



## **DECISION STATEMENT**

### **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM**

#### **1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan**

- 1.1 I confirm that the Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan (LMNDP), 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.
- 1.2 I also declare that I have no personal or prejudicial interest in respect of this decision.

Signed

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

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 Marston Parish Council is the "Qualifying Body" for their area.
- 2.2 In November 2016, Long Marston Parish Council requested that, in accordance with section 5(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ("The Regulations"), the Parish of Long Marston 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 4 week period between 15<sup>th</sup> December and 13<sup>th</sup> January 2017. 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 Marston Neighbourhood Area by way of approval of The Cabinet on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2017.
- 2.5 In accordance with Regulation 7 of The Regulations, the decision to designate the Long Marston 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 30<sup>th</sup> May and 11<sup>th</sup> July 2022 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 April 2023 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 11<sup>th</sup> May and 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2023 in accordance with Regulation 16 of The Regulations.
- 2.9 Louise Brooke-Smith was appointed by the District Council to independently examine the Plan in May 2023 and the Examination took place in August 2023 with the final Examiner's report being issued on 31st October 2023.
- 2.10 The Examiner concluded she was satisfied that the Long Marston 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 her 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.

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
<b>Page 15</b>			
Accept that the use of two names is noted briefly within the opening section, but it would be helpful if reference is included in Section 3 which explains that both names are commonly used and interchanged.	Draft NDP Page 9	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  The proposed modification is required for clarity and accuracy.	Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b>  <b>Both the historic Marston Sicca and more modern Long Marston are commonly used and are interchangeable.</b>
<b>Page 16</b>			
Both Appendix A and B should be included in the Table of Contents. The title 'Table of Contents' should be placed at the top of page 3.	Draft NDP Page 3	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  The proposed modification is required for clarity and accuracy	Amendments made to the contents on page 3
<b>POLICY L&amp;E 2 LOCAL GAP</b>			
5.3.6 The policy would be appropriate and compliant as follows; The Long Marston Local Gap is defined in Figure 17. This local gap has an open and undeveloped nature which contributes to the rural character and setting of the village. This should be maintained in order to preserve its function as an important "green finger" which creates a physical break in the built form of the village and provides a transition to the countryside beyond the houses off Wyre Lane.	Draft NDP Page 24	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  <i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i>	Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b>  <del>The Long Marston Local Gap is defined in Figure 17. This local gap has an "open and undeveloped nature...[which] contributes to the rural character and setting of the village" and should be maintained in order to preserve its function as an important "green finger" which "creates a physical break in the built form of the village and provides a transition to the countryside beyond the houses off Wyre Lane. (See APP/J3720/W/18/3215586)</del>  <b>The Long Marston Local Gap is defined in Figure 17. This local gap has an open and undeveloped nature which contributes to the rural character and setting of the village. This should be maintained in order to preserve its function as an important "green finger" which creates a physical break in the built form of the village and provides a transition to the countryside beyond the houses off Wyre Lane.</b>

