, visual attractiveness, and achieving appropriate densities. It is manifestly excessive and contrary to the NDP’s stated climate aims.	
DEV 5	Criterion d) Duplicates Policy L&E 5 criterion g	
DEV 6	<p>This site is identified as a potential site for approximately 10 self-build/custom-build dwellings in the Site Allocations Plan Preferred Options (June 2022).</p> <p>This policy safeguards land on the east of Long Marston Road as a Reserve Housing site. Notwithstanding the latest Preferred Options version of the SAP which now identifies the site as a self-build/custom-build site, as the land is for ‘up to 8 dwellings’ this will not attract an on-site affordable housing contribution.</p>	No

Page number/ Policy/ Topic	Representation	New Comment since Regulation 14 Consultation?
	I welcome this proactive approach. However, in the absence of any obvious viable sites for a Local Need scheme or any advice from the Rural Housing Enabler to the contrary, I do think it might be useful for the policy to allow for the <i>earlier</i> release of the site for a Local Need scheme as a possible means of incentivising delivery.	
Figure 36	The block boundary makes it hard to see the outline. See if a red outline boundary would work better.	Yes