

**Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Regulation 16 Representations: By Contributor**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
Developers and Consultees Comments			
1	National Highways		No comments
2	Coal Authority		No comments
	Environmental Health		No comments
3	Historic England	General	Historic England is supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it. We are very pleased to note that the Plan evidence base is well informed by reference to the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record and includes historic landscape sensitivity analysis.
4	Jonathan Thompson Land & Consultancy Limited	Dev3	<p>Paragraph 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that: “To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.”</p> <p>The Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy currently classifies Long Marston as Category 4 Service Village which is capable of supporting housing. This categorisation is based upon an assessment of the presence and comparative quality of three key services - general store, primary school, and public transport - together with the existing size of the settlement. However, we contend that it is no longer appropriate to rely solely upon surveys of the physical infrastructure, such as access to transport, albeit that bus stops for the no.27 bus service are within easy walking distance of the site and the village is served by a Post Office and Village Shop.</p>

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
			<p>It is instead appropriate to also consider the social, economic, and environmental benefits for sustainable development of the burgeoning trends in rolling out carbon efficient technologies into rural areas and trends in work and behavioural patterns. With an emphasis on quality of life, beauty, and the environment and with increased home/remote working and an expectation for more hybrid working patterns into the future, there is a notable increased shift in demand towards more rural living.</p> <p>Technological advances including electric cars, e-bikes and scooters, the emergence of commercial car sharing businesses, and faster broadband speeds all mean that rural living can be a sustainable development option. Clearly many, both in urban and rural areas, now rely on the Internet for accessing a broad spectrum of social, community, entertainment, and other services, as well as for work. This trend has grown significantly during the Covid-19 pandemic but looks set to continue now people are familiar with the opportunities and tangible benefits. According to Ofcom, Long Marston village currently benefits from access to Superfast Broadband.</p> <p>Policy DEV 3: 'Preserving the Separate Identity of Long Marston' states, inter alia, that:  "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 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." (Author's emphasis).</p> <p>Policy DEV 2: 'Ensuring Appropriate High-Quality Development', as referred to in Policy DEV3 (above) sets out design-based criteria against which new development proposals will be assessed. It is the case that Kendrick Homes Limited (our client) is a high-quality regional housing developer with a proven track record of delivering quality new homes. They are committed to the delivery of sustainable development and in doing so take their commitments towards environmental and biodiversity enhancements seriously.</p> <p>The supporting text to Policy DEV 3, at Paragraph 8.3.3 (page 58), clearly states that, with reference to Policy DEV 3: "This policy does not prohibit the boundaries of the built-up area of Long Marston changing providing growth in the built-up area does not lead to a merging with other settlements".</p>

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
			<p>As a matter of fact, the residential development of the site of Land North of Barley Fields would not result in any merging with other settlements, and most certainly no merging with development at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is noteworthy in that in deciding upon the Planning Appeal made by Bloor Homes Western which related to the exact same site at Land North of Barley Fields, Long Marston (LPA Ref: 16/02206/FUL/PINs Ref: APP/J3720/W/17/3175407) whilst dismissing the Appeal on other grounds the Planning Inspector did observe that with reference to the physical confines of the settlement of Long Marston that in his view: “... the proposal (and thereby the site) would be seen as part of the wider (previously) permitted residential scheme and I agree with the appellants that the proposal would achieve a logical rounding off the built-up area. In addition, the Council raise no objection regarding the visual effect of the proposal on the surrounding area. On this basis I am satisfied that the proposal would be within the physical confines of the settlement.”</p> <p>In light of the above, our client contends that there is a strong case for the inclusion of the Land North of Barley Fields, which has previously been considered suitable for Housing development (by way of a Reserve Housing Site) by the District Council, within the BUAB for Long Marston, which in turn would secure the principle of its residential development in line with adopted Core Strategy policies AS.10 and CS.16.</p>
	Jonathan Thompson Land & Consultancy Limited	Dev 6	<p>Our client respectfully submits that this site should be allocated as a preferred “reserve housing site within the Marston Sicca NHP.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6.10 (page 64) refers specifically to our client’s site, Land North of Barley Fields, and indicates that whilst it had been considered it was not favoured for reasons which are not fully explained or justified. Whilst the paragraph does refer to the previous planning application and appeal, it fails to acknowledge or recognise the previously stated comments of the Appeal Inspector who, observed that: “... the proposal (and thereby the site) would be seen as part of the wider (previously) permitted residential scheme and I agree with the appellants that the proposal would achieve a logical rounding off the built-up area. In addition, the Council raise no objection regarding the visual effect of the proposal on the surrounding area. On this basis I am</p>