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
I do not consider it necessary to repeat the reference to the salient appeal decision or use a quote from the Inspector's findings.	Draft NDP page 25	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>	<p>The much-used public footpath SD40 is a pedestrian access from the centre of the village to the end of Wyre Lane, leading to the Greenway and countryside beyond. The land to either side of footpath forms an important green wedge and wildlife corridor, separating the buildings of the centre of the village and the end of Wyre Lane. A planning application to develop this paddock (18/02563/OUT) was dismissed at appeal APP/J3720/W/18/3215586 in 2019. The planning inspector's comments included: <b>It creates a physical break in the built form of the village and provides a transition to the countryside beyond the houses off Wyre Lane, particularly for users of the PROW passing through the site.</b></p> <p><del>"The village of Long Marston is a small rural settlement. It is essentially linear in form, with buildings fronting Main Street against a backdrop of the countryside to the east and west. The open and undeveloped nature of the appeal site contributes to the rural character and setting of the village. Although not designated in the development plan as such, the belt of open land of which the site forms a part, functions as a green finger to the rear of the houses in Main Street. It creates a physical break in the built form of the village and provides a transition to the countryside beyond the houses off Wyre Lane, particularly for users of the PROW passing through the site. The Landscape Sensitivity Study for Local Service Villages (2012) (the LSS) prepared as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy, assesses the degree to which landscape within or on the edge of settlements is sensitive to change resulting from development. Notably it identifies the appeal site as being inappropriate for any new development due to its integration with the adjacent dwellings and the presence of the footpath which crosses it."</del></p> <p><del>Another application for development of the paddock (14/02985/FUL) on the north side of Wyre Lane was also refused permission and dismissed at appeal (APP/J3720/W/16/3153788). The planning inspector's comments included: "The open and undeveloped nature of the appeal site also contributes to the bucolic character and setting of the lane and this part of the village generally. The lane also serves a number of residential properties of various types, largely located to the east and north east of the appeal site. The properties are set in fairly sizeable plots and there is a much looser, lower density pattern of development compared to that along the main road running through the village. The appeal site itself provides an area of separation between these two areas of the village. The erection of 5 dwellings on the site would erode this gap such that there would be no obvious distinction between the two areas of the village and their presence would diminish the existing transition between the more built-up area of Long Marston and the open countryside. The proposal would significantly change the character of this part of Wyre Lane ... would detract</del></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
			<del>from the rural character of Wyre Lane and be out of keeping with the surrounding open and loose knit pattern of development... the appeal proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of this rural lane."</del>
I consider that in para 5.2.3 of the NP BUAB needs to be set out in full, as Built-Up Area Boundary, to remove any potential confusion.	Draft NDP Page 24	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  The proposed modification is required for clarity and accuracy	Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b>  The <b>Built up Area Boundary</b> BUAB map (see figure 18) clearly shows the separation between the residential areas of the main part of the village and the Goodwins/Wyre Lane areas, affording a rural aspect to houses in both areas
I consider that the 'local gap' boundary should, for reasons of consistency, follow the alignment of the BUAB	Draft NDP Page 26	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  The proposed modification is required for consistency	Figure 17 amended to align the 'local gap' boundary with the BUAB
<b>POLICY L&amp;E 3 VALUED LANDSCAPES, VISTAS AND SKYLINES</b>			
I consider that the 2 paragraphs could be combined as follows;  Development proposals impacting on all valued landscapes, as shown in Figure 19, as well as important vistas and skylines, particularly where they relate to heritage assets, rising land, village approaches and settlement boundaries must demonstrate how they are appropriate to, and integrate with, the character of the landscape setting whilst conserving, and where appropriate, enhancing the character of the landscape.	Draft NDP Page 28	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  <i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i>	Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b>  <del>Development proposals impacting on landscape setting must demonstrate how they are appropriate to, and integrate with, the character of the landscape setting whilst conserving, and where appropriate, enhancing the character of the landscape.</del> <del>Development proposals should ensure that they respect all valued landscapes, as shown in Figure 19, as well as important vistas and skylines, particularly where they relate to heritage assets, rising land, village approaches and settlement boundaries.</del> <b>Development proposals impacting on all valued landscapes, as shown in Figure 19, as well as important vistas and skylines, particularly where they relate to heritage assets, rising land, village approaches and settlement boundaries must demonstrate how they are appropriate to, and integrate with, the character of the landscape setting whilst conserving, and where appropriate, enhancing the character of the landscape.</b>
<b>POLICY L&amp;E 4 MAINTAINING FOOTPATHS AND ACCESS TO THE COUNTRYSIDE</b>			

