

**Pre-Submission Consultation:- Responses and Actions from Public and Statutory Consultees 7th
November– 31st December 2016
Part A (excluding submission by SDC)
(Updated with EJ input 18/05/17)**

Consultee	Issues Raised	Policy/Action Addressed
1.Sport England	<p>1 There should be positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities provision.</p> <p>2. The Neighbourhood Plan should reflect the recommendations set out in the LPA indoor/outdoor sports strategy and Community Infrastructure Levy is utilised to support the delivery of those recommendations.</p>	<p>“Open Space, Sport and Recreation Report” by Arup 2014 for SDC identified a deficit of play areas and open space in Shipston. Also “a good existing amount of sports provision with no need for more” and “a need for additional indoor sports facilities”.</p> <p>The NP includes a recommendation in a list of projects for upgrading or additional Sports Hall capacity when CIL money is available (P.28). Shipston NP also recognises that future planned growth will require further investment in sports facilities.</p>
2.WCC 22/09/16	Neighbourhood Planning for Health:- Thirty four recommendations for action to improve community health and reduce inequalities	The proposed NP is in accord with the aims and recommendations outlined in this document as is the Core Strategy CS25 Healthy Communities.
3. Andrew Finding 11/11/16 Land Adjacent To Bosley Close	<p>No consultation on designation of land as ‘Local Green Space’</p> <p>Owner refuses permission for such designation</p>	the LGS2 designation in terms of wildlife, historic significance and beauty is fully detailed in the Audit and Issues Report
4. Josephine Finding 10/11/16	As above	See above
5. George Houghton resident 09/11/16	Will there be extra car parking in the town Centre?	The draft Plan highlights the need for extra car parking in the Town centre. Specific details will be subject to proposals after the approval of the Plan.
6.Natural England email 11/11/16	No issues raised	N/A
7. Alan Bartlett 13/11/16 resident	Why doesn't Shipston have a supermarket and petrol filling station?	No contact details provided so unable to issue a direct response. An update on this matter was included in the letter from the Mayor. This isn't within the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. Because it's such a topical issue, specific reference was made to the approved planning application for a supermarket and petrol filling station on a Campden Road site in the Mayor's letter which

		accompanied the plan document. No further action deemed necessary.
8 Mike Smith, landowner Email 15/11/16	Land North of Pig brook, alongside the A 3400 is not to be designated a projected local nature reserve (PLNR). Land to the South of Pig Brook may be allocated as a PLNR.	The relevant area north of Pig Brook is to be excluded from the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Land to the south of Pig Brook is outside of the Plan area and hence not relevant.
9. Historic England	Commends emphasis on conservation, good design and protection of landscape. No issues raised	Noted
10. National Grid Email 22/11/16	No issues raised	Noted
11. Michael Langrish Email 21/11/16	LGS1. I fully support the addition of a permissive footpath connection over the river to the Shakespeare's Way public footpath. LGS2. I fully support the addition of a permissive footpath to complete a circular walk along the Western fringes of the town, from the upper part of the Hanson Track down to Shoulderway Lane. The existing farm track is presently used unofficially by walkers and it would add greatly to the walking opportunities on the edge of town if it were to become a permissive footpath. Without this permissive footpath a circular walk involves continuing along the Hanson track, then past Horseleys Farm, and back along Shoulderway Lane, about three times the shorter distance offered by the permissive path. Name: Michael Langrish	Noted Noted
12. John R. Smith Resident	Due to diminishing employment prospects new local industries are needed together with additional medical care and schools. Additional housing should only be provided once these are in place.	The overwhelming majority of new homes likely to be built within the Plan period already have planning permission and the Neighbourhood Plan therefore cannot influence the timing of when they are constructed.
13. John B. Smith Resident/Town Band	I found the project is being well documented and understand the reasons for the plan	Noted
14. M.J.G Smith Landowner	Fully supports One way System	Noted
15. Jane Cussons Resident	Supports One Way System. Supports provision for 'green belt' areas Concerned that Medical Centre should be built before new houses	Noted
16. Ray Tennant Commercial businessman 6 th December 2016 Via email	Shortage of small, affordable, light industrial units (500-1000 sq. ft) and no provision in the Plan except for Norgren site which Mr Tennant considers unsuitable as too close to housing. Rent in Tileman's lane site too expensive compared to other areas.	Policy EC5 encourages business friendly live/work developments

<p>17. F. Wardack/Linfoot Homes Via email 9/11/16</p> <p>F Wardack/Linfoot Homes</p>	<p>LAND AT RIDGEWAY, LONDON ROAD, SHIPSTON-ON-STOUR</p> <p>Linfoot Country Homes is the contracted purchaser of land at Ridgeway, London Road, Shipston, shown outlined red on the attached plan 1. We have entered into a conditional contract with Mr and Mrs Wardak (who are the freehold owners of the land outlined red, black and green on plan 1) whereby we will purchase the land outlined red in the event that we obtain satisfactory planning permission for residential development on this land for general market housing, to include a minimum of 18 dwellings of which no more than 35% are affordable/ low cost houses with the remainder being open market houses.</p> <p>It is the intention of Mr and Mrs Wardak that in the event that planning permission as outlined above is obtained for the land outlined red that their land outlined green on the plan is transferred to the Town Council for use as public open space. Our contract with the Wardaks allows us to require a transfer of the green land to the Town Council at the point that we purchase the red land having obtained the necessary satisfactory planning permission. The contract also contains provisions to ensure that the pedestrian right of access across neighbouring land to the Willington footbridge (along the route shown on the attached plan 2) is delivered. In the event that the local planning authority resolves to grant planning permission for a development as outlined above, the transfer of the green land to the Town Council would be controlled through a s.106 agreement. We would propose that the form of transfer is agreed with the Town Council in advance and submitted with the planning application. It would then be attached to the s.106 agreement.</p> <p>We confirm that we are willing to incorporate into the layout of the proposed development a right of access to allow pedestrians to get from the 'Orbit' land to the north-west to the public open space on the green land and also a link to allow residents on the red land to walk towards the town centre through the Orbit land without having to walk along the Shipston Road (assuming this is agreeable to Orbit).</p> <p>The policy proposals in the pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan in connection with the land at Ridgeway (in particular policy ENV1 (LGS1) and policy HSG4) are not deliverable as currently drafted. They would need to be amended as follows (as far as the Ridgeway land is concerned) to ensure deliverability:</p> <p>1. There should be no restriction on the timing of the</p>	<p>The following was the Neighbourhood Plan team's response to the representations received from Mr & Mrs Wardak and Linfoot Country Homes in November and December 2016:</p> <p>Paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Addendum to the Housing Audit & Issues Report clearly explain how the Core Strategy's new housing requirement for Shipston between 2011 and 2031 is 'a minimum of 500 homes' and that permission has already been given for 499 dwellings (excluding Extra Care accommodation). Since that document was written, permission has been granted for a further 6 homes.</p> <p>The clear desire of the local population, expressed consistently throughout the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, is to restrict further housing development, particularly at the edge of the town, in view of the considerable scale of growth experienced in recent years (and already committed in the near future), especially given the current deficiencies in physical and social infrastructure. The draft Plan therefore allows for more intensive development within the existing built-up area (Policy HSG6) and the re-use of previously developed land (Policy HSG7) to provide additional market housing, but seeks to limit new housing at the edge of the town to small scale schemes, and then only to meet a demonstrable local need for affordable homes, low cost market homes or housing specifically to meet the needs of older persons.</p> <p>Given the large number of affordable and Extra Care units already with planning permission but not yet built (132 and 130 respectively) and taking into account the District Council's estimates of the rate of development on each site, the draft Plan suggested that there are sufficient supplies of such specialist accommodation already in the pipeline such that no unmet local need is likely to arise until 2021 at the earliest. It therefore proposes(Policy HSG4) that development of the land at the Ridgeway should, first, be restricted to housing specifically to meet meeting local needs for specialist types of housing (as determined by an up-to-date Housing Needs Survey), rather than a mix of market and affordable housing, and secondly, that it should</p>

F Wardack/Linfoot Homes

release of the land. Any restriction is unacceptable to Mr and Mrs Wardak as landowner and would mean the public green space would not come forward.

2. Affordable/low cost housing provision should be in line with Policy CS.18 of the Core Strategy (i.e. maximum 35% with the remainder being open market housing). The proposed restriction to affordable (Policy HSG1), low cost (HSG2), or accommodation for older persons (HSG3) to meet local needs will mean that development of the land would not be viable and thus it would not be delivered for housing or public open space.

3. The allocation should be for up to 18 dwellings (and not just 16 as suggested in the Plan) which the land can satisfactorily accommodate. We attach a list of our more specific representations with respect to the individual policies in the Plan and will also submit these through the online submission process.

If you would like clarification on any of the points made in this letter or further information on our development proposals and/or the details of how the open space land would be transferred to the Town Council, please do not hesitate to contact me.

DRAFT

REPRESENTATIONS ON THE SHIPSTON-ON-STOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Policy HSG4

The allocation of the land at the Ridgeway, London Road, for future housing development is supported but there is no justification for preventing the release of the land to post-2021. Furthermore, delay in the release of the land will mean that the Plan's objectives for public accessibility to land to the west of the River Stour (Policy ENV1 and ENV5) will not be secured as it would be unacceptable to the landowners.

Policy HSG4

The land at the Ridgeway should be released for general market housing of which no more than 35% should be a mix of affordable housing (which may include 'starter homes') with the remainder being open market housing. The proposed restrictions to affordable (Policy HSG1), low cost (HSG2), or accommodation for older persons (HSG3) to meet local needs will mean that development of the land would not be viable and thus it would not be delivered for housing or public open space.

Policy HSG4

The land at the Ridgeway has the capacity to satisfactorily accommodate up to 18 new dwellings (not

not come forward for development until 2021 at the earliest.

In fact, permitted new housing development in Shipston is not being constructed as quickly as the District Council assumed in its last Housing Sites Schedule (March 2016) and so the date when unmet local needs are likely to arise has probably slipped a year or two into the future – perhaps to 2023. A new Housing Sites Schedule is expected to become available later in 2017.

The representations from Mr Wardack and Linfoot Homes fail to acknowledge the evidence given in the Plan and its supporting documents to justify the type and timing of acceptable development at the Ridgeway and they have not offered any persuasive evidence to demonstrate that the housing policies in the draft Plan cannot be justified. They suggest that a scheme comprising a mix of solely affordable, low cost market and extra care homes would not be commercially viable. However, the experience in a neighbouring parish is that some small builders are showing an interest in just such schemes.

We find no justification for amending the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan in response to these representations. However, as the landowner is unwilling to bring the Ridgeway land forward for development in accordance with those policies, we therefore propose to delete from the Plan the allocation of land at the Ridgeway for housing purposes.

However, further representations were subsequently received from Linfoot Country Homes and a meeting with them was arranged for 8/03/17 – see below.

F. Wardack/Linfoot
Homes

just 16 as suggested in the Plan).

Policy ENV1

Allocation of the land identified to the west of the River Stour, with a pedestrian access, for Local Green Space (LGS1) is acceptable to the landowners, subject to the allocation of the adjacent land at the Ridgeway for up to a total of 18 houses of which no more than 35% will be affordable (which may include 'starter homes') with the remainder being general open market dwellings, for construction pre-2021. Public access to the allocated Local Green Space would be permitted by the landowner following the grant of satisfactory planning

permission for the specified housing development.

Policy ENV5

Allocation of the land identified to the west of the River Stour, as it affects the Local Green Space (LGS1) as part of the Southern Well-being Zone, is acceptable to the landowners, subject to the allocation of the adjacent land at the Ridgeway for up to a total of 18 houses of which no more than 35% will be affordable (which may include 'starter homes') with the remainder being general open market dwellings, for construction pre-2021. Public access to that part of the Zone would be permitted by the landowner following the grant of satisfactory planning permission for the specified housing development.

Policy HSG1

This policy should not require affordable housing to be provided on any particular development site in excess of that required by Policy CS.18 of the affordable Core Strategy.

Policy HSG2

The provision of low cost market housing on any particular development sites should not be in addition to affordable housing, if the amount of affordable housing is at the level required by Policy CS.18 of the Core Strategy. The provision of affordable and low cost market housing should not exceed in total 35% of the number of dwellings on a development site.

Policy HSG3

There should be no requirement to provide accommodation for older persons, in excess of normal market and housing mix needs, on any particular development site.

Issues concerning policies HSG1,2, 3 and 4; ENV1 and 5. Ref, Ridgeway Development
Donation of land for public use is dependent on planning permission being granted for 18 houses, including 35% low cost/affordable houses.