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
			<p>satisfied that the proposal would be within the physical confines of the settlement.” (Author’s emphasis).</p> <p>The comments of the Inspector (above) clearly challenge and address the 2nd and 3rd bullet points listed by the Parish Council under paragraph 8.6.10. The 1st bullet point acknowledges that matters of access could be satisfactorily addressed. Therefore, it is unclear and certainly not sufficiently justified as to why the Land North of Barley Fields has been dismissed as a suitable Housing (or Reserve Housing) site within the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Our client advises that the site is available for development and could be delivered, subject to obtaining planning permission, well within 5 years. In this respect, the site is both ‘deliverable’ being “... available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years” and ‘developable’ being “... in a suitable location for housing development with reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged” (as per the NPPF, Glossary).</p> <p>The site offers a suitable location for development now and has a realistic prospect that housing could be delivered on the site relatively quickly, in line with Paragraph 69 of the NPPF. In summary, our client’s site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is within the confines of the Long Marston village;</li> <li>• has clear physical defensible boundaries which will clearly define the suggested revised BUAB;</li> <li>• is in a sustainable location;</li> <li>• the residential development of the site is financially viable;</li> <li>• all relevant site conditions have been assessed and topographical and ground contamination surveys are being undertaken by our client. An assessment of the site access from Barley Fields, has been undertaken and concludes that there are no impediments to its use and the development of the site utilising this access would be in line with Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the NPPF.</li> </ul>

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is in the ownership and control of a landowner keen to bring it forward for development at the earliest opportunity. In this regard, there are no impediments to the deliverability of new homes on the site.</li> </ul> <p>For all the above reasons, our client contends that there exists a strong argument for the redefining of the BUAB for Long Marston to fully include the site currently referred to as Land North of Barley Fields, Long Marston, and its allocation as a reserve site for housing.</p>
5	Stansgate planning	Dev 6	<p>There is currently a District-wide need to provide sites for self-build and/ or custom-build dwellings, reflected in the register provided on the District Council’s website. As national research has shown, the great majority of people are unaware of the legislative duty placed upon Councils to keep such registers and the register is therefore likely to be a considerable under-estimate of the number of people wishing to buy a serviced plot of land for a self or custom build house within the District. The District Council has acknowledged that it currently has a significant under-supply of serviced plots to meet its legal duty in provision through the publication (and regular updates) of its “Assessment of Demand and Supply”, with the most recent publication being in January 2023. In recent decisions made by the District Council’s Planning Committee on self/custom-build schemes, the District Council has recognised the conclusions of a Planning Appeal Inspector determining a scheme in Welford-on-Avon (appeal reference APP/J3720/W/22/3297821, decision date 30 January 2023). In that appeal decision, the Inspector concluded that the District Council’s Core Strategy policies for housing development could not carry full weight because they do not include any direct reference to self-build or custom house build development (and there are no other Core Strategy policies which Q41 Please make any comment you have in relation to Policy Dev 6 below. Refer to this type of development). The Inspector then attached significant weight to the accepted shortfall in provision of serviced plots. Finding that all other site-specific planning matters were acceptable (other than the location of the development which was adjacent to, but outside the settlement boundary of Welford-on-Avon), the appeal was allowed. With a large and continually growing demand for serviced plots for self and custom build housing within the District, including within Long Marston and the surrounding local area, it would be sensible to allocate a sustainable site close to the settlement</p>