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>However, a couple are ambiguous and could cause confusion: Criteria (d) would be ultra vires unless a developer had a legal right or obligation to maintain or otherwise improve a public right of way. In many cases a development site would simply abut a PRoW. I note this matter has been raised by the LPA and the QB has proposed modified text as follows;</p> <p>(d) Ensure that its boundaries next to or adjacent to footpaths are comprised predominantly of natural planting</p> <p>Similarly the QB has accepted representations that have questioned the second sentence and have accepted that it should be omitted. Again, I concur.</p>	<p>Draft NDP Page 32</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p>Wherever possible or appropriate, proposals for new development should:</p> <p>a) Enhance or divert a public right of way (PRoW) to create equal or improved access, particularly for those leading to the countryside. Where the proposed development would cause harm to an existing PRoW, the PRoW should be diverted.</p> <p>b) Provide or improve connections and accessibility for all users to the existing network of footpaths and cycle-ways unless it can be demonstrated that this is not possible.</p> <p>c) Enhance the visual impact on existing routes through screening, landscaping and planting.</p> <p>d) <del>Ensure footpaths next to or adjacent to its boundaries are comprised predominantly of natural planting. Provision should be made to ensure these are maintained.</del> <b>Ensure that its boundaries next to or adjacent to footpaths are comprised predominantly of natural planting.</b></p> <p>e) Encourage walking and cycling opportunities. Those that do not encourage walking and cycling opportunities will not be supported</p>
<b>POLICY L&amp;E 5 CLIMATE EMERGENCY</b>			
<p>Most of the criteria are clear and indeed have been appropriately amended since the publication of the draft version of the NP. However, I note that in response to the Reg 16 submissions, the QB has proposed to amend (e) to read as follows; Renewable energy development will be supported, provided that it does not adversely affect the residential amenity, tranquility and rural character of the village and the neighbourhood area, such as unacceptable visual impact, excessive noise or traffic.</p> <p>I concur with this proposed text.</p> <p>Bullet (f) appears incongruous as it refers to design matters and would be better positioned within Policy DEV2 Ensuring Appropriate High-Quality Design. I consider it should be removed from Policy L&amp;E5. I note that the QB has already accepted its omission.</p>	<p>Draft NDP Page 36</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p>a) New development proposals are encouraged to take into account the Government's net zero target of 2050.</p> <p>b) Development should, where possible and appropriate, incorporate the recycling of grey water and captured rainwater, and integration with SuDS systems. New homes will be expected to demonstrate efficient use of water.</p> <p>c) Sustainable construction of well designed, energy efficient homes and buildings will be supported.</p> <p>d) The impacts of climate change should be considered and developers will be encouraged to include measures to help cope with and reduce the impact of flooding.</p> <p>e) <del>Renewable energy development requiring planning permission will be supported, provided that it does not adversely affect or cause unacceptable harm to residential amenity or to the visual impact and tranquility of the rural character of the village and the neighbourhood area, such as excessive noise or traffic.</del> <b>Renewable energy development will be supported, provided</b></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><b>that it does not adversely affect the residential amenity, tranquility and rural character of the village and the neighbourhood area, such as unacceptable visual impact, excessive noise or traffic.</b></p> <p><del>f) Resource efficient design, including the use of local materials, energy efficient technologies and sustainable construction techniques, will be supported.</del></p> <p>f) New development will be required to meet the following standards for the provision of electric vehicle charging points unless they are superseded by national standards: All new dwellings, where parking is provided within the curtilage, shall be provided with at least one permanently wired electric car charging point per dwelling.</p>
<b>POLICY COM 1 PROTECTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND ASSETS</b>			
<p>This is the single policy now addressing the community objective of protecting local amenities and facilities. It comprises a series of criteria that reflect the findings of the community surveys and consultations.</p> <p>The reference to 'or this plan' under criterion (c) is not needed and can be omitted to simply refer to Figure 27.</p>	<p>Draft NDP Page 38</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p>c) Development that will result in the loss of community facilities or assets (see figure 27) <del>or this plan</del> will not be supported unless: i) It can be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer viable or likely to be in the foreseeable future AND ii) Following an active period of marketing of at least one year, an alternative operator or community use has not been found</p>