Requesting amendments to ENV 1 and HSG 4

Should be no restriction on the timing of the release of HSG4. Any restriction would mean that Public Green Space ENV1 with access from London Rd would not be allowed to come forward before at least 2021 so will be

	<p>sold as one lot, negotiations anew will have to be with a new owner.</p> <p>Affordable/low cost housing provision should be in line with Policy CS.18 of the Stratford District Core Strategy providing 35% affordable/Low cost. The proposed Neighbourhood Plan restriction simply for affordable (Policy HSG1), low cost (HSG2), or for older persons (HSG3) to meet local needs will mean that development of the land HSG4 would not be viable because of the high cost of infrastructure thus would not be delivered for housing providing public open space ENV1.</p> <p>For HSG4 to be viable needs must be for up to 18 dwellings including 35% affordable/low cost (and not just 16 as suggested in the Plan) which the land can satisfactorily accommodate at a low density.</p> <p>There is no Housing Policy contingency allowed for in the Neighbourhood Plan that allows Modest Developments to come forward that coul/would deliver much needed social benefits for the Town</p>	
<p>F.Wardack?Linfoot Homes</p> <p>Email 19/12/16</p>	<p>Shipston-on-Stour NP (Neighbourhood Plan) Public consultation & Ridgeway Land, CV36 4HZ with My Representations on Draft NP Letter to Clerk to: the Town Council, New Clark House, Shipston, CV36 4HD.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Orbit Homes secured Outline Planning Permission for 55 Homes on London Road opp. Shipston Cemetery. 2. The Neighbourhood Plan is ONLY able to write Policies and show land allocation/use within the Parish Boundary. See Shipston’s website link to the Neighbourhood Plan for full info with “Policies Map” also “Commitments Map” including written Policies. The red outline denotes Shipston Parish boundary. 3. The red line bordering Ridgeway Land to the North East as shown on the Policies Map is Pig Brook. 4. NB Ridgeway Land shown between London Road and Pig Brook identified by Policy ENV1 relates to Public Open Space within the South Eastern section of the Well Being Zone identified ENV5. 5. ENV1, Allocation of Land to the West of the Stour shown green is only part of that whole parcel of land to become available as Public Open Space because the Parish Boundary of Shipston, shown red, dissects along this section of PIG BROOK. Similarly ENV5, includes ENV1 in the Southern “Well Being Zone” whilst shown by stipes over the Green marked ENV1 is also only part of the land available that WILL add to the Public Well Being Zone of the Parish. 6. The area covered by ENV1 is described as a Wetland. However whilst the lowermost half 	<p>See response above to Mr Wardack’s and Linfoot Homes’ earlier representations</p>

nearest Pig Brook can become soggy in persistent wet weather the remaining upper half is well drained. More of a wetland proper is the most southern corner of the parcel of land that cannot be shown or described in the NP.

7. Policy ENV5 includes Shipston Cemetery though perhaps ought to have its own Policy of preservation as it does not relate to the Well Being Zone that follows from Sports field alongside the Stour and Pig Brook.
8. **At Shipston Town meeting of full Council, see Agenda of 12th December item 16: a full presentation of proposals for Ridgeway land including a topographical layout map was made that showed the whole site as was initially presented in outline to the full Town Council last January. Paul Rathkey restated the Councils continuing full support.**
9. However it is important to note that the freehold of the field that lies between that red line and the broader meandering blue line on the NP maps is in the same and single ownership of Ridgeway but cannot be shown on the NP Policies Map because it lies within a neighbouring parish. However the additional land is included in the whole land parcel with ENV1 to be gifted to the Town via section 106 agreement in the event ONLY when Planning Permission is granted for 18 dwellings described below.
10. Registered by legal agreement there is to be a Permissive Path in Perpetuity from the Ridgeway River Field alongside the River Stour Southwards all the way to the Willington Bridge, provided Planning Permission is obtained for 18 dwellings on that part of Ridgeway land HSG4 adjacent only to the Orbit and London Rd.
11. **Current Housing Policies in the NP when applied to Ridgeway Land do not act in the best interests of the Town and its visitors.** HSG1 (affordable), HSG2 (simply low cost) and HSG3 (purely older persons) unfairly constrain even the most modest of edge of settlement developments to target groups rendering HSG4 “not financially viable” because of the capital investment required for provision of infrastructure.
12. **There is no Housing Policy Provision or contingency contained within the current Draft NP** that could permit modest windfall developments that would provide much needed and useable versatile Public Open Space or benefits for the Town and visitors. However development of Ridgeway Land will provide far reaching benefits under the direct control of the people of Shipston.

13. The Policies Map cannot be overlaid onto the Commitments Map. Further constraints do not reflect the true potential of benefits to the Town that currently stated Policies on Ridgeway Land could deliver.
14. HSG4 Land allocated at Ridgeway has adequate space for a conventional general housing development of 18 units at a very low density, not 16 as stated. Ridgeway's 18 homes is a modest development that should be released as it will have little impact on the Towns overall growth re housing numbers, making the proposal viable that would be in line with SDC core strategy Policy CS18 and provides for 35% affordable/low cost.
15. HSG4 Propels Land allocated at Ridgeway into post 2021. Ageing current owners of Ridgeway have a need to downsize. If planning permission cannot come forward beforehand the opportunity to provide an accessible informal Country Park for Shipston with public access to that amenity land and river walk will not be delivered under ENV1 or ENV5 as the whole will be sold as one lot into private ownership.
16. Particularly note the current agreement to provide the river walk is only available to current owners. Unless allowed to come forward the opportunity will be lost.

Linfoot Homes on behalf of the landowner note and support the change to draft NP policy to the effect that the Ridgeway land is no longer considered suitable for affordable family or extra care housing. The land is suitable for general housing and could come forward for early release.

Proposed that 6 of the proposed 18 houses are specified as low cost homes for sale plus 2 of the total 18 dwellings be specified as 'local market' homes. Such an amendment to the NP would ensure deliverability of the Ridgeway land to the Town Council together with riverside footpath and associated pedestrian right of way across neighbouring land to Willington Bridge.

Following further discussion with Linfoot Homes, the submitted Plan will allocate the Ridgeway land for the construction of 18 dwellings, half of them to meet local needs: six affordable homes (comprising low cost homes for sale) and three local market homes. The site will be allocated for release for development in the first five years of the Plan period. The Local Green Space designation on Mr & Mrs Wardak's land, as originally shown on the pre-submission draft Plan published last November, will be retained

Meeting with Linfoot Homes 08/03/17. Subsequent letter from Claire Linfoot McLean to Ed Jackson dated 14/03/17 specifying agreed points and confirmation via email, 14/03/17 by the landowner, Mr Frank Wardack

18 Anon via comment form	Flooding	See Policies FLD 1-3
19 Coal Board	No issues	N/A
20 From Stuart Fleming, resident, by email 19/12/16	Support for the development proposed on the area on the ridgeway identified by policy ENV1, I live across the road from the proposed site and feel this site is more suitable for development than a lot of other sites that have been put forward. The reason for backing this proposal is the additional country park and river walk which would indeed be a great asset to Shipston on Stour. I am also Chairman of Shipston Angling Club and we as a club see this as a great way of preserving and protecting this stretch of the river Stour for the future and provided the residents of Shipston with a stunning walk along one of the areas greatest assets.	See response above to Mr Wardack's and Linfoot Homes' representations (No 17)

<p>21. Turley From Ann Gillings, Frontier Estates, concerning former Turbine Blading Site on Lower Tileman's Lane</p> <p>Via email 21/12/16</p>	<p>The following comments are submitted on behalf of Frontier Estates, landowners of the former Turbine Blading site, part of the area defined as 'Lower Tilemans Lane' within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>In summary, whilst we note the aspirations for this wider area, it is imperative that the Plan recognises that a planning permission (ref:16/01897/FUL) will have been granted for the Turbine Blading site, which forms a large part of the wider 'Lower Tilemans Lane' site (the s106 is due to be signed early January and the permission issued by 13th January 2016). That permission is proposed to be implemented by Banbury Heights, and operated as set out the application. Demolition will begin shortly, followed by remediation with construction taking place later in 2017 following the discharge of conditions. The Plan is unclear in places in respect of the terminology adopted for the site, and wider area. The term "Former Turbine Blading" site should be used in respect of the attached red line only.</p> <p>The Plan should therefore support that development, and that although we have an objection to any Development Brief in principle, should such a document or proposals for the wider area be prepared, they must acknowledge and support the extant permission.</p> <p>Detailed Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 20 – The 15 Essential Supporting Actions – Point 14 <p>The wording of this aim must acknowledge the permission granted as an accepted baseline for any future Development Brief (detailed comments on which are provided below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy EC1 – Keeping Land Available for Employment Uses <p>This policy should be more specific in the area to which it relates. As there is a specific allocation for Lower Tilemans Lane, which sets out the range of uses anticipated (again, detailed comment is provided below in respect of this policy) and defined 'local needs', policy EC1 can only rightly relate to Upper Tilemans Lane, which should be defined by way of the Policies Map. Further, it has been accepted by the Town Council and Local Planning Authority that there is no requirement to retain the Turbine Blading site, part of the Lower Tilemans Lane site in employment use, as demonstrated by the approval of the recent planning permission. The policy can not therefore apply to Lower Tilemans Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy EC4 – Encouraging Employment Use on the Former Turbine Blading Site <p>This policy should be deleted on the basis that the Turbine Blading Site now has permission for a Care Home and Extra Care accommodation. To seek to designate the site for employment use against this background would not be evidence based, nor sound. It is directly conflicting with policy HSG8, and does not</p>	<p>The Plan will be amended as necessary (including Point 14 of the 15 Essential Supporting Actions, Policy EC1, Policy EC4, paragraphs 3.6.3 and 3.6.5, and Policy HSG8) to reflect the resolution to grant planning permission for a Care Home and Extra Care housing on this site, and to welcome such provision.</p>
---	--	--

Turley/Frontier
Estates

appropriately recognise the changed context. Should the Town Council wish to encourage employment uses on the wider Lower Tilemans Lane area, this is best achieved through HSG8.

- Policy INF1 – Contributions to Essential New Infrastructure and Community Facilities

This policy is inappropriately worded as it states that development proposals will be supported when contributions through CIL are triggered. The existence of CIL should not be the trigger for supporting, or otherwise, a proposal, noting that the CIL allows for only the net additional floorspace and in some cases, this will be nil. Equally, some forms of development, such as care homes and retirement dwellings are recognised by the Plan to be exempt, yet are still supported by the Plan. The policy should be worded to delete the first sentence of the policy to continue to state that contributions will be required as appropriate and set out the projects for funding.

- Page 37 – para 3.6.3 and 3.6.5 – Meeting Housing requirements

This supporting text should acknowledge the planning permission (which will be granted in early January) for the 60 bed care home and 10 Extra Care Units at the Former Turbine Blading site, helping to meet the provision for elderly in the town.

- Policy HSG3 – Meeting the Housing Needs of Older Persons

Whilst the spirit of this policy is supported, in supporting a range of care related developments, the wording in respect of a local connection requirement for Extra Care and Sheltered is not appropriate.

Both types of development - Extra Care and Sheltered can, and often are, privately provided, and it is accepted that such provision does not require affordable housing (as set out in policy CS17 of the Core Strategy). Although research indicates that the majority of residents do only move a short distance into new accommodation (unless moving to be close to family etc), there is no legitimate planning reason why such provision should be limited to those with a local connection only. This can only be achieved through affordable provision. In this respect it should be treated no differently than open market housing. To do otherwise disregards the manner in which this type of accommodation is provided and the policy should recognise this. As currently drafted this represents a significant conflict with the Core Strategy.

- Policy HSG8 – Lower Tilemans Lane

As noted, Lower Tilemans Lane, includes the Former Turbine Blading site, but also relates to other land. The policy wording should be specific in relating to Lower Tilemans Lane only.

However, this policy must also recognise that planning permission has already been granted on the Turbine Blading element. Hence the policy should be focussed

Policy HSG3: the proportion of the population which is of pension age is higher in Shipston than in Stratford District, Warwickshire and England & Wales (see Housing Issues & Audit Report para 3.2.2). It is an attractive area to retire to, but to maintain the economic and social vitality of the town it is considered desirable to restrict the occupancy of Extra Care and Sheltered accommodation to people with a local qualifying connection, as defined in paragraph 16 of the Addendum to the Housing Issues & Audit Report.