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
			<p>boundary, which has already been considered suitable for inclusion in the NDP as a reserve housing site. The allocation of the site for this purpose would show a proactive approach to meet local development needs, in line with the findings of the appeal Inspector in the Welford-on-Avon appeal and with the recent decisions made by the District Council in respect of sites in Halford and in Wellesbourne. All three of these sites are allocations within the SDC SAP, as is this site in Long Marston. As the progress of the SAP has slowed through the election period (and the documentt can currently be given only limited weight), it would be beneficial to the local community of Long Marston to allocate this site for self and custom house building to provide greater certainty and control over development proposals, rather than decisions being made through the appeals process. As well as being a suitable reserved housing site, this site should be allocated in the NDP as a site suitable for self-build/ custom house building, in accordance with the SDC Site Allocations Plan Regulation 18 Revised Preferred Options Consultation June 2022.</p>
	Stansgate planning	Dev 3	Support for the proposal.
	Stansgate planning	Valued landscapes.	<p>Land to the south of The Brickall should not be classed as a valued landscape (no.2 in the proposed NP).</p> <p>In the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2012 (technical evidence to support the preparation of the Core Strategy adopted in 2016), this land falls within land parcel LM01, which is categorised as having medium sensitivity to housing development, the lowest sensitivity land found anywhere in the District in this landscape study. In contrast, land further to the north and south-west was found to be of high/medium sensitivity. Whilst there are comments made in respect of the southern part of this large land parcel providing rural separation between the settlement and the Bird Industrial Park, along with views to the church across the fields, there is no commentary about any specific sensitivity in the remainder of the land parcel, including this land</p>

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
6	Pegasus Group on behalf of L&Q Estates	Policy 07	Support all questions
7	Cotswolds National Landscape Board	L&E 3	The Board is disappointed that the LMNP continues to lack an explicit mention of the National Landscape within its policies, especially when views towards this nationally-designated protected landscape are specifically identified as 'valued' within the plan itself. The National Planning Policy Framework outlines the great weight to given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs and that AONBs have the 'highest status of protection' in relation to these issues whilst Policy CS.11 of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy states that "Development proposals in the District involving land either within, or outside but affecting, the Cotswolds AONB should conserve and enhance the special landscape qualities and scenic beauty of the AONB and be consistent with the objectives set out in the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan". Whilst the Steering Group's comments regarding the development between the village and the National Landscape are noted, we consider that the LMNP should explicitly aim to protect against further incremental adverse impacts upon the setting of the National Landscape from potential future development within the Neighbourhood Area. Therefore, we recommend to both the Parish Council and Stratford-on-Avon District Council that LMNP Policy L&E3 and its supporting text are amended to incorporate mention of views to and from the National Landscape.
8	Stratford branch of the Ramblers Association	L&E 4 Support	It is pleasing that the policy addresses the need for easy and enjoyable access to the countryside. This should include the following. 5.4.8: "Paths with high close board fences can hide views and if on both sides of a path can result in a claustrophobic tunnel effect which makes the user feel cut off from the surrounding landscape. Solid fencing and walls can prevent birds, small mammals and invertebrates from moving freely between gardens. In the Questionnaire 59% said they would like to see wildlife habitats developed" This should be a recommendation that these high close board fences should be avoided.

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
Residents Comments			
9	Resident	L&E 1 Support	It is important that we preserve the rural environment and minimise our intrusion on the natural world so that local wildlife can flourish
		L&E 2 Support	The public footpath running through this small stretch of green space is used by many as a safe way to access the greenway from the centre of the village. There is no footpath along Wyre Lane. The green space enhances the setting of the adjacent listed building, Hopkins and provides a beautiful rural oasis between the build areas of the village
		L&E 4 Support	many people who live in Long Marston like to walk the footpaths. It is important to maintain /enhance their rural setting
		L&E 5 Support	All new development should employ the highest standards of sustainability. This is becoming more urgent
		Com 1 Support	Community recreation facilities are an important way of keeping people in good health. Open spaces give a sense of wellbeing and habitat for wildlife. This is what rural environments are for.
		Inf 1 Support	I support local business opportunities. With local employment the dependency on the car will be reduced.
		Inf 2 Support	Support: Long Marston lies in a valley bounded by Rumer hill and Meon Hill. The soil is clay, making surface water drainage difficult. There have been a number of floods in the past due to the inability of surface water to drain away
		Inf 4 Support	High speed broadband is now an essential tool for the modern business
		HA 1 Support	Long Marston has a wealth of historic buildings in beautiful rural settings. We must preserve them for future generations
		Dev 1 Support	Most people who have come to live in Long Marston have done so because it is a small rural village with easy open access to the countryside. new development should not have an urbanising effect on the character of the village



Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
		Dev 2 Support	The informal setting of the current dwellings should be respected when design new builds
		Dev 3 Support	There has been and will be a massive amount of development around the village at Meon Vale and the airfield. In order to preserve the rural nature of Long Marston, coalescence between the village and these new developments must be avoided. urbanisation of the area could destroy the peaceful setting of the village. We have already noticed a huge increase in road traffic.
		Dev 4 Support	Developers are keen to sell large houses for the maximum profit. The real need is for smaller houses more suited to young families
		Dev 5 Support	Too many new developments make too little provision for parking, resulting in clogged residential roads. This is even more important now that electric vehicles are being encouraged. Home charging is far too difficult without off street parking.
		Dev 6 Support	Long Marston has already had more than 200% of the development anticipated by the SDC core strategy. In the event that reserve sites have to be released this plot is the most suitable. It is a run-down dwelling on a large plot. Building a small-scale development here would avoid concentrating all new development at the north end of the village.
10	Resident	L&E 1 Support	In an area of clay, poor drainage and loss of ridge and furrow fields then item f) is of utmost importance
		L&E 4 Support	We need to ensure local PRoW are protected both for the wildlife that enhances them and for the public that use them. In a rural area this allows for the public to walk or cycle instead of using transport, therefore reducing carbon emissions.
		Inf 4 Support	Essential for any rural community to have access to high-speed broadband especially with the advent of increased 'home working'
		HA 1 Support	Various ridge and furrow fields around the village have already been lost, surely we should make every effort to protect these fields.

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
		Dev 4 Support	Affordable Housing for local people is essential not only for community cohesion but to allow village families to reside close to each other and therefor support each other.
		Dev 6 Support	Long Marston has already seen development of over 70 dwellings, in a small rural community with very limited public services this in my view is considerable over development. Very few of these dwellings have been affordable or shared ownership properties. Any further development must address these issues.
11	Resident	Inf 4 Support	With the advent of more working from home and greater reliance on the internet it is essential that rural villages have access to high-speed broadband
12	Resident	L&E 2 Support	The adjacent developments of Meon Vale and the Airfield Site make it vital that the village of Long Marston retains its character with a belt of countryside around it, and long-term will remain a reference point for the new housing developments around it. In addition, the retention of wildlife corridors is important for the local flora, bird species & fauna.
		L&E 3 Support	Previous comments apply here too.
		L&E 4 Support	Fitness and well-being are better served by attention to easy access to safe, rural walking, cycling etc, and Long Marston already has a good network of paths and bridleways upon which to build.
		L&E 5 Support	These should be countrywide targets, and are difficult to argue against.
		Inf 4 Support	More employees are working from home than ever before, since the Covid-19 pandemic, so this is a logical requirement. It might also become incumbent on connectivity providers to upgrade existing provision, when new and adjacent developments are in process.
		HA 1 Support	Given the comments earlier concerning "Green Fingers" separating the village from adjacent housing developments, I would have thought that none of the ridge and furrow fields would have been in danger of being lost as heritage assets.
		Dev 1	Thoroughly agree.

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
		Support	
		Dev 2 Support	The "mixture of architectural styles" should be considered alongside b), d) and g).
		Dev 3 Support	See my previous comments.
		Dev 5 Support	Point a) would seriously test planning for more than two cars. Admittedly, living in a countryside village mostly necessitates at least one car per household, but maybe this could read "...at a ration of one space per bedroom with a maximum of three parking spaces".
		Dev 6 Support	Given condition a) in the previous section, I would challenge whether this site could support 10 dwellings. In this sensitive position adjacent to St James Church, more consideration for the house designs and spaces around the dwellings than has been given to the Brewery and Barley Fields developments would be essential, in my view.
13	Resident	L&E 1 Support	Fully support objectives.
		L&E 2 Support	Fully support this Policy. The local gap land has not been used or cultivated for very many years (approximately 20 years) and has fully returned to nature with mature trees and a whole range of natural flora and fauna. Muntjac deer are frequently seen on the land.
		L&E 3 Support	Fully support this Policy
		L&E 4 Support	Fully support this Policy
		L&E 5 Support	Fully support this Policy
		Com 1 Support	Fully support this Policy