<b>POLICY INF 1 BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT</b>			
<p>It would remove ambiguity and potential confusion if the following matters were addressed.</p> <p>Criteria (b) should be amended to remove the minor typographic error and read as follows; 'The developer can demonstrate.....'</p> <p>Criteria (c) should only comprise the first sentence. The second sentence should comprise a new criterion and the subsequent elements would follow as sub - bullets as follows: (d) Proposals to diversify farm business will be supported when they meet the following criteria;</p>	<p>Draft NDP Page 41</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic condition 1</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p>Proposals for commercial development within the Neighbourhood Area will be supported provided they meet the following criteria:</p> <p>a) The proposed development is of a scale and form and in keeping with the size and character of the village and its setting;</p> <p>b) <del>That</del> <b>The</b> developer can demonstrate that the scale of development is clearly related to the employment needs of the local economy.</p> <p>c) Development proposals should demonstrate that they have been appropriately assessed in order to minimise traffic generation and highway impact. <del>Proposals to diversify farm businesses will be supported when they meet the following criteria:</del></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>- Diversification and extension of rural business based on existing farm sites will be supported only where there would be no harm to the character or biodiversity of the countryside or to aspects of local heritage.</p> <p>- Where such diversification or extension of business require additional building, this must be appropriate in scale to the rural location and if necessary be screened by landform or planting.</p> <p>It is unclear whether little bullets 'b' and 'c' relate to the diversification and extension of rural business on existing farm sites or refers to new development out-with existing farm sites. On the assumption of the former, they could continue to form third and fourth bullets relating to farm diversification. If they don't relate to farm diversification, then it should be set out as new main criteria (e) and (f).</p>			<p>d) <b>Proposals to diversify farm businesses will be supported when they meet the following criteria:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Diversification and extension of rural business based on existing farm sites will be supported only where there would be no harm to the character or biodiversity of the countryside or to aspects of local heritage.</li> <li>2. Where such diversification or extension of business requires additional building, this must be appropriate in scale to the rural location and, if necessary, be screened by landform or planting.</li> <li>3. Proposals for new built development must demonstrate that existing buildings cannot be used.</li> <li>4. Open storage of goods, containers and equipment associated with the business is kept to a minimum and is appropriately located and screened to reduce any impact on the landscape or the setting of the area.</li> </ol>
<b>POLICY INF 2 FOUL WATER DRAINAGE</b>			
<p>Criteria (e) is repeated at (h) and in any event the issues raised are already covered in (g). I consider that the policy should therefore comprise criteria (a) to (d) as presented and then followed by (f) and (g) and with these criteria reordered as (e) and (f).</p>	<p>Draft NDP Page 42</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic condition 1.</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p>All new development must demonstrate adequate means of foul drainage and evidence submitted to demonstrate sufficient capacity exists within the system to drain and process sewage during and subsequent to episodes of heavy rainfall.</p> <p>Proposals to erect new dwellings should include measures to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Store discharges of foul water from the development and prevent its discharge into the public foul water sewer unless capacity is available to accept it without contributing to existing overload "down-stream".</li> <li>b) Prevent pressurised foul water from back feeding from the public sewer into the property or its curtilage.</li> <li>c) Suitable techniques for "domestic grey water recycling" should be adopted where it will reduce the volume of "buffer" storage required above.</li> <li>d) Developers shall ensure that foul and surface water from new development and redevelopment are kept separate. Where sites which are currently connected to combined sewers are redeveloped, the opportunity to disconnect surface water and highway drainage from combined sewers shall be taken.</li> <li>e) <del>Proposals for new development will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems.</del></li> <li>f) <b>e)</b> New developments are encouraged to include water reuse, grey water recycling and rainwater capture measures, including the use of water butts.</li> </ol>