<p>Turley/Frontier Estates</p>	<p>on the <i>remainder</i> of the Lower Tilemans Lane allocation in seeking to bring forward the uses proposed, which in combination with the permission, may deliver mixed use on the site as a whole.</p> <p>In terms of the uses proposed, the policy should recognise and support the care home in listing that use. In addition, it is noted in the Addendum to Housing Audit and Issues October 2016 at Table 2, in responding to the public suggestion that housing should be included on the site, the table concludes “housing already proposed as part of mixed use development” on the whole site. Clearly, housing is not included within the mix of uses, and would be compliant with the remainder of the policies in the plan. As such, housing should also be included within the list of acceptable uses.</p> <p>In addition, and fundamentally, we have significant concerns regarding the approach to the Development Brief. In light of the permission which comprises the majority of Lower Tilemans Lane, there is not considered to be a need for a Brief, beyond the terms of the policy which identifies uses. Such a Brief cannot form part of the Neighbourhood Plan (until reviewed and incorporated in the future) and there is no commitment to adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document by the LPA. It can therefore not have Development Plan status, nor be used to inform the determination of any planning application. It is therefore unnecessary.</p> <p>If, against this background, a Brief is still proposed, it is essential that the Policy acknowledges that the Brief can not require comprehensive development of the whole Lower Tilemans Lane site, nor a restriction on when that individual proposals may come forward, both before or after any such plan is produced. A demonstration of ‘no prejudice’ to wider development is all that can be sought.</p> <p>I trust this is useful in confirming our representations, but should you wish to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
<p>22. From Rose Hallows via email 27/12/16</p> <p>Rose Hallows</p>	<p>Message: "Representations re Draft Neighbourhood Plan"</p> <p>I am writing with regard to proposed building of 18 dwellings on Ridgeway Land at CV36 4HZ. Although we don't live in Shipston ,we are regular visitors, as my husband is chairman of Stratford fishing club.We have ambitions of moving to Shipston when we retire and HSG2 would certainly make this possible for us. Policy ENV1 to create a Public Country Park, with a river walk on the the Stour would be amazing for visitors and locals alike.</p>	<p>See response above to Mr Wardak’s and Linfoot Homes’ representations (No 17)</p>

<p>23.</p> <p>From Martin Ferrier, resident, by email 22/12/16</p>	<p>Page 1: It is presumptuous to say this is the final local consultation. There may be so many changes that you will need to go out for a further consultation.</p> <p>1.1.1 It is not clear where the footnote reference is that this is referring to. Before the first use of footnotes there should be a reference to where to find them.</p> <p>1.1.9 says “possibly” more commercial development. Is there any evidence that the current decline in jobs won’t continue?</p> <p>1.2.2.4 Unnecessary to explain it took 18 months</p> <p>1.2.2.4 The audit and issues reports are mentioned. There is no link as to where to find them.</p> <p>1.2.2.5 ends with “see Text Box 4”. It is not obvious where that is! If you mean the locality plan, then there are no boxes in it.</p> <p>1.3.1 doesn’t say what “particular kinds” of proposed development, for example ones submitted on Thursdays?</p> <p>2.1.9 the implication of the words “retail development” is that it is on the Norgren or Turbine Blading sites which is incorrect. The Norgren site has a small allocation of class B1 employment land. (16/01002/FUL) The proposed supermarket is not on re-use land.</p> <p>2.2.2 Reference to text box 1 which is not identified. (see comment about 1.2.2.5)</p> <p>2.2.3 this discussion about the incorporation of flooding as a fifth topic is irrelevant.</p> <p>2.4.2 How valid is it to refer to the town design guide as it wasn’t an adopted document.</p> <p>Priority 6 p17 seems contradictory language “meeting conservation requirements” “changes being considered”!</p> <p>Action7 p19 the first sentence uses judgemental words “suitable and well designed”. However, the objective will be met by the actions of landowners and developers which won’t of itself throw up the most suitably located sites. It will not be the landowner or the developer which will come up with the best designed settlements it will be the controls of the various planning officers and councils that will ensure that! The words used are judgemental, who will apply the judgement and will that judgement be acceptable in the eyes of the residents?</p> <p>Action 8 p19. This is only of value if there is a documented set of good design objectives. Hence</p>	<p>Comments Material to the plan have been noted and applied in conjunction with other representations received,</p> <p>2.1.9 This refers to the supermarket which has been given planning permission on the former garage site in Church Street</p> <p>Action7 p19: suitably located sites are those allocated in the Plan. The adopted Town Design Statement (one of the proposed ‘consequent local projects’) will provide guidance on good design.</p>
--	---	--

Martin Ferrier

we need an adopted Town Design statement with clear guidelines.

Action 9 p19 can we clarify this, is this a “housing needs survey” or an “affordable housing needs survey”? Who is going to pay for this survey? Who is going to ensure this is done periodically and what is the recommended period?

Action 9, p9 item 3.6.10 shows that the housing needs survey probably under calls the need. I don’t see the value of an affordable needs survey when SDC (Stratford-on-Avon District Council) maintain a list which is significantly longer. We should use that list in preference to spending money on a local affordable needs survey.

Action 11. P 20. The medical centre is planned to be on a site which is not “mainly residential” it will also contain a supermarket and petrol station. The objective of a larger medical centre won’t be met just by the provision of land; it requires funding for a building. Whilst the mayors covering letter may explain this I believe that the reader of this document should be left in no doubt. I suggest an additional sentence along the lines of “Whilst this will provide the land for the medical centre additional funding is required to erect the building”.

Action 12. P20. If this is a medium-term activity and this plan is till 2031 then the need for growth in the primary school should have been identified by now. The data exists and we know the minimum growth of the town to be able to say positively if we need a new primary school by 2031 or not. Most the housing in the plan will have been built by 2021! Deferring till a subsequent plan is avoiding the issue.

Action 14. P20. This introduces a 2021 update of the plan. Nothing has been said about that earlier in the document. It should have been introduced in the context of the time scale of this plan being 2016-2031. Has the Shipston-on-Stour Town Council agreed to that update?

Action 14 P20. It says this will likely be led by the District Council, have they agreed to do that?

3.1.2 the words on-the-ground actions are superfluous.

3.1.3 the words “with the National Planning Policy” should be either “within the National Planning Policy” or “with respect to the National Planning Policy”.

3.2.2 and 3.2.3 only talks about retail in the town centre ignoring the supermarket (introduced in 2.1.9) and petrol station on the Campden Road.

Action 9 p19 : As with the two previous Housing Needs Surveys (in 2004 and 2013), this should be commissioned by the Town Council and will encompass the scale of unmet local need for all types, tenures and sizes of housing. The Plan states in the explanation of Policy HSG2 that such surveys should be conducted every three years from 2016 onwards.

Action 12 Noted

Action 14. P20: This wording is not intended to fix a date for updating the Plan – it merely recognises that an update will be needed in due course (just as the Core Strategy will itself need to be updated) to provide clearer analysis of the town’s requirements in the 2020s.

Martin Ferrier

There is also the convenience store at Pettiphers garage (13/02896/FUL), shouldn't that be mentioned?

3.2.3 No mention of the expanding business units at the top of the Tilemans lane estate.

3.2.4 Excellent, but who is going to make that happen? We should be careful about setting an expectation if there is no identified means of delivering. It says "...assuming the owners and occupiers agree...". Is this realistic or just wishing?

3.2.7 The land has I believe been purchased and is subject to planning application 16/01897/FUL. A decision to grant was made at the SDC planning committee meeting on 16/11/2016 (not sure if the consent letter has been sent). It would thus be inappropriate to retain this policy as it has been overtaken by events.

3.2.8 is an excellent policy but only if the work proportion is not decreased from what it is now. The work part also must be enforceable.

3.2.9 is an excellent policy.

3.2.10 is an excellent policy if matched with an analysis which shows it will be beneficial as outlined in the Policy. There is no hint here as to who will fund this. The policy only talks about traffic, whereas the header leads you to think there will be other improvements.

3.2.11 isn't this a duplicate of 3.2.9? difficult to see what is different.

3.2.12 excellent policy.

3.3.4 The major item missing off the list is medical facilities!

3.3.5 this is a duplicate of 3.2.10

3.3.6 who wouldn't agree?

3.4.3 I thought that SuDS was "sustainable urban drainage systems"

3.4.4 This is a watered-down version of what has been proposed by the Shipston-on-Stour Flood Action Group. Whilst in principle this is a good thing the wording is confusing. The sentence starting "access roads" is clear and is talking about permeable surfaces. The preceding sentence however is not clear as to what the author wants to happen. The title talks about "better than flood neutral". Can't we state the amount of betterment, for example 25% and then list the sorts of things that will achieve that? From this policy, I only see a requirement for permeable pavements. We should be talking about Swales, Trees, storage tanks, valves etc.... It should also put betterment in the context of what the NPPF requires. The policy could then be: Developments which use a

3.4.3 It is.

3.4.4 We don't think it necessary to list the full panoply of SuDs systems but will state that developments should incorporate a SuDS 'train' which achieves at least 25% betterment than the NPPF minimum of flood neutrality.

Martin Ferrier

combination of these approaches to achieve 25% betterment will be supported.

3.4.5 Excellent policy easy to implement.

3.5.3 According to the map NCA (National Character Areas) 96 Shipston-on-Stour lies within the Feldon Dunsmore Area and is not at the junction of the Cotswolds and Feldon. I refer you to <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4878893332824064>. The junction between 96 and 106 occurs south of Shipston-on-Stour at Tidmington/Burmington.

3.5.8/3.5.9 say that developments have to respect their setting at edge of settlement and in the town centre. What about the bit in between?

3.5.11 It would be helpful to say what is the amount of shortfall.

3.5.11 It says "It will be possible" without any explanation of how that will be achieved. Should it be "It may be possible". Have the land owners agreed?

3.5.12 This is excellent especially as the land owner has agreed.

3.15.2 Where is the ecologists report? All evidence should be publically available.

3.6 to avoid confusion later I suggest definitions at the start of this section of the terms "market housing", "affordable housing" (a technical term), "low cost housing", "rental", "shared equity", "care homes", "extra care homes", etc.....

3.6.3 You have used the words Extra Care. I thought there was a distinction between Care Homes and Extra Care Homes.

3.6.3 Where did you get the figure of 138? You don't explain if this 138 is in addition or included into the 640.

Is the 138 an underestimate. If we take into account:

- 12/00403/OUT North Of Campden Road Shipston-on-Stour Development of a supermarket (A1 Use Class) with associated petrol station (Sui Generis Use Class), customer parking and servicing area; an 'Extra Care' Retirement Development (Use Class C2) comprising up to 80 cottages and 50 apartments and associated care and staff facilities; up to 54 residential dwellings (C3 Use Class) including 35% affordable provision; a community use building (D1/D2 Use Class); and associated access arrangements, open space, allotments and landscaping. That appears to be 130.
- 14/00612/FUL Low Furlong I thought was an additional 20.
- 15/03124/FUL Stour Bank Hay Meadow Shipston-

3.6: Definitions will be included in a Glossary

3.6.3: There is indeed a distinction between Care Homes and Extra Care accommodation. Bed spaces in Care Homes do not count against the housing figures in the Core Strategy and therefore do not feature in any of the statistics in the Neighbourhood Plan. Care Homes are communal residential establishments; Extra Care units are a specialist type of accommodation (houses or flats), each with its own front door and separate address. It is misleading to talk of Extra Care Homes (with a capital H).

3.6.3: The figure of 138 comprises 130 north of Campden Road and eight at Rosedale. Because of the type of accommodation previously on the site the District Council and the County Council both regard the net increase in the number of units at Rosedale to be eight. Low Furlong is a Care Home and therefore does not count

Martin Ferrier

on-Stour CV36 4SA View Change of use from a day centre (D1) to residential living (C2) with new side and rear extensions. Stour Bank, Hay Meadow, Shipston-on-Stour. Isn't this a change of use to C2 of 5 units.

- 13/00082/FUL Rosedale. Is in fact only a net increase of 2 C2 units (look at the application form). I assume this is the 8 complete referred to.

- The Tilemans lane application has been granted (not sure if consent letter written) 16/01897/FUL and it is 70 bed care home (use class C2) and 10 extra care apartments (use class C2) not 60.

3.6.7 I think the reader might get confused with the 499 you quoted in 3.6.5 and the minimum 500 quoted here.

3.6.7. Appears to contradict the point made in 3.6.6

3.6.10 The affordable housing needs survey only covered the town of Shipston-on-Sour. Whereas CV36 includes as far as Long Compton, Oxhill and Ilmington. Therefore, the supply to meet the 159 needs number should consider not only what is built in Shipston-on-Stour but what has been and is planned for places such as Long Compton. How does this interface with the Long Compton NH Plan?

The figures don't appear to be consistent. The local affordable housing needs survey says there are only 26 required whereas the waiting list for CV36 of 159 is approximately 6 times bigger. Is CV36 six times bigger than Shipston-on-Stour?

3.6.11 is excellent if developers agree. However, won't providing houses at below market drive up the price of the rest of the houses? I would like to see an expansion of this item to show how the finances of such a development would work.

