

Harbury Parish Council

Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting 1 December 2016 at 7.30pm The Farley Room, Harbury Village Hall

Present

Cllr Lockley (Chairman)	Cllr Christou	Cllr Gibb	Cllr Knowles
Cllr Thompson	Cllr Allen	Cllr Summers	Cllr Ekins
Cllr Mancell	Cllr Thornley		

Absent: None

In Attendance

Mrs Alison Biddle, Clerk to the Council
Michael Wellock (NDP Planning Consultant)

Public

Mrs Linda Ridgley, Harbury News
Members of the public: 10

16/268 Apologies: None

16/269 Declarations of Interest: None.

16/270 Dispensations: None.

16/271 Public Participation

Planning Application – Farm Close

A number of objections were raised to this planning application which included the following:

- It is in the conservation area and would have a harmful impact on neighbouring properties and the street scene.
- It is inappropriate over development of a garden site.
- It is too close to the existing building on the site.
- There are inaccuracies in the application documentation.
- It would mean the loss of mature trees and a wall.
- There would be difficulty turning in and out of the drive and would impact on road safety.

Neighbourhood Development Plan

- HEI has submitted some comments and it was confirmed that these had been circulated to councillors.
- A concern was raised about the inclusion of the site at the top of Bull Ring Farm Road within the settlement boundary. A planning application for this site was recently refused by SDC and therefore the boundary should be altered to exclude this site to prevent any possible future development.

16/272 Planning Application 16/03140/FUL

Proposed two storey cottage

Allington House, 1 Farm Close

It was **RESOLVED** to object to this application on the following grounds:

- There is a lack of enhancement to the conservation area.
- It is over development of the site.
- There will be an adverse impact on the street scene including the loss of trees and the possible loss of the wall.
- The proposal is contrary to the VDS, the PP and the emerging NDP.
- Harbury has already met its quota of housing under the Core Strategy.

- There are inaccuracies in the application which includes the photo purporting to be of Stonewalls which is in fact Pans Garden.
- As it is close to the junction with Farm Street there are implications for road safety.

16/273 Harbury Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 14 Pre-submission Public Consultation

1 Review of Table 1 – Representations from Stratford on Avon District Council

Comments were noted and amendments agreed as per table 1 at appendix 1.

Please note the following significant amendment:

It was **RESOLVED** to exclude the site at the top of Bull Ring Farm Road from the settlement boundary.

2 Review of Table 2 - Representations received statutory consultees, other bodies and members of the public

Comments were noted and amendments agreed as per table 2 at appendix 2.

3 Next Steps

The parish council's planning consultant will make the amendments as agreed above and prepare the documentation for submission to SDC.

There was some discussion about whether or not it will be necessary for the parish council to run a second public consultation as the settlement boundary has been changed to exclude the site at the top of Bull Ring Farm. The planning consultant was of the opinion that this would not be necessary but this is contrary to advice previously received from SDC. The clerk will contact SDC for further clarification,

16/274 Date of Next Meeting

The next ordinary meeting will be on 26 January 2017 at 7.30pm in Harbury Village Hall.

Meeting closed at 9.40pm

Signed.....Chairman Date.....

APPENDIX 1

Harbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

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

Table 1 - Comments from Stratford-on-Avon District Council

Policy related comments:

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Parish Council Response
Section 3 – Harbury Profile	Paragraph 3.1, p.14	Fourth line – should read ‘Stratford-upon-Avon.’	Agreed.
Section 3 – Harbury Profile	Paragraph 3.10, p.17	Final sentence should read ‘These were previously adopted by Stratford-on-Avon District Council and still have status as informal supplementary planning guidance.’	Agreed
Section 4 – Vision and Objectives	Objective 1, p.25	The objective looks to ensure that a significant proportion of new housing is affordable and retained in perpetuity for those with a ‘local’ connection. Given that housing policies within the NDP promote ‘windfall’ development within the village settlement boundary but do not look to promote allocated sites, concern is raised that the objective will not be met when considering the provisions of Policy CS.18 (Affordable Housing) of the Core Strategy in relation to scale of development necessary to trigger affordable housing provision and the level of provision required through the Core Strategy.	No change. This sets out the objective for the plan. It does not deal with implementation.
Section 4 – Vision and Objectives	Objective 6, p.26	The objective looks to ensure that all extensions and renovation of existing buildings will be carbon neutral. It is considered this is far too onerous a target and should be re-worded to read ‘...encouraging all extensions and renovations of existing buildings to be carbon neutral, where possible’ or something similar.	Agreed

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Parish Council Response
Map 1 – Settlement Boundary	Significant views, p.28	<p>Amend key to read ‘Significant views out of the village’ for clarification purposes. It is also queried whether the 4 views shown on the map are the only ‘significant’ views. It is not clear how they were chosen and what were is meant by ‘significant’ when evaluating a view?</p> <p>It is unclear as to why certain areas of land to the north and east of the village have been included within or excluded from the settlement boundary. Justification may be required in order to confirm consistency of approach in assessing the line of the boundary.</p>	<p>Agreed to amend key to read ‘Significant views out of the village’.</p> <p>The four views have been carried forward from the existing Village Design Statement – no change to Map 1 but include the justification that this is in accordance with the Village Design Statement</p> <p>It was RESOLVED to exclude the site