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><del>g) f) Where applicable, proposals for new development should demonstrate that flood risk and sustainable drainage systems have been taken into consideration.</del></p> <p><del>h) Proposals for new development will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems.</del></p>
<b>POLICY INF 3 FLOODING – PLUVIAL FLOODING POLICY</b>			
<p>Criteria (e) however is a general approach and will not be applicable in all circumstances. Hence, I agree with the representations made by the LPA and welcomed by the QB that 'Where appropriate,' should be inserted at the beginning of the sentence.</p> <p>Criteria (h) repeats much of criteria (b) and (c). I consider this to be superfluous, and potentially confusing for any reader, adding little to the overall policy. Hence, I consider it could be modified to simply refer to its last sentence as follows;</p> <p>(h) Connecting to a combined sewer system is not suitable and not favourable.</p> <p>Criteria (g) again repeats much of (b) (c) and (h) and can be omitted.</p>	<p>Draft NDP Page 43</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic condition 1</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p>a) Proposals will only be supported if they satisfactorily address the risk of pluvial flooding, do not increase the risk of flooding, and where existing flood risks are identified, are supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment.</p> <p>b) Appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be incorporated into all new developments and designed to control run-off generated on-site to the greenfield run-off rate (Qbar) for all return periods up to and including the 1 in 100 years plus climate change critical storm event criteria.</p> <p>c) Infiltration SuDS and above ground SuDS attenuation, such as swales, ponds and other water-based ecological systems, should be used wherever feasible. They should be designed to be multifunctional and consider the four pillars of SuDS which are water quality, water quantity, amenity and biodiversity.</p> <p>d) SuDS features must be located outside areas of identified flood risk</p> <p>e) <b>Where Appropriate</b> Existing culverts on a development site should be opened up to provide more open space/green infrastructure for greater amenity and biodiversity. Proposals including new culverts should minimize the length of such.</p> <p>f) Where mitigation measures involve cut off ditches, balancing ponds and or similar, proposals should demonstrate the responsibility for and means by which these shall be maintained to ensure their satisfactory performance in perpetuity.</p> <p><del>g) Where applicable, proposals for new development should demonstrate that flood risk and sustainable drainage systems have been taken into consideration.</del></p> <p><del>g)h) Appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) where necessary should be incorporated into all new developments following the SuDS hierarchy. This should maximise any opportunities to enhance biodiversity, create amenity and contribute towards green infrastructure. Connecting to a combined sewer system is not suitable and not favourable.</del></p> <p><b>h)→</b> All new development proposals must ensure that a minimum easement of 8 metres from the top of the bank of the Noleham Brook and other smaller Ordinary Watercourses is provided to allow access for maintenance and to ensure that the natural features and functions of the wider river corridor are retained or reinstated.</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
The accompanying text presents a clear context for the two policies. For clarity it would be helpful if the reference in paragraph 7.3.5 to a 'recent Met Office report' was supported by a date and report name.	Draft NDP Page 44	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  <i>The proposed modification is required for clarity .</i>	Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b>  <del>7.3.5. A recent Met Office report says "... Emerging evidence that, over the UK, daily heavy rain events may be more frequent. What in the 1960s and 1970s might have been a 1 in every 125 days event is now more likely to be a 1 in every 85 days event? This supports other evidence that UK rainfall is increasing in intensity". This would exacerbate the existing problem.</del>  <b>7.3.5.A recent Met Office climate projection (UKCP 18: August 2022) says "... rainfall associated with an event that occurs typically once every 2 years increases by 29%" This would exacerbate the existing problem.</b>
Figure 28 (Surface Water Flood Risk in Long Marston) would be assisted if it was dated and reproduced to indicate the NP area boundary.	Draft NDP Page 45	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  <i>The proposed modification is required for clarity and accuracy.</i>	Map amended as requested to show date produced and the Neighbourhood Plan area boundary.
<b>POLICY HA 1 HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSETS</b>			
Fig 31 illustrating the Long Marston Historic Environment Assessment Archaeological Sensitivity Map includes a large black line enclosing the village and referenced as 'buffer'. It is unclear what this means and hence clarification should be given	Draft NDP Page 50	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  <i>The proposed modification is required for clarity and accuracy.</i>	Reference to 'buffer' removed from the map key.
<b>POLICY DEV 1 MAINTAINING THE RURAL CHARACTER</b>			
I note that the QB have proposed an improved wording for criteria (f) as follows; 'Where signage is fixed to a premises, it should be of a design and scale that is in keeping with the village's rural character.'	Draft NDP Page 54	<i>Modification Agreed.</i>  <i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i>	Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b>  <del>f) Where signage is fixed to a premises, be of a design and scale that reflects and respects the village's local character. Fixed signage that causes unacceptable harm to the local character, heritage assets or its setting will not be supported</del>  <b>Where signage is fixed to a premises, it should be of a design and scale that is in keeping with the village's rural character.</b>
<b>POLICY DEV 2 ENSURING APPROPRIATE HIGH-QUALITY DEVELOPMENT</b>			