3.6.12 you say at most 130, yet there is ASL at 130, Tilemans lane at 80, Low Furlong at plus 20

3.6.13 My understanding is that the provision of ENV1 is linked to the Ridgeway development. Consequently, I think it would be appropriate review the proposed timing of the Ridgeway development. (Discussed at Shipston-on-Stour Town Council meeting on 12/12/2016)

3.6.13 The balance of market housing and "affordable" housing at both sites should consider the economic viability to the land owner and developer. The proposed numbers should be reviewed with the potential developers.

3.6.14 Whilst this is an attractive idea, where is the evidence that there is a demand for such an initiative? Is 5% of a development economically

towards the Extra Care figure. The same applies to Stour Bank (see the District Council's submission to the Core Strategy Examination in January 2016 entitled 'C2 Uses and Housing land Supply').

The decision letter for the Tileman's Lane development has not yet been issued. The wording of the Plan will be amended to reflect the latest position, including the number of Extra Care units permitted. (Again, the Care Home element does not count against Extra care provision.)

3.6.6 and 3.6.7: We will reconsider the wording of these paragraphs. In any case, permissions granted now exceed 500.

3.6.10: the figures for the whole of the CV36 postcode area are only included because the District Council was unable to provide data just for Shipston parish. However, only 17 of the 159 households on the waiting list were classified as being of medium to high priority, meaning, amongst other things, that only those 17 were assessed as actually having a housing need (and some of the 132 who did not had no local connection either). So this figure of 17 is not substantially different from the 26 identified in the Housing Needs Survey.

3.6.11: such a scheme has worked well in other areas, such as Ilmington. We are not aware of evidence indicating that it drives up the price of the rest of the houses.

3.6.12: see comment above re. 3.6.3. The figure is 130, plus a resolution to grant permission for a further 10 in Tileman's Lane.

3.6.13: see comments above on representations by Mr Wardak and Linfoot Homes (No. 17). The proposed timing of the housing allocation at The Ridgeway is to be changed.

3.6.13: the Plan will now provide for some market housing on The Ridgeway site. It does not provide for any market housing on the other site: this allocation made under Policy HSG4 is only to meet the local housing need

Martin Ferrier

viable? How has 5% been derived? If you are expecting the developer to provide this land at cost, then you will drive up the cost of the other houses including the affordable ones! I would like to see an expansion of this item to show how the finances of such a development would work.

3.6.15 This intensive development doesn't mention anything about parking. Won't this exacerbate that problem?

3.6.16 You say "...To offset any continuation of that growth pattern..." without justifying why that is a bad thing.

3.6.17 This is out of date. The land has I believe been purchased and is subject to planning application 16/01897/FUL. A decision to grant was made at the SDC planning committee meeting on 16/11/2016 (not sure if the consent letter has been sent). It would thus be inappropriate to retain this policy as it has been overtaken by events.

3.6.17 "...This Development Brief will be commissioned by the Town Council..." I am not aware that the Shipston-on-Stour Town Council has been asked to do this or agreed to do this.

3.7 Policies map. It is not clear what of these have land owner/developer agreement and what ones are speculation.

4.1 why can't we have a glossary of the terms used in this document? This is a cumbersome approach and each time the reader needs to look something up they have to go to one or more of these documents.

4.2(i) item doesn't refer to a "Town council" which is what Shipston-on-Stour Town Council is.

4.2(i) doesn't The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 have an influence? According to the government's "Policy paper 2010 to 2015 government policy: planning reform" Neighbourhood planning was introduced through the Localism Act 2011. Neighbourhood planning legislation came into effect in April 2012.

4.2 (ii) last sentence doesn't say if this applies to core strategy or neighbourhood plan.

4.2 (iii) will leave readers querying "isn't that what 106 money is for?"

4.2 (xiii) As far as I am aware this design guide was never adopted.

4.2 (xiv) ... but where are these reports?

4.3 That the town council is committed to putting the plan into action and keeping it updated is presumptuous and not to my knowledge agreed by Shipston-on-Stour Town Council.

4.3 Copyright statement, this is obviously wrong as

requirements of Policies HSG1, HSG2 and HSG3 as identified by a recent local Housing Needs Survey.

3.6.14: requests were made by the public during the preparation of the Plan to include such provision.

3.6.15: comment noted

3.6.16: curtailing the rapid physical growth of the town's built-up area was one the priorities raised repeatedly by the community during the preparation of the Plan

3.6.17: this paragraph is indeed out of date in respect of one site and it will be amended accordingly. However, parts of the lower Tileman's Lane area will remain under-utilised and there is no reason to change the overall policy and the proposal for a Development Brief.

<p>MartinFerrier</p>	<p>it has been given out to the public. Also, doesn't acknowledge the copyright of suppliers, such as the providers of the maps, graphics and photographs, and the underlying copyright of the people supplying the map data.</p> <p>General:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None of the photographs have captions. It is not clear what the purpose of the photographs are. There are few references in the text. I suggest each photograph should have a caption explaining what it is illustrating. 	<p>4.3: each map already contains the necessary copyright statement for the mapping data.</p> <p>The graphics and lay out have not yet been finalised. All photos will be captioned.</p>
<p>24.</p> <p>RCA/ Shoulderway Lane Via email 29/12/16</p> <p>RCA/Shoulderway Lane</p>	<p>SHIPSTON-ON-STOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN HOUSING REQUIREMENT</p> <p>4.1 Based on the preceding section of this response, it is recognised that there is a significant housing need within the District and that the settlement of Shipston-on-Stour is a highly sustainable location for growth. The SSNP is therefore an opportunity to contribute to meeting some of this need, coupled with securing further investment in the community infrastructure of the town.</p> <p>4.2 In that context, it is initially encouraging to note that the early content of the SSNP. The document sets out four local priorities including the aim of <i>“Creating the right amount, types and tenures of housing, particularly affordable housing, to meet local needs”</i> (RCA emphasis).</p> <p>4.3 However, despite the above, the 7 priorities for action identified on page 17 of the SSNP fail to make any reference to addressing affordable housing need. Despite affordable housing being a local priority, it is not supported by a ‘priority action point’. RCA consider this to be a significant shortcoming of the SSNP.</p> <p>4.4 Following on from the above, RCA are extremely disappointed to note that the proposed SSNP allocates only 40 dwellings from 2021 to 2031. This is a meagre level of development is further compounded by the fact that each development site is dispersed into very small sites (below 30 dwellings) which will impact on their ability to deliver a proportionate level of affordable housing.</p> <p>4.5 The rationale for the SSNP promoting such a low level of development appears to be that other</p>	<p>4.3 et seq: The Neighbourhood Plan does indeed address affordable housing need. It points out that there are a large number of outstanding planning permissions within the Plan area; and the Addendum to the Housing Audit & Issues Report makes clear that over 400 of these remain to be built. Most of these are on large sites and so clearly a significant number of affordable homes are already in the pipeline: over 130. At expected rates of construction these will be more than sufficient to meet local needs until the early 2020s and there is no justification for allocating additional affordable housing for immediate development.</p> <p>To cater for affordable housing needs by local people after all those commitments have been implemented, the draft Plan makes allocations for a small number of additional affordable</p>

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

residential proposals (brought forward through the appeals process) provide for 'sufficient' development up to 2021. The commitments in Shipston broadly equate to the Core Strategy figure, but this is an absolute minimum requirement. The opportunities therefore are either to deliver additional housing (and boost significantly the supply of housing) through the Neighbourhood Planning process or through the Site Allocations DPD at a District level.

4.6 On the basis of the above, it is important to assess the housing growth target of the SSNP against key basic conditions (as set out in paragraph 2.4 of this response).

Basic Condition 'a': *"having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order (or neighbourhood plan).*

4.7 The NPPF prescribes key national policies against which an emerging NP should be tested. Paragraph 47 states that there is a requirement to boost significantly the supply of housing. Alongside this, paragraph 47 also identifies that Local Planning Authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their plans meet *"...the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area..."*.

4.8 To comply with this requirement, the Core Strategy sets out that the housing figure for Shipston-on-Stour is to be considered a minimum. This approach allows for growth beyond this figure (through the Reserve Sites Allocation of 2,920) to facilitate growth in most sustainable locations.

4.9 The flexible and positive approach of the Core Strategy is not advanced within the emerging SSNP. The Neighbourhood Plan puts a break on any future development up to 2021, effectively sanctioning a moratorium on development. Beyond this date, the plan allocates two sites totalling 40 units. Given the identified scale of the affordable housing requirement within the District, RCA consider the SNPP to be in direct conflict with national policy as well as that of the Core Strategy.

Basic condition 'd': *"the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) contributes to the achievement of sustainable development."*

4.10 As set out within the PPG, the basic conditions require that a NP contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Again, it is important to return to the Framework as this sets out what constitutes sustainable development. Paragraph 7

homes on sites at the edge of the built-up area (Policy HSG4). However, because the pool of affordable homes in Shipston will have increased by over 180 since 2011, the number of such homes becoming vacant each year in the future, and available to meet the needs of local people for affordable housing, should be significantly higher than in the past.

The two sites allocated in the draft Plan may well not be sufficient to meet local need right through the period to 2031, but through the consultation exercise on the draft Plan an opportunity to provide additional housing to the north of the town (on a site originally proposed but later excluded on highway grounds) has been identified as a possible additional or reserve site for housing, since it may now be possible to overcome highway objections. We propose to amend the Plan to include this land within the area to be covered by the Development Brief proposed for the Tileman's Lane area under Policy HSG8.

RCA/ Shoulderway
Lane

identifies that it comprises of 3 interrelated roles, including a social role. The Framework states that the social role incorporates the following:

“supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Consultation RCA043ad December 2016 Barratt and David Wilson Mercia RCA Regeneration © 23 info@rcaregeneration.co.uk

creating high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being”.

4.11 As the SSNP effectively prevents any major new housing development to 2021 and then limits the scale of future development to just 40 new homes, it is considered that the SSNP does not contribute to the achievement of the social role of sustainable development. The plan does not provide the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations and it does not contain sufficient flexibility for the plan to adapt at a later date.

Basic condition ‘e’: *“the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).”*

4.12 The adopted Core Strategy has adopted a settlement hierarchy which recognises that Shipston-on-Stour is a highly sustainable location for growth. On this basis, the Core Strategy seeks to allocate a minimum of 510 new homes to the town. Despite this, the SSNP allocates just 40 new homes and only for the latter part of the plan period.

4.13 RCA considers that there are a number of flaws to the approach promoted by the SSNP when assessed against the strategic policies of the development plan.

4.14 Firstly, there is no justification for restricting new growth to a period beyond 2021, and there is a particular need for affordable housing now. Restricting development to the latter part of the plan period would result in such housing need continuing to be unmet. This is despite the acknowledgement of the SSNP that the provision

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

of affordable housing is a local priority. Indeed, if every Neighbourhood Plan in the District did the minimum required, the District Council would be forced to allocate substantial growth through the SAP DPD, which could undermine the Neighbourhood Planning process.

4.15 Paragraph 5.1.8 of the Core Strategy provides clarity over the role of the MRCs, stating that *“They provide a good range of shops, facilities and jobs compared with smaller villages. They also tend to have more frequent public transport services than most of the District’s smaller settlements. Provision is made over the plan period as a whole for development in each of these settlements, known as Main Rural Centres, but with a varying amount in each reflecting the specific constraints and opportunities that apply and the importance of retaining their individual character and distinctiveness”*.

4.16 The table below outlines the locations for dispersed housing growth as set out in the Core Strategy:

Location	Number of units	% of overall target
Stratford-upon-Avon	3,500	24.0%
Main Rural Centres	3,800	26.0%
Lighthorne Heath	2,300	15.6%
Long Marston	2,100	14.4%
Local Service Villages	2,000	13.7%
Large rural brownfield sites	1,245	8.5%
Other rural locations	750	5.1%

4.17 Though the flexible application of the Core Strategy policies, reserve sites can and will be sought within Stratford-upon-Avon and the MRCs. The Council have not indicated in the Core Strategy that LSVs will be a source of Reserve Site Allocations as they are more constrained by fewer services and facilities.

4.18 As previously stated, RCA consider that there are a number of MRCs with constraints that may not be able to accommodate as much growth when compared to Shipston-on-Stour. Examples of this are where settlements are constrained due to landscape or environmental designations (e.g. Green Belt, Flood Plain). In order to meet the policy requirements of the Core Strategy, the SSNP must make a significant contribution to additional housing need.