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
		Dev 1 Support	Fully support this Policy
		Dev 3 Support	Fully support this Policy
		Dev 5 Support	Fully support this Policy
14	Resident	L&E 1 Object	People are in desperate need of homes, more now than ever. Long Marston is a strategically placed village with great transport links. This plan is isolating and is not upto date with current needs. Home building can be done sympathetically within the village, not large scale developments but small pockets where the wildlife havens will be enhanced, nature and people side by side.
		L&E 2 Object	This green space is someone's private garden. it is maintained by the owner and is surrounded by houses; this is not a green finger of open land. The green finger of land should be located behind the Brickall development on the opposite side of this land as this is the opening to the countryside. This land has been pushed into the neighbourhood plan as direct retaliation against the owner putting in planning permission and not for the benefit of the village.
		Dev 1 Object	Long Marston need to move with the times and stop isolating itself. We need community expansion
		Dev 3 Object	This plan clearly demonstrates that Long Marston is going against local and national need, building is required in all villages - no sink estates but well throughout inclusive developments in the heart of the village, not a ridge boundary that has been designed by NIMBYS of the village to preserve their selfish needs over that of others.
		Dev 4 Object	This is a discriminatory policy, why not welcome others from further afield, Long Marston needs to be diverse. The Parish Council have turned down affordable housing in the village - why? because they do not attract the right sort. Absolute snobbish out dated views.
15	Resident	L&E 2	The field and paddocks are privately owned and managed as my garden, it does not have any Ecological significance, and this is supported by ecological studies carried out over recent years.

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
		Object	We strongly object to point 5.2.7 stating “this green area is a natural wildlife habitat, unused for 20 years.” This is my private garden that is mowed and maintained annually, this is well documented, so the NP is misleading. There are houses around my land and this is not a "local Gap" - it does not lead to open countryside but gardens and houses. Members of the Neighbourhood plan Steering group/Parish Council live around my field and are using this exercise for their own gains - extremely bias and not representative of the village. NIMBYS! As clearly shown on the figure 17 map the suggested "local gap" is NOT a gateway to open countryside. The Local gap is behind the Brickall, with a public footpath crossing from Wyre Lane to the Greenway.
		Dev 6 Object	This is land is outside of the village Its on ridge and furrow land This land is adjacent to open countryside and is not infill. Development here will change the aesthetics of the village. It will extend the village out towards Meon Vale, closing the gap between Long Marston and Meon Vale. Built Up Area Boundary will be extended to the edge of the village. This development site is well out of the village away from other houses.
16	Resident	L&E 2 Object	My land is included in this, at no point has anyone discussed this "Local Gap" me the land owner. In the preliminary draft plan the "local gap" was referred to "valued green infrastructure" - why has this changed? seemingly with no consultation? Also the SD40 footpath which crosses my land was also misdescribed and incorrect - I note this has been amended but again no further consultation. The preliminary draft plan should of been corrected and re consulted on for us resident's, before this stage. My private land is not available for inclusion into the NP as “Valued Green Infrastructure or Local Gap”, the lack of engagement has resulted in incorrect assumption of my private property. We have various plans for our private land which are NOT in line with the NP view. In Long Marston, particularly in Wyre Lane the sewage pipes have collapsed and the properties in that area are at risk of having their properties flooded with sewage. This is well known to the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. To prevent these properties being flooded with excrement and being uninhabitable Severn Trent have approached myself with the possibility of using my field as part of a temporary residential access, whilst Wyre Lane is inaccessible due to these proposed works. My land has also been highlighted by Severn Trent as a compound for their