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>However, I consider that a reader or decision maker could be confused by the juxtaposition of criteria (b) and (c) which appear to contradict themselves. I note that the QB has accepted this and has suggested that (c) is removed. I concur.</p> <p>I consider that element (f) of Policy L&amp;E5 should be relocated and added to Policy DEV2. 'Resource efficient design, including the use of local materials, energy efficient technologies and sustainable construction techniques, will be supported.'</p>	Draft NDP Page 56	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p>New development should be of high-quality design that respects the character and the distinctiveness of the village. In particular, proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) incorporate appropriate landscaping;</li> <li>b) use building styles and materials that are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the surrounding environment;</li> <li><del>e) include a mixture of architectural styles;</del></li> <li><del>d)c) be well integrated with the existing built form.</del></li> <li><del>e)d) incorporate security by design measures to reduce crime and the fear of crime;</del></li> <li><del>f)e) protect neighbour amenity;</del></li> <li><del>g)f) respect the historical significance and setting of listed buildings to which they are attached or adjacent to and not dominate in scale;</del></li> <li><del>h)g) use low to medium height hedges to create well defined boundaries around houses and avoid the use of walls and close-boarded fences.</del></li> <li><b>h) Resource efficient design, including the use of local materials, energy efficient technologies and sustainable construction techniques, will be supported.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>POLICY DEV 3 PRESERVING THE SEPARATE IDENTIFY OF LONG MARSTON</b></p>			
<p>There is no reference to the implementation of an Article 4 direction which would remove permitted development rights and hence for the avoidance of any confusion on the part of a reader of the NP, reference should be made in the second sentence of the second paragraph to the use of permitted development rights, under current statute.</p> <p>The following is proposed: 'Further to Policy DEV4 and in addition to the use of extant permitted development rights allowing the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings, support for new housing in the countryside will also be given for dwellings for rural workers, replacement of dwellings and individual dwellings of exceptional design.....</p>	Draft NDP Page 57	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p>The built-up area of Long Marston is defined by the development boundary (see Figure 18).</p> <p>All areas outside the Built-up Area Boundary are classed as countryside. <b>Further to Policy DEV4 and in addition to the use of extant permitted development rights allowing the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings, support for new housing in the countryside will also be given for dwellings for rural workers, replacement of dwellings and individual dwellings of exceptional design.</b> Support for new housing in the countryside will be limited to dwellings for rural workers, replacement dwellings and individual dwellings of exceptional design (NPPF paragraph 79 and part E and J of policy AS.10 of the Core Strategy).</p> <p>Development proposals beyond the Built-up Area Boundary which reduce the gap between Long Marston and nearby developments at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield (Area coloured pink in Figure 34) will be resisted unless they comply with Policy Dev 2 and specifically allow for the preservation of the separate identity of Long Marston and surrounding settlements.</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
<b>POLICY DEV 4 HOUSING FOR LOCAL PEOPLE</b>			
<p>The bullet points within the policy are reasonably clear. However, I note a degree of repetition and hence the risk of confusion. Also, it would help the reader if the order of bullets was more logical. I suggest the following;</p> <p>(a) Developments should provide a suitable mix of size and type of homes to ensure the housing needs of people with a local connection to the parish.</p> <p>(b) Housing Schemes shall prioritise allocation to those with a local connection which is defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• being born in the parish or whose parents were ordinarily resident in the parish at the time of birth;</li> <li>• currently live in the parish and has done for at least the past 12 months,</li> <li>• used to live in the parish and did so for a continuous period of not less than 3 years;</li> <li>• currently works in the parish and has done so for at least the past 12 months for an average of not less than 16 hours per week;</li> <li>• or currently has a close family member (i.e., mother, father, brother, sister, son, daughter) living in the parish and who has done so for a continuous period of not less than 3 years.</li> </ul> <p>(c) Small-scale local needs schemes and local cost affordable home ownership schemes will be supported on sites beyond, but adjacent to, the Built-up-Area Boundary where the following is demonstrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a proven and unmet local need, having regard to the latest Housing Needs Survey; and</li> <li>• Appropriate arrangements will be put in place via a planning obligation to regulate its future occupancy to ensure the continued availability of the housing to meet the needs of local people.