4.19 Linked to the previous point, the need for reserve sites is brought into sharper focus by

RCA/Shoulderway
Lane

unmet housing need in neighbouring authority areas. The SSNP ignores the fact that the District Council will, at some point, need to incorporate unmet housing need from neighbouring authority areas. Within the wider West Midlands region, there are known significant housing pressures arising from the Greater Birmingham and Solihull HMA. Local Authorities situated within 'overlapping' Housing Market Areas need to accommodate a proportion of this unmet housing need. This is recognised in paragraph 1.3.8 of the Core Strategy which states that *"The Council will continue to work with the authorities in each HMA in accordance with the duty to cooperate and will therefore keep under ongoing review the need to respond to new evidence using the mechanisms set out in the Plan to address the need once its known"*.

4.20 In light of the above, it is then necessary to review the content of the Examination Inspector's Report into the emerging Birmingham City Plan. The Inspector has examined, in some detail, the evidence base underpinning the emerging Birmingham City Plan including work undertaken by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP). Work by the GBSLEP has identified a housing shortfall of approximately 38,400 homes over the next 20 years. This work, titled Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG), has been examining options of how this housing need is to be met across the adjoining authorities including in Stratford District. The strategic significance of the SPRG was identified within the Examination Inspector's Report with Inspector Clews stating the following: Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Consultation RCA043ad December 2016 Barratt and David Wilson Mercia

RCA Regeneration © 26

info@rcaregeneration.co.uk

"...The next stage is for the GBSLEP itself to assess the options and decide on a preferred option to take forward into the next iteration of its Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth [SPRG]. Alongside this, so far seven LPAs in the HMA have committed themselves to a review of their adopted or emerging Local Plans, should this be necessary to address Birmingham's shortfall. All this is clear evidence of effective cooperation between the LPAs with the aim of meeting the housing needs of Birmingham and the HMA as a whole. While the SPRG is a non-statutory document, both its

RCA/ Shoulderway Lane

preferred option and the evidence underpinning it are likely to be material considerations of significant weight when Local Plans are reviewed”.

4.21 At the time the Core Strategy was adopted, ways of meeting Birmingham’s shortfall were still being explored, and Stratford on Avon partially falls within the BBSLEP HMA. RCA consider that at some point, the District will need to take some of this shortfall. At para 1.3.8 of the Core Strategy, concerning the GBSLEP shortfall, it is acknowledged by the Council that:

“...the situation is not fully resolved although the quantum of unmet need is known. The Council will continue to work with the authorities in each HMA in accordance with the duty to cooperate and will therefore keep under ongoing review the need to respond to new evidence using the mechanisms set out in the Plan to address the need once it is known.”

4.22 In light of the above, RCA consider that there is an outstanding need to identify further land for housing or a larger ‘reserve’ of potential sites. This will firstly meet the national requirement to boost significantly the supply of housing whilst also addressing the persistent and continued affordable housing shortfall within the District. Secondly, it will ensure the delivery of sustainable development by delivering homes in highly accessible and sustainable locations.

4.23 The risk to the SSNP in its current form is that it will become out-of-date once a proportion of the unmet GBSLEP housing need is allocated to Stratford and the District-wide need consequently increases, potentially leaving it without a 5 year housing land supply. Whilst RCA acknowledge the Written Ministerial Statement¹ of 12 December 2016, this is now subject to a pending Legal Challenge in any case.

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2016-12-12/HCWS346/>

5. ASSESSMENT OF SHOULDERWAY LANE SITE

5.1 The previous section of this representation sets out how the general housing growth strategy of the SSNP does not meet three basic conditions as prescribed by the PPG.

5.2 RCA consider that further land for housing should be identified in the emerging SSNP, and that the land at Shoulderway Lane is a candidate for

5.2 et seq: We do not consider the Shoulderway Lane site to be a suitable one for

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

consideration.

5.3 The following paragraphs provide an assessment of the site and identify whether an allocation at Shoulderway Lane would be in general conformity with the emerging SSNP policies.

5.4 RCA note that a direct assessment of the land at Shoulderway Lane was not included within the evidence base underpinning the emerging SSNP.

This is in direct conflict with the Planning Practice Guidance which repeatedly reiterates the point that *"The assessment should identify all sites and broad locations regardless of the amount of development needed to provide an audit of available land."* (Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 3-009-20140306) (RCA emphasis).

5.5 This is particularly concerning given the officer 'recommendation to approve' prior to the determination of the application in April 2016.

5.6 Local Authority officers were satisfied that the proposed development was in general accordance with the requirements of the adopted Core Strategy and that despite the Council claiming a 5 year housing land supply at that point, there were no technical reasons for refusal. This is a powerful position and one that the SSNP fails to acknowledge or explore formally.

5.7 RCA therefore wish to see a formal assessment of the land at Shoulderway Lane, before the submission of the SSNP.

Policy HSG1: Ensuring a supply of affordable rental and shared equity homes:

5.8 This policy is, in effect, a rural exception sites policy insofar as developments purely for affordable housing would be acceptable where they meet an identified need. However, as identified, the current and future need for affordable housing is so significant that a rural exception policy is unlikely to make anything other than a limited contribution. Instead, it is considered that a mix of approaches is required, including bringing forward larger sites for residential development, and doing more than just 'the minimum'.

5.9 The previous planning application on the land at Shoulderway Lane also included 35% affordable housing, equating to 37 new affordable units.

Given the context and scale of affordable housing issues at a local and District level provision at this scale is of significant weight: delivering on a key local priority.

5.10 The evidence illustrates that there has been a

housing development. Previous proposals for such use were strongly opposed by the local population and the Town Council and were refused by the Local Planning Authority as recently as May 2015. The reasons for refusal, particularly in respect of the loss of amenity by neighbouring properties, the impact on the landscape character and on the visual amenity of the area, the remoteness of the site from the town, and the impact on listed buildings, remain as valid as ever.

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

shortfall in the delivery of affordable housing across the District for a prolonged period. House prices in the District are some of the highest in the region, while the affordability ratio is one of the worst; being at 10.16:1 (Source: DCLG, 2016). Based on these statistics, local people earning average wages will struggle to purchase or rent privately in the area. Accordingly, such residents will require some form of subsidised housing. Through the Core Strategy, the District Council has made a commitment to meeting the affordable housing needs in the district in the coming years. Again, if local Neighbourhood Plans do not align with this, then the District will fail to deliver on this commitment.

5.11 Core Strategy policy CS18 also sets out the preferred tenure split of the affordable housing provision, as follows:

- ☑ Maximum 20% Affordable Rent
- ☑ Maximum 20% Intermediate Tenure
- ☑ Minimum 60% Social Rent

5.12 The proposed development on land at Shoulderway Lane can deliver this tenure mix, unless otherwise advised by the housing team at the District Council, or as a result of further research.

Policy HSG4: Allocating housing land to meet local needs from 2021 onward:

5.13 RCA believe that the two sites identified within the SSNP will not provide a realistic amount of affordable housing for Shipston-on-Stour during the plan period. With just 40 units, it is questionable as to whether such minimal development could deliver 35% affordable housing in any case, being distributed to smaller sites (see paragraph 4.11).

Policy INF1: Contributions to essential new infrastructure and community facilities:

5.14 A residential development on land at Shoulderway Lane would be entirely in accordance with this objective. The site has no constraints that would undermine the viability of the proposed development and would be accompanied by the full range of both on-site and off-site commuted community infrastructure sums. These financial contributions would help to fund additional healthcare, education, leisure facilities, green infrastructure, highways and transportation, and measures to improve flood resilience.

Furthermore, development of this site would also create jobs and homes for local people who in turn will contribute to the local economy. Finally,

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

development of the site would also attract New Homes Bonus which could in part be spent locally on projects identified in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy FLD1: Attaining ‘better than flood neutral’ surface water drainage:

5.15 The site at Shoulderway Lane is situated entirely within flood zone 1. Notwithstanding this, it is known that some garden flooding occurs in existing properties located within the Hawthorns Estate which is adjacent to the north-eastern boundary of the site. Measures within the Drainage Strategy submitted with the application for the site have already demonstrated that this could be addressed above and beyond the normal standard required and that there will be betterment for those neighbouring properties beyond the run-off rates experienced on the undeveloped site at the present time. This was acknowledged by the Council during the determination of the last application. No objections were raised either by the Lead Local Flood Authority or Severn Trent Water Ltd to the proposals.

Policy ENV1: Conserving the adjoining countryside:

5.16 RCA note that a large proportion of the land within the Shoulderway Lane site have been designated as ‘Local Green Space’ (LGS). RCA object in the strongest terms to this as without development to accompany it, the land is inaccessible by the public and is entirely in private ownership.

5.17 This view is reinforced by the Planning Practice Guidance², which states:

<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/>

“ [it] is clear that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a ‘back door’ way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name.”

Further, “Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs

5.16 Planning Practice Guidance has been adhered to and additionally a LGS Checklist developed by an adjacent LPS (Cotswold DC). This is a comprehensive 44-point assessment covering 12 different aspects of Local Green Space nomination. The completed Checklist is documented in the Audit & Issues Report (Oct 2016) that forms part of the Neighbourhood Plan documentation.

As the NPPF explains there are no ‘hard and fast’ rules for determining how big and LGS can be. A guidance statement as to what constitutes an ‘extensive tract of land’ is contained in the Natural England publication ‘Nature Nearby’ Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance. This was adopted in the Cotswold DC Toolkit referred to above. LGS 2 is well below the 20ha suggested.

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.” (Paragraph 007, reference ID: 37-007-20140306)

5.18 The justification to policy ENV1 is that *“without these designations countryside that is highly important to the character and setting of the town and the wellbeing of residents might be lessened”*. No evidence is provided as to how these areas of land are important to the setting of the town or the wellbeing of residents.

Furthermore, there is no evidence to illustrate how the importance of this land would be reduced without such a designation. It appears that the LGS designation in this location only serves to block future development, when the policies of the Core Strategy already protect against development in open countryside.

5.19 Indeed the LGS designation is not aligned to the evidence base of the Core Strategy. The Local Planning Authority assessed the landscape sensitivity of land surrounding key growth settlements, including Shipston-on-Stour. The evidence base highlights that land to the west of the town (including land at Shoulderway Lane) is of medium sensitivity in terms of being able to accommodate housing growth. In comparison, land to the north is classified as high/medium to high in terms of its landscape sensitivity while land to the east is all predominantly classed as high sensitivity. As such, the land at Shoulderway Lane is the least sensitive from a landscape perspective; in direct contrast to the content of the SSNP.

5.20 In light of the evidence base, it is important to note the content of paragraph 77 of the NPPF. This paragraph makes it clear that a LGS designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. Such designations should only be used *“where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance...”*. The evidence base is clear that the land to the west of the town is not of particular significance.

5.21 RCA consider (and District Council Officers agreed in the Committee Report) that the previous planning application proposed a high level of open space and landscaping to the west of the 106 new homes, securing a suitable landscape buffer and recreational area on the most sensitive part of the site. The area broadly aligns to the LGS designation in the SNPP, however as previously stated, this designation will not be supported without the

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

accompanying development.

Policy ENV2: Ensuring development respects the landscape setting:

5.22 It is accepted that this policy does align with the Local Plan and National Policy by protecting local character and encouraging good design.

5.23 The design of the previous proposed development of 106 dwellings on land at Shoulderway Lane sought to minimise impacts on local hillsides and was blended into the existing landscape. The built form and hard landscaping materials were reflective of the local landscape character. Furthermore, the proposal also sought to include significant hedgerow and tree planting in order that the development would blend with the existing character and pattern of the landscape within the locality.

5.24 In addition, the careful siting of the dwellings would also reduce identified or perceived adverse effects. This could also be enhanced by replanting gaps in the existing hedgerow and provision of additional planting to the eastern and southern boundaries.

5.25 RCA have already demonstrated how residential development on land at Shoulderway Lane could be compatible with local landscape character and the setting of Shipston-on-Stour. RCA welcome further opportunities to discuss this with the SNPP team.

Summary of Shoulderway Lane site:

5.26 RCA consider that the land at Shoulderway Lane is a site that positively responds to a number of priorities set out in the emerging SSNP. It will clearly make a positive contribution to addressing affordable housing need, for which evidence demonstrates that such a need is substantial. An allocation here would be in compliance with the District Council's strategic policies contained within the Core Strategy as well as the national planning policies contained within the NPPF.

5.27 The scale of development will also make significant contributions for on-site and off-site infrastructure as required under INF1. Development here would also be compatible with the flooding minimisation objectives of the SSNP and the proposed drainage strategy was supported by the two key statutory consultees during the determination of the previous application.

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

5.28 There is no justification for large areas of agricultural land to the west of Shipston-on-Stour being allocated as LGS. In direct contrast, the evidence base³ to the Core Strategy identifies that this land is the least sensitive in landscape terms and has potential to accommodate further residential development. This was further reinforced by the Officer's report to committee where it was considered that the long-term impact upon the landscape from a residential development of the site would only be minor. This was informed by the inclusion of substantial additional planting buffers along key parts of the site.

5.29 RCA consider that the omission of formal assessment of the land at Shoulderway Lane is a significant shortcoming of the evidence base. This is compounded by the positive officer's recommendation, and the lack of evidence to counter the fact that there are no technical issues with the development of the site.

5.30 Failing to assess this site ignores the overall benefit the land at Shoulderway Lane can bring in meeting the broad aims of the SSNP. This site will deliver much needed affordable housing, including bungalows and homes for first time buyers. There is a substantial area of open space included within the scheme and there will be significant contributions to the provision of community infrastructure in the town.

5.31 Overall, RCA consider that until the SNPP has formally assessed this site and revised their views in respect of the many positive contributions that development on this site will make, that the plan cannot be submitted for examination.

3 Meeting a Revised Housing Requirement:
Options Assessment July 2015 Pre-Submission
Neighbourhood Plan Consultation RCA043ad
December 2016 Barratt and David Wilson Mercia
RCA Regeneration © 35
info@rcaregeneration.co.uk

6. SHIPSTON-ON-STOUR DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – GENERAL COMMENTS

6.1 While previous aspects of this response have focused upon the wider housing issues impacting upon the SSNP as well as the positive contributions that land at Shoulderway Lane can make to addressing key issues of the emerging plan, it is recognised that the remit of sustainable

5.28 Planning Practice Guidance has been adhered to and additionally a LGS Checklist developed by an adjacent LPS (Cotswold DC). This is a comprehensive 44-point assessment covering 12 different aspects of Local Green Space nomination. The completed Checklist is documented in the Audit & Issues Report (Oct 2016) that forms part of the Neighbourhood Plan documentation.

As the NPPF explains there are no 'hard and fast' rules for determining how big and LGS can be. A guidance statement as to what constitutes an 'extensive tract of land' is contained in the Natural England publication 'Nature Nearby' Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance. This was adopted in the Cotswold DC Toolkit referred to above. LGS 2 is well below the 20ha suggested.

RCA/Shoulderway
Lane

development incorporates a broader set of issues. Accordingly, the following paragraphs provide analysis of other policies within the SSNP.

6.2 The draft plan has clearly been developed following some initial informal consultation and review. It is noted that the quality and content of the SSNP has improved over time.

Policies EC1 – EC9:

6.3 The support for employment uses to remain in the town is understandable and forms a key part of the policies in this section. However, on this point the SSNP lacks some coherence as there are too many policies covering the same sites or repeated elsewhere.

6.4 Policy EC2 appears to provide 'carte blanche' to potential employment development in virtually any location within the SSNP boundary; the SSNP covers large areas of agricultural land and it is debatable whether local people would support employment uses (EC2), live-work units (EC5) or a large hotel (EC6) in these locations.

6.5 Policy EC3 seems largely redundant and could be covered effectively under EC1 if the policies map is amended to identify those other planned mixed use sites referred to within this policy.

6.6 Policy EC4 overlays policy EC1. The turbine blading site sits within Tileman Hill and is therefore the same site.

6.7 Policies EC8 and 9 are quite specific and it is debatable whether they are really policies. A key issue is how these improvements will be delivered – something which is discussed below in the infrastructure section.

Policies INF1-3:

6.8 Policy INF1 identifies that developments will be supported when they trigger contributions. The policy identifies that infrastructure pressures will grow over time. Given that there is little allocation within the Plan it is unclear where these contributions will come from.

6.9 Policy INF2 appears to be a duplication of 'policy' EC7.

Policies FLD1-3:

6.10 The key issue with these policies is that they largely duplicate of existing local or national policy. The standards requested in these policies exceed national standards. However, there is no clear justification why the already stringent standards should be subject to a further increase. RCA consider that it should be borne in mind that such standards consider the implications of climate change and are developed by experts. Unless

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

robust evidence can be provided, there appears little point in pursuing the inclusion these policies.

Policies ENV1-6:

6.11 Earlier in this representation, RCA raised very serious concerns regarding Policy ENV1, where it allocates two areas as LGS. The policy then states that development on this land will be resisted “other than in very special circumstances”. Very Special Circumstances is a Green Belt test and one that pertains to the assessment of development proposals against Green Belt policy. RCA object strongly to the use of this terminology and consider that it could be construed as introducing the same policy tests on LGS sites within the plan area. Neighbourhood Plans cannot make Green Belt designations.

6.12 It is debatable whether Policies ENV2 and ENV3 are needed as these are quite general and are therefore covered within the Stratford-upon-Avon Core Strategy. ENV4 appears to repeat policy EC9.

6.13 In terms of Policy ENV5, it is not clear what this policy is actually seeking to achieve. The areas of land appear to fall within the ownership of various community organisations and clubs. Whilst the overall concept of allowing residents access to these areas is laudable, it is not entirely clear what the purpose of this policy is and how it is justified.

6.14 Furthermore, it is noted that the emerging SSNP is proposing a prospective permissive path along the western edge of land at Shoulderway Lane. For completeness, there is no Public Right of Way extending across the Shoulderway Lane site and this was confirmed by the Public Rights of Way team recently.

6.15 The SSNP contains no delivery mechanism for the provision of such a path; particularly as the land is privately owned and forms part of an existing agricultural field. Such a pathway can only be delivered as part of a wider development of the site.

Housing policies HSG1-8:

6.16 These policies broadly seek to ensure a supply of affordable and specific housing for the elderly alongside planning allocations beyond 2021. These are limited in nature and it is not clear that future allocations will achieve the aims to maintain a supply of affordable units or dwellings for elderly residents.

6.17 Essentially, the future allocation of 40 units

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

cannot tackle the severe levels of undersupply in the area. This has already been discussed in some detail in preceding chapters.

6.18 The explanatory text under Policy HSG4 suggests that a range of sites were considered by the SSNP team. The 'Housing Audit and Issues Report – Addendum' dated October 2016 clearly identifies that the Shoulderway Lane site was not considered at all. In Chapter 5, the flaws in the approach are tackled directly, had the site been considered against the general principles of emerging policies it would be well aligned.

6.19 Policy HSG5 seeks to promote self-build plots which, whilst a laudable aim, is extremely difficult to deliver on a scale larger than 2 or 3 plots at a time. Where there is a S106 agreement in place, the difficulty can be further compounded by the liability to pay commuted sums, trigger points and so on. Moreover, the management of multiple self-build projects in close proximity can also present problems and impact on neighbouring residential amenity. Sites that have the capacity to deliver 20 units or more are more likely to appeal to smaller building companies, of which there are very few locally. As previously mentioned, such sites tend not to be able to deliver the required economies of scale and often then cannot afford to make the proportionate levels of planning obligation to offset their impact on community infrastructure.

6.20 Policies HSG6 and 7 require further refinement as they run very close to contradicting other policies to protect employment use. HSG8 goes even further and would effectively result in a residential scheme as extra care and public open space being acceptable under this policy.

6.21 The above analysis indicates that, whilst the presentation of the plan has improved during its evolution, there is still further work required to ensure the SSNP is a useful, justified and robust policy document. Some of the general policies are considered flawed as follows:

☒ There are repetitions of policy throughout and policies in relation to flooding are covered by the Core Strategy.

☒ Policies contradict each other, the Tileman Hill employment site is viewed as failing whilst other policies seem to identify a demand for (and then create policies to support) more employment land. The exact issues do not appear to be particularly well understood.

☒ Policies to promote tourism and employment are very general and would permit such development

6.19: it might well be inconvenient for large builders to make dwelling plots for sale to custom and self-builders, but enforcing such sales appears to be one of the most effective ways of meeting local demand for such plots and so complying with paragraph 50 of the NPPF. The draft Plan also encourages development proposals for custom and self-build on smaller sites in Shipston.

RCA/ Shoulderway Lane

at any location within the Neighbourhood Plan.

- Policy ENV1 seeks to allocate private land and effectively sterilise the ability of Shipston-on-Stour to grow sustainably in the future. This approach is somewhat cynical.

6.22 RCA have concerns regarding the implementation and delivery of the policies contained within the SSNP. In this regard, it is important to note the content of paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This paragraph details the four key tests for determining whether a plan is sound. The paragraph identifies that a plan must be 'effective' which means that the plan should be deliverable.

6.23 It is noted that a number of policies simply state the desires of the SSNP team but provide no robust evidence or clear methodology for implementation. Examples of this include the allocation of the 'wellbeing zones' under policy ENV5 and the Permissive Path under ENV1. In essence, the proposed permissive path is proposing a walking route through private land. While support is given to promoting healthy communities, as advocated by the National Planning Policy Framework, it is unclear how the NP intends to require the landowner to make their land available to complete the walking route. In order to deliver this policy, there appear to be two options: the District or County Council could use compulsory purchase powers to obtain the land. The costs to the Council alone would make this completely unrealistic. Alternatively, such a route could be delivered as part of a development proposal. Without a definitive mechanism for delivering such policy requirements, the SSNP is simply a 'wish list'.

6.24 RCA consider that the SSNP is still some way from meeting basic conditions; with critical weaknesses being a lack of allocated housing sites to meet its policies related to affordable housing and wider District objectives and that it fails to formally consider the Shoulderway Lane site for future development.

7.1 RCA Regeneration are instructed by Barratt and David Wilson Mercia to submit representations to

RCA/ Shoulderway Lane

the emerging Shipston-on-Stour Neighbourhood Plan. BDW Mercia have a land interest on land at Shoulderway Lane which recently was recommended for approval by Stratford-on-Avon District Council officers for the development of 106 new homes. BDW Mercia are promoting the site for inclusion within the SSNP as well as the emerging Districtwide Site Allocations Plan.

7.2 The adopted Core Strategy recognises that Shipston-on-Stour is a highly sustainable location for growth; being 1 of 8 Main Rural Centres within the Council's settlement hierarchy. As a result of its sustainable location, the Core Strategy proposes that a minimum of 510 homes will be delivered in the town during the plan period.

7.3 There is a substantial need for affordable housing in the District and Shipston on Stour. Alongside the identified affordable housing need, evidence from the GBSLEP highlights a significant shortfall in housing land, some of which will need to be allocated to Stratford on Avon District. This fact is recognised by the adopted Core Strategy which states that a review will be undertaken once the final figures from the requisite evidence base is available.

7.4 Importantly, the adopted Core Strategy states that a future Site Allocations Plan will make an allowance for reserve sites. This is designed to provide flexibility in the plan and to ensure a 5 year housing land supply. Furthermore, such sites will also contribute to meeting unmet housing need arising from within and outside the Housing Market Area.

7.5 The Core Strategy states that reserve sites will be allocated based upon the settlement hierarchy. Accordingly, all Main Rural Centres will be required to make a significant contribution to the 2,920 unit reserve. However, a number of Main Rural Centres are constrained in terms of their ability to accommodate growth. Such constraints are not applicable to Shipston-on-Stour. Accordingly, there is a fundamental need for the SSNP to address the issue of reserve sites.

7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Consultation RCA043ad December 2016 Barratt and David Wilson Mercia RCA Regeneration © 41
info@rcaregeneration.co.uk

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

7.6 In connection with the above, the housing growth policies contained within the adopted Core Strategy recognise that growth to the Main Rural Centres is to be a minimum. In contrast, growth to Local Service Villages (the next tier down in the settlement hierarchy) is more restrictive.

Accordingly, to deliver the unmet housing need, growth will be required in the Main Rural Centres in order to comply with the dispersal strategy contained within the Core Strategy (see paragraph 3.3). Many of the other MRCs are constrained by greenbelt and floodplain or have already identified reserve sites to cater for unmet need. RCA considers that this places greater pressure on the SSNP to do more than 'just the minimum' and allocate further sites for development. This is considered to be a fundamental issue not addressed in the current iteration of the SSNP.

7.7 This representation explains why the land at Shoulderway Lane is positively aligned to the requirements of the SSNP. The development will contribute 35% affordable housing, in line with the Core Strategy. This scale of development is considered to be a significant benefit when judged against the scale of affordable housing need and the Council's persistent undersupply. Such provision supports a key local priority identified within the SSNP.

7.8 Alongside the above, the development would provide financial contributions towards additional healthcare, education, leisure facilities, green infrastructure, highways and transportation, and measures to improve flood resilience.

7.9 It is recognised that the proposed residential development on Shoulderway Lane would alter the immediate landscape; which is proposed to be classified as a LGS within the SSNP. However, this designation is not aligned to national policy and is not supported by the evidence base to the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy evidence shows that the western aspect of the town is the least sensitive from a landscape perspective for accommodating residential development.

Accordingly, allocating development to Shoulderway Lane would be in conformity with national guidance and the Council's own evidence.

7.10 Ultimately, the officers of the District Council were satisfied that proposals on land at Shoulderway Lane were acceptable in policy terms when appraised against the Core Strategy and national planning policy. The fact that the SSNP evidence base has not analysed this site is

RCA/Shoulderway Lane

RCA/Shoulderway Lane	<p>considered to be a significant flaw.</p> <p>7.11 Alongside the above, it is considered that there are further shortcomings within the draft SSNP as proposed. This is centred upon repetitive policies and a lack of delivery mechanism of many of the policy objectives. Without a clear methodology for delivery, the SSNP merely acts as a 'wish list' with limited ability to achieve such objectives.</p> <p>7.12 RCA consider that the SNPP in its current form is not ready to be submitted for examination and requires further work. 7.13 RCA and BDW Mercia warmly welcome further discussions with the SNPP team covering both the general and more site-specific policies of the emerging SNPP, as well as further contributions to the evidence base underpinning it.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Consultation RCA043ad December 2016 Barratt and David Wilson Mercia RCA Regeneration © 38 info@rcaregeneration.co.uk</p>	
RCA/Shoulderway Lane		

25. Gladman Developments Ltd Gladman	<p>Introduction</p> <p>This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the first draft version of the Shipston-On-Stour Neighbourhood Plan (SOSNP) under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Gladman request to be added to the Town Council's consultation database and to be kept informed on the progress of the emerging neighbourhood plan. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy.</p> <p>Gladman would like to offer their assistance in the preparation of the neighbourhood plan for the submission version of the neighbourhood plan and invite the Town Council to get in touch regarding this.</p> <p>Legal Requirements</p> <p>Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of</p>	

Gladman	<p>the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the SOSNP must meet are as follows:</p> <p>(a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.</p> <p>(d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>(e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</p> <p>(f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role in which they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.</p> <p>At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account the latest and most up-to-date evidence of housing needs in order to assist the Council in delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition.</p>	
Gladman	<p>The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development.</p> <p>Paragraph 17 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a clear and positive vision for the future of the area and policies contained in those plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive</p>	

and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.

Paragraph 49 of the Framework is clear that ‘relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites’. This applies not only to statutory development plan documents but is also applicable to both emerging and ‘made’ neighbourhood plans. This has also been confirmed in the High Court.

Paragraph 184 of the Framework makes clear that local planning authorities will need to clearly set out their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. The Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that it is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.

Planning Practice Guidance

It is clear from the requirements of the Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan. On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take toG review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.

Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. It is with that in mind that Gladman has reservations regarding the SOSNP’s ability to meet basic condition (a), (d) and (e) and this will be discussed in greater detail throughout this response.

Relationship to Local Plan

The current adopted plan that covers the Shipston-on-Stour Neighbourhood Plan area and the development plan which the SOSNP will be tested against, is the

Gladman

Statford-on-Avon District Council Local Plan 2011-2031 (SoALP), recently adopted in July 2016. The plan will be helpful for the continued preparation of the SOSNP with, at present, an up to date evidence base upon which to align the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. In the SoALP, Shipston-on-Stour is classed as a main rural centre suitable for housing and business development to help meet development needs of the district; it is expected that this will be achieved through allocation of reserve sites within neighbourhood plans or through the production of a site allocations document. The plan contains a section for Shipston-on-Stour setting a vision for the area; it is important that the SOSNP does not unnecessarily repeat or conflict with these strategic aims.

Shipston-on-Stour Neighbourhood Plan

The SOSNP seeks to allocate reserve housing sites to meet the needs of local residents, following a housing need survey undertaken in 2013. It is important to note that this is not an Objectively Assessed Need and should not be treated as such, this evidence should be used to help inform the minimum requirement when allocating reserve sites, as highlighted in the SoALP. The examiner's report for the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan in Mid Sussex confirms this and stated that: "Given that the strategic objective of the plan refers to "at least 130", I assume it to be a minimum. If it were to be a maximum this would not allow for the flexibility the Framework seeks in responding to changing conditions."

It would be therefore inappropriate and contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions to restrict sustainable development progressing. Gladman contends that in its current form the SOSNP is contrary to the basic conditions of neighbourhood plans as some of the policies are not in accordance with the Framework and may be considered to not be in accordance with the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan. These will be addressed below.

Policy ENV1 Conserving the adjoining countryside

The plan intends to designate two parcels of land as Local Green Space (LGS) to protect the countryside. In order to designate land as LGS the Town Council must ensure that it is able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet national policy requirements set out in the Framework. The Framework makes clear at §76 that the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development for the wider area.

Paragraph 76 states that: 'Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable

See response to RCA/Shoulderway Lane submission paras 4.3 *et seq* (above).

Gladman

Gladman

development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period' Further guidance is provided at §77 which sets out three tests that must be met for the designation of LGS and states that: 'The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- Where the green space is reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and
- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.'

The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the advice and guidance contained in the PPG. Gladman note paragraph 007 of the PPG which states, 'Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines the aim of plan making.'

Of further note is paragraph 015 of the PPG(ID37-015) which states,

'Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently, blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name.'

Designation of LGS should not be used as a mechanism to designate new areas of Green Belt (or similar), as the designation of Green Belt is inherently different and must meet a set of stringent tests for its allocation (paragraphs 82 to 85 of the Framework).

The issue of whether LGS meets the criteria for designation has also been explored in a number of Examiner's Reports across the country and highlight the following decisions: - The Blackwell Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report recommended the deletion of two LGS designations measuring approximately 19ha and 32ha respectively and found both designations did not have regard to national policy which states that LGS should only be used where the area concerned 'is not an extensive tract of land.'

Policy ENV1 Conserving the adjoining countryside
Gladman provide extracts from the NPPF and the advice and guidance contained in the PPG. The NP are fully familiar with these documents and have used them as the primary guidance in the case for LGS2.
As evidence to their observations, Gladman further give illustrations from other NP's (none in this District) concerning definitions of 'extensive tracts of land'. Without knowing the context of the settlements quoted it is impossible to determine if these have any relevance. By contrast, The NP Team have drawn their guidance from the evidence obtained and applied by a neighbouring District (Cotswold DC). The comprehensive checklist they have developed and used arguably goes well-beyond the NPPF and PPG. They have drawn on recommendations at national level set out BY Natural England (Nature Nearby – Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance) and the WCC guidance (Neighbourhood Planning for Health). The 'tract of land' involved in LGS2 is in fact below the maximum level suggested of 20ha.
The case for LGS is comprehensively dealt with in the Audit & Issues Report which together with the Addendum dated October 2016 forms an integral part of the NP documentation.
See also CEF ??

Gladman

- The Seldlescombe Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately 4.5ha as it was found to be an extensive tract of land.

- The Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately 5ha and also found this area not to be local in character. Thereby failing to meet 2 of the 3 tests for LGS designation.

- The Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report identifies that both sites proposed as LGS in the neighbourhood plan 'in relation to the overall size of Alrewas Village' to be extensive tracts of land. The Examiner in this instance recommended the deletion of the proposed LGSs which measured approximately 2.4ha and 3.7ha.

Gladman contends that as LGS2 is 18.24 ha it is indeed an extensive tract of land; and as such conflicts with §77 of the Framework and the designation should be removed. The Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan does not deem it necessary to protect the land to the south west of Shipston-on-Stour with such a designation. Gladman questions the motives as well as the extent of this allocation.

Policy HGS4 Allocating housing land to meet local needs from 2021 onward

Paragraph 173 of the Framework states that:
'pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan- making and decision takings. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal costs of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.

This policy allocates two sites for development to accommodate approximately 40 dwellings to meet local housing needs following the housing needs survey. It is unclear whether development is restricted to 'affordable housing' as policies HGS1, HGS2 and HGS3 would suggest. If this is the case this would conflict with Paragraph 173 of the Framework as solely affordable developments would not provide a competitive return for a willing landowner/developer and therefore would be unviable and unlikely to be delivered in the plan period. PPG states 'if the policies and proposals are to be implemented as the community intended a neighbourhood plan needs to be deliverable.' It is considered further work is therefore necessary to clarify the policies relating to housing to ensure viability and deliverability to therefore meet the basic conditions of

Policy HSG4: the development in Shipston of Angela's Meadow (a scheme of 26 affordable homes) by a Housing Association illustrates that the development of relatively small sites for 100% affordable or similar specialist housing can be a viable proposition.
See also support for small scale developments

Gladman

neighbourhood plans.
As the plan is seeking to maintain a supply of affordable housing throughout the plan period it will be necessary to increase the total housing market levels to ensure the desired affordable housing levels can be delivered whilst ensuring a competitive return for a willing landowner/developer.
Policy HGS5 Encourage custom and self-build housing opportunities Gladman questions why developers will need to provide at least 5% of dwelling plots for sale to custom or self-builders without sufficient evidence to warrant the policies inclusion and suggest this policy is removed. This adds a further burden to potential development and should be agreed on a development by development basis where there is evidence for demand.
Policy HGS7 Encouraging the re-use of previously developed land Whilst this policy is only encouraging the re-use of previously developed land the objective of this policy is to prioritise previously developed land before the development of new greenfield sites on the edge of the settlement. Gladman generally support the principle of brownfield development, §111 of the Framework states that planning policies should encourage the effective use of land by re- using land that has previously been developed, it does not state that brownfield development should be prioritised. Whilst recognising the Town Council's ambitions to provide housing on brownfield land, this should not restrict the development of sustainable greenfield sites. It is also worth noting that there is likely to be brownfield land which is not sustainable and this should not be given priority for development over and above sustainable greenfield sites. An over reliance on brownfield development which acts to restrict housing delivery on sustainable greenfield sites is contrary to the Framework. A key objective of the Framework is to boost significantly the supply of housing, it also details the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and explicitly neither of these restricts greenfield development in favour of brownfield.
Strategic Environment Assessment
Gladman raises concern with the lack of a Strategic Environment Assessment scoping report to show that in the process of allocating land for housing that there will not be a significant effect on the environment of Shipston-on-Stour, similar documents have been produced but Gladman wishes to alert the Town Council that these would not be considered a true SEA scoping report through examination.
The preparation of Neighbourhood Plans falls under the scope of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SEA Regulations) that require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be undertaken where a Plan's proposals would be likely to have significant environmental effects. The need for an SEA should be established early in the

from Warwickshire rural Housing Assoc.and Bromford Housing Group

HSG5: requests were made by the public during the preparation of the Plan to include such provision.

HSG7: comment noted. The overwhelming weight of public opinion in the town is that greenfield development at the urban fringe needs to be curtailed. This is probably the community's main priority for the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy HSG7 therefore seeks to ensure that suitable opportunities to re-use previously developed land are exploited in preference to further expansion on greenfield sites.

Gladman

Neighbourhood Plan preparation process through the completion of a Screening Assessment, ensuring that a Neighbourhood Plan's proposals have been fully considered against all reasonable alternatives where an SEA would be required .

The PPG specifically states that a SEA may be required where:

- A neighbourhood plan allocates sites for development
- The neighbourhood plan area contains sensitive natural or heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals in the plan
- The neighbourhood plan is likely to have significant environmental effects that have not already been considered and dealt with through a sustainability appraisal of the Local Plan.

Gladman consider that without the Screening Assessment being made available it is difficult to establish whether an SEA is required. We therefore take this opportunity to inform the Town Council that any failure to comply with the requirements of the SEA Regulations would result in the Plan being found contrary to basic condition (f).

If it is identified that an SEA is required then the Town Council will need to ensure that the SOSNP is compatible with the SEA regulations. The SEA Regulations make clear at section 12(2) that 'the report shall identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on environment of – (a) implementing the plan or programme; and (b) reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme.'

The Town Council should ensure that it assesses each reasonable alternative in a consistent and transparent manner detailing the reasons why some alternatives have progressed and others have been rejected.

Gladman wishes to draw attention to the recent Stonegate judgement where the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan was quashed on grounds relating to the SEA process undertaken and failure to comply with EU law.

Conclusions

Gladman recognise the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman have sought to clarify the relation of the SOSNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area. Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not fully comply with basic conditions (a), (d) and (e) the plan seeks designate LGS that is considered an extensive tract of land and some of the policies lack clarity required to be applied consistently, without this clarity it is considered some of the policies may not be deliverable if in practice they

<p>WCC</p>	<p>clear basis that any such uses will not conflict with the use and efficient operation of the GMS or come to restrict the possible future development of the land for other than school purposes.</p> <p>The issue of public access and nature of the above proposals outlined appear to conflict with the Northern Wellbeing Zone and so WCC must OBJECT to the proposed policy as it stands. Name: Jonathan Horsfield For_organisation: The Physical Assets Service, Warwickshire County Council Please indicate to which sector we should best allocate your comments: public_body</p>	
<p>27.</p> <p>Stansgate Planning for Patrick Holley/Hanson Hill LGS</p> <p>Patrick Holley/Hanson Hill LGS</p>	<p>Comments: PARAGRAPH 3.5.7 POLICY ENV1 – HANSON HILL LOCAL GREEN SPACE</p> <p>The following representation is made on behalf of Mr Patrick Holley, who is one of the landowners of LGS2 - Hanson Hill Local Green Space.</p> <p>Planning Policy Context</p> <p>NPPF paras 76 to 78</p> <p>Paragraph 76 - states that local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them.</p> <p>Paragraph 77 states -</p> <p>The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; • where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and • where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. <p>Relevant Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 37-007-20140306 Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.</p> <p>Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 37-009-20140306. Local Green Spaces may be designated where those spaces are demonstrably special to the local community, whether in a village or in a neighbourhood in a town or city.</p> <p>Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 37-014-20140306 The proximity of a Local Green Space to the community it serves will depend on local</p>	<p>Hanson Hill Local Green Space</p> <p>In the representation, Stansgate act for only a minority portion (6.09ha) of the total area of LGS2 (18.24ha). This being the case, statements from them that refer to the whole area are outside of their remit.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance has been adhered to and additionally a LGS Checklist developed by an adjacent LPS (Cotswold DC). This is a comprehensive 44-point assessment covering 12 different aspects of Local Green Space nomination. The completed Checklist is documented in the Audit & Issues Report (Oct 2016) that forms part of the Neighbourhood Plan documentation.</p> <p>As the NPPF explains there are no 'hard and fast' rules for determining how big and LGS can be. A guidance statement as to what constitutes an 'extensive tract of land' is contained in the Natural England publication 'Nature Nearby' Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance. This was adopted in the Cotswold DC Toolkit referred to above. LGS 2 is well below the 20ha suggested.</p> <p>In contrast, whilst Stansgate can give their opinion that LGS 2 is an 'extensive tract of land',</p>

Patrick
Holley/Hanson Hill
LGS

circumstances, including why the green area is seen as special, but it must be reasonably close. For example, if public access is a key factor, then the site would normally be within easy walking distance of the community served.

Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 37-015-20140306
Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. ...blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name.

Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 37-017-20140306
Some areas that may be considered for designation as Local Green Space may already have largely unrestricted public access, though even in places like parks there may be some restrictions. However, other land could be considered for designation even if there is no public access (e.g. green areas which are valued because of their wildlife, historic significance and/or beauty).

Designation does not in itself confer any rights of public access over what exists at present. Any additional access would be a matter for separate negotiation with land owners, whose legal rights must be respected.

Hanson Hill Local Green Space – Analysis

LGS2 measures 18.6 hectares and constitutes a large area of open countryside and “an extensive tract of land.” Its designation as LGS fails for this reason alone.

According to government policy (NPPF), designation of a Local Green Space should only be used where it is demonstrably special to a local community AND holds a particular local significance AND is local in character. As will be argued next, the proposed designation fails all three requirements, even though only one failure is sufficient for the land not to be designated as LGS.

There is no evidence provided as part of the Neighbourhood Plan to explain what makes this field particularly “local”; that is, distinctive from other fields in the parish, district or county. Indeed, the particular justification on page 34 of the draft NP for designating this land as LGS does not stand up to scrutiny:

“LGS2 will ensure the upper slopes and tops remain open.....”
Existing policies in the Core Strategy will protect the upper slopes from development.

“.....there to be viewed and enjoyed as an amenity and recreational asset.”
There is no public access to LGS2. It has no role as a public amenity or recreational asset. A public footpath runs through the LGS, NE/SW along a track leading to the top of Hanson Hill. However, LGS designation makes no difference to the level

this is not supported by any external evidence. The evidence supporting LGS2 as a Local Green Space is contained in the Environment Audit and Issues Report – Addendum October 2016. This documentation forms part of that supporting the Shipston on Stour Neighbourhood Plan.

Stansgate have not seen fit to number their paragraphs therefore referencing is cumbersome. At one point, they refer to “...this field”. LGS2 comprises of a number of fields and the 6.09ha that they represent itself comprises of three fields so it is difficult to make comment on their statement.

Clear evidence is presented in the above-mentioned Audit and Issues Report that make clear the value and importance placed by the community on the setting and open space. This evidence includes the ‘all-houshold’ survey conducted in 2016.

Stansgate make a statement in their submission “Existing policies in the Core Strategy (CS) will protect the upper slopes from development”. They provide no cross-reference to the CS as evidence to validate or clarify this statement. Without these specifics, it is difficult to comment.

Stansgate do not appear to appreciate the role and value of green open space to a community. This is well-documented and extensively researched in independent reports at national and county level. The contents of such reports, together with the views of the community inform the basis for the LGS designations in this Neighbourhood Plan.

Ref. Nature Nearby from Natural England
Ref Neighbourhood Development Planning for Health from Warwickshire County Council

As they correctly acknowledge, lack of access does not preclude the designation of an LGS. The Hanson Track bridleway as it is locally known is a huge asset to the community in providing access to open countryside. They make assumptive statements concerning the use of the Hanson Track without providing any evidence to support their stated opinion. Evidence supporting the LGS2 designation in terms of wildlife, historic significance and beauty is fully detailed in the Audit and Issues Report referred to above. It is interesting to note that the three particular fields for which Stansgate is acting were previously selected as potential Local Wildlife Sites in 2009 and permission was sought and given for such a designation by the landowners at that time. Subsequent ecological surveys have been undertaken and found a high diversity exists and has the potential to grow over time.

Patrick
Holley/Hanson Hill
LGS

of public access to any part of Hanson Hill or the wider countryside. Although lack of public access does not preclude its designation as LGS, it serves to weaken its alleged role as a space valuable to the local community.

“more and better use will be possible of existing public rights of way...”

There is no evidence for this claim. To repeat, there is only one public footpath through the LGS to link the top of Hanson Hill with Shipston on Stour. LGS designation will make no difference to the frequency of use of this footpath.

“a prospective permissive path to complete a circular route...”

This aspiration is irrelevant to LGS designation. Moreover, its prospective route lies adjacent to, but outside the LGS area.

With reference to NPPF paragraph 77, there is no evidence the land is particularly special in terms of its wildlife, historic significance or beauty. No claims about special wildlife or ecological value have been made by the draft NP. The land has no historic buildings and does not lie within or adjacent to the Conservation Area. There are no above-ground historic features of interest and no demonstrable reason for the site to be a Local Green Space on the grounds of its historic significance.

The land has no inherent beauty or distinctive landscape features other than being ordinary fields. Reference is made to the Stratford-on-Avon District – Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (July 2011). The proposed LGS lies within landscape parcel SH09 of Shipston on Stour. Parcel SH09 has been identified by the LSA as:

- Medium sensitivity to housing development. This is the lowest category of any parcel of land around the edge of Shipston on Stour.
- High/High medium sensitivity to commercial development. This is the joint lowest category of any parcel of land around the edge of Shipston on Stour.

This independent landscape character assessment does not support the identification of LGS2 as LGS due to its particular beauty, sensitivity or local significance. On the contrary, by scoring the lowest in terms of its sensitivity to residential or commercial development, the assessment makes a good case for LGS designation to be removed from this land.

The Draft NP states proposals for “any development on this land will be resisted other than in very special circumstances.” The phrase “very special circumstances” is taken from Green Belt policy, which is a particularly restrictive policy to which the government attaches “great importance” (paragraph 79 of the NPPF). Local Green Space designation does not merit such a high level of restriction. The draft NP Policy ENV1 goes even further than Green Belt policy by restricting any type of development, including types that are appropriate in Green Belt, namely agricultural and forestry buildings, replacement buildings, sport and recreation buildings and

The status and value of the White Report is addressed in the supporting documentation to the NP and referred to several times. Stansgate have no offered any evidence to support their opinion and whilst all feedback is valuable, no changes are necessary to the NP.

Evidence supporting the LGS2 designation in terms of wildlife, historic significance and beauty is fully detailed in the Audit and Issues Report referred to above. It is interesting to note that the three particular fields for which Stansgate is acting were previously selected as potential Local Wildlife Sites in 2009 and permission was sought and given for such a designation by the landowners at that time. Subsequent ecological surveys have been undertaken and found a high diversity exists and has the potential to grow over time. The status and value of the White Report is addressed in the supporting documentation to the NP and referred to several times. Stansgate have not offered any evidence to support their opinion and whilst all feedback is valuable, no changes are necessary to the NP.

<p>Patrick Holley/Hanson Hill LGS</p>	<p>engineering operations. This high level of restriction sought by Policy ENV1 is unacceptable, outside the purpose of Local Green Space designation and will result in a “back door” way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name” (PPG Reference ID: 37-015-201403).</p> <p>Finally, the explanation for Policy ENV1 on page 33 reads “without these designations countryside that is highly important to the character and setting of the town and the wellbeing of residents might be lessened.” This explanation is incoherent and speculative. The absence of LGS designation does not result in countryside being “lessened”.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>The Submission Draft Shipston on Stour Neighbourhood Plan fails to demonstrate that LGS2 Hanson Hill Local Green Space is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance and is local in character. Stratford-on-Avon District Council’s Landscape Sensitivity Assessment demonstrably points to the opposite conclusion; that by the Framework’s and Planning Practice Guidance standards LGS2 does not qualify as a Local Green Space. Furthermore, as an “extensive tract of land” it is too large to be LGS. LGS2 should therefore be removed as a LGS designation from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Name: Andrew Murphy For_organisation: Stansgate Planning, on behalf of Mr Patrick Holley Please indicate to which sector we should best allocate your comments: landowner</p>	
<p>28 Letter 17/03/17 from SBK ref. land at Hanson Farm. Received after the consultation period closure date. See CEF NO ??</p>	<p>Parcel No 102 below Hanson Hill should not be identified in policy ENV 1 as LGS and should be made available for residential development</p>	<p>The majority of Parcel 102 remains identified in ENV1 as an LGS and that’s how it will remain in the NP. However, it is recognised that it may be appropriate to allow development up to the break of slope (around 85m AOD) as identified in the White Report and the 2012 SHLAA. No change necessary. See also CEF 043</p>
<p>29. By email 13/12/16 Mervin Holliday, resident</p>	<p> Comments: 3.3.5 There is totally inadequate car parking planned for the future. Parking spaces need to be of adequate width for todays vehicles, not the vehicles of 40 years ago..</p>	<p>3.3.5 Provides support for future schemes to improve parking within the physical constraints of the Town centre.</p>
<p>30. Nick Carr, Rosconn, Strategic land. Email 13/12/16</p>	<p>In the 2015 Draft Plan Policies, Policy H7 identified the land as Site A, allocating it for 35 homes (subject to complying with H2, H3 and H4). The pre-submission draft has not carried forward this allocation, seemingly due to highway concerns. We would be very keen to meet with the Steering Group, to firstly introduce ourselves and secondly to outline our vision for the site</p>	<p>Following discussions with Rosconn and the subsequent receipt of information from Warwickshire County Council, it is now clear that the highways objection to the development of this land for housing (which resulted in it being removed from the pre-submission draft Plan) no longer exists. The submitted Plan will therefore now include a</p>

		proposal to include the land to the north of Railway Crescent and Shipston Business Village in the Development Brief proposed for the Tileman's Lane area in Policy HSG 8.
31. Daniel Pulham/ Baptist Church Email 31/12/16	The NP is ignoring the need for a Baptist Church in Tilemans Lane?	Supported by 3.3.3 in NDP and AS.6 in SDC Core Strategy. Communication with the Baptist Church is ongoing.
32 Helen Ashton email 31/12/16	Thank you to the team who have worked to put this together and created this blueprint for a Shipston desired by the community.	Noted
33. National Grid Email 29/11/16	No Issues raised	Noted
34. Inland Waterways Email 23/11/16	No issues raised	Noted
35 Trustees Townsend Hall, Shipston Email to RT 11/03/17	Refurbishment needed to Townsend Hall	This is covered in policy 3.3.2 and CIL list 3.3.4 and in the Core Strategy 6.6 B3. Wording in Draft Plan Document and Consequent projects will be modified accordingly
36. Property manager Sheldon Bosley Hub via Town Clerk Reference future of Sheldon Bosley Hub. Received after the consultation period closure date	Discussion with Town Clerk concerning future of Sheldon Bosley Hub and property manager not aware of draft neighbourhood Plan. No specific issues raised	Noted. The NP team have no record of ownership of the Sheldon Bosley Hub, but the club management committee were informed and have had early contact with the NP.
37. Shipston Tourism Group via Town Clerk email 27/02/17 Received after the consultation period closure date	Funding for conversion of Old Clerk House into Tourism Centre/Museum	The project aligns with policies EC8 and EC6 and with policy CS24 in the Core Strategy. Agreed to add to Consequent Local projects List.
38. Consultation with SDC??	See separate document	
Consultee	Issues Raised	Policy/Action Addressed