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
			<p>equipment. If the NP is pushed, these properties will be landlocked during for 3 -6 months, whilst work is being completed. Alternatively the work will not be done and 10+ properties will be engulfed in excrement making these properties potentially uninhabitable, uninsurable and unsellable, all for the NP steering groups inability to think of others before there selves. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering group have chosen to ignore this fact as they seem to have their own agenda for my property, which is very concerning. It has to be noted members of this steering group live around this "local gap", they are trying to preserve their own "view", raising my concerns that nepotism is at play. On figure 17 map it is quite plain to see this "local gap" is classic infill land and the "green finger" of land which opens up to countryside is in fact on the opposite side of Wyre Land in-between the Brickall development and the Greenway. I would like to know why my land is the only land photographed when referring to "Local Gap"?? I have had to endure horrific abuse of my private property, which has been fully documented. We were advised by the police not to put animals on the field until this criminal behaviour stopped as we had safety concerns over our animals, this abuse is continuing and being documented. I am concerned about the reference that no animals have been on my land, when I have specifically informed the NP group in writing last year the reasons for this, again they seem to be using this criminal behaviour against me. Landowners should be engaged with at the earliest opportunity to ensure the landowners vision for their land is represented in line with the development of the neighbourhood plan (NP), this has STILL not been done, in my case. I have sent a fully detailed objection together with evidence to support the above to the email provided.</p>
		Dev 1 Object	<p>Long Marston needs a fresh new approach, it is not a quaint Cotswolds village - we need adopt our own approach and identify. They fear "urbanisation" this village has a very busy main road running through but no street lighting as they fear urbanisation, putting safety at risk. If urbanisation comes at the cost of safety, so be it.</p>
		Dev 6 Object	<p>Outside of the BUAB Links LM with Meon Vale, something that the NP wanted to avoid. Ridge and furrow field Detrimental affect on St James Church Will be seen by greenway Open countryside Expanding the village There are more suitable sites within the village Visible from road side and not fitting with the NP In direct contradiction with Policy Development 3 -</p>

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy no.	Comment
			Preserving settlement boundary and Policy 1 maintaining rural character. This would be a development bolted on to Long Marston. Very odd place to support development
17	Resident	L&E 2	The proposed "Local Gap" only purpose seems to create a boarder between Long Marston and the properties in Wyre Lane, separating them from the rest of the village, I know this area is referred to as the hamlet by these residents as they do not want to be linked to the actual village. Now it seems that some on the steering group are creating this gap to maintain the distance from the rest of us, why? The description of this Local Gap is rather misleading and is not factual at all. It should be noted the Chairman of the steering group and member of the parish council, property backs on to this land and questions need to be raised to why this area has been chosen and not others that fit the Local Gap description more accurately.
		L&E 3 Object	There need to be more specific detail, so the guidance is clear and set out for all and cannot be misinterpreted to suit different agendas, making it fair for all.
		Inf 1 Object	There need to be more specific detail, so the guidance is clear and set out for all and cannot be misinterpreted to suit different agendas, making it fair for all.
		HA 1 Object	There need to be more specific detail, so the guidance is clear and set out for all and cannot be misinterpreted to suit different agendas, making it fair for all, preventing 1 rule for 1 and 1 rule for another.
		Dev 6 Object	Not in the village Existing house should be renovated to create a family home. 10 Homes here will stick out WAY outside the village Extend the village

**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**

<b>Page number/ Policy/ Topic</b>	<b>Representation</b>
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.
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.
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.
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.
Policy L&E 5	Criterion e) – the wording is convoluted
Policy L&E5	Criterion f) – this criterion does not relate specifically to the climate emergency – it should be moved to a design policy.
COM 1	<b>Criterion C – the words “or this plan” do not relate to the rest of the sentence</b>
COM 1	<b>Criterion C – There is a full stop missing at the end of the sentence.</b>
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.
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.
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



Page number/ Policy/ Topic	Representation
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	<p>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.</p>
DEV 5	<p>Criterion d) Duplicates Policy L&amp;E 5 criterion g</p>
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> <p>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.</p>
Figure 36	<p>The block boundary makes it hard to see the outline. See if a red outline boundary would work better.</p>