</li> </ul> <p>(d) For Discounted Market Sale homes, the Minimum discount will be 40% Local Needs</p>	<p>Draft NDP Page 59</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p><del>Developments should provide a suitable mix of size and type of homes to ensure the housing needs of people with a local connection to the parish. Small-scale Local Needs Schemes will be supported on sites beyond, but adjacent to, the Built-up Area Boundary where the following is demonstrated:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• There is a proven and unmet local need, having regard to the latest Housing Needs Survey; and</del></li> <li><del>• Appropriate arrangements will be put in place via a planning obligation to regulate its future occupancy to ensure the continued availability of the housing to meet the needs of local people.</del></li> <li><del>• Low-cost affordable Home Ownership, including products which for first time buyers, will be supported where there is an evidenced need. For Discounted Market Sale homes, the Minimum discount will be 40% Local Needs Housing Schemes shall prioritise allocation to those with a local connection which is defined as follows:</del></li> <li><del>• being born in the parish or whose parents were ordinarily resident in the parish at the time of birth;</del></li> <li><del>• currently live in the parish and has done for at least the past 12 months, used to live in the parish and did so for a continuous period of not less than 3 years;</del></li> <li><del>• currently works in the parish and has done so for at least the past 12 months for an average of not less than 16 hours per week;</del></li> <li><del>• or currently has a close family member (i.e. mother, father, brother, sister, son, daughter) living in the parish and who has done so for a continuous period of not less than 3 years.</del></li> </ul> <p><b>1) Developments should provide a suitable mix of size and type of homes to ensure the housing needs of people with a local connection to the parish.</b></p> <p><b>2) Housing Schemes shall prioritise allocation to those with a local connection which is defined as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a) being born in the parish or whose parents were ordinarily resident in the parish at the time of birth;</b></li> <li><b>b) currently live in the parish and has done for at least the past 12 months,</b></li> <li><b>• c) used to live in the parish and did so for a continuous period of not less than 3 years;</b></li> <li><b>• d) currently works in the parish and has done so for at least the past 12 months for an average of not less than 16 hours per week;</b></li> <li><b>• e) or currently has a close family member (i.e., mother, father, brother, sister, son, daughter) living in the parish and who has done so for a continuous period of not less than 3 years.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>3) Small-scale local needs schemes and local cost affordable home</b></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><b>ownership schemes will be supported on sites beyond, but adjacent to, the Built-up-Area Boundary where the following is demonstrated:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●a) <b>There is a proven and unmet local need, having regard to the latest Housing Needs Survey; and</b></li> <li>●b) <b>Appropriate arrangements will be put in place via a planning obligation to regulate its future occupancy to ensure the continued availability of the housing to meet the needs of local people.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>4) For Discounted Market Sale homes, the Minimum discount will be 40% Local Needs</b></p>
<b>POLICY DEV 5 CAR PARKING</b>			
<p>I note that this matter has been acknowledged by the QB who have proposed to amend criteria (a) to read as follows; Provision for the parking of motor vehicles, including garages and car ports, in accordance with Stratford on Avon District Council's development requirements Part O, is available within the curtilage of the development.'</p>	<p>Draft NDP Page 61</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required to meet basic conditions 1 and 3.</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p><del>Provision for the parking of motor vehicles, including garages and carports, at a ratio of one space per bedroom, is available within the curtilage of the development</del></p> <p><b>a) Provision for the parking of motor vehicles, including garages and car ports, in accordance with Stratford on Avon District Council's development requirements Part O, is available within the curtilage of the development</b></p>
<b>POLICY DEV 6 FUTURE HOUSING</b>			
<p>Paragraph 9.6.2 of the submission NP should amend the second word 'Stratford' to Strategy.</p>	<p>Draft NDP Page 63</p>	<p><i>Modification Agreed.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed modification is required for accuracy.</i></p>	<p>Amended/ removed – line strike through. Added – in <b>BOLD</b></p> <p>The village of Long Marston is identified as a Category 4 Local Service Village in the Stratford on Avon Core <del>Stratford</del> <b>Strategy</b> and so the following housing requirement applies:</p>

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

<b>Sustainable Development Role (NPPF)</b>	<b>Neighbourhood Development Plan's Contribution</b>
Economic	If implemented these policies will have a positive impact on the local economy, sustaining and supporting the local economy and improving the communications infrastructure to support home working.
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 and 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.</p> <p>The NDP includes policies to protect the natural environment which have a positive impact on the environmental sustainability of the plan and positively address Climate Change.</p>

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

- Subject to the modifications above, the Long Marston 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:

[Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan | Stratford-on-Avon District Council](#)

And can be viewed in paper form at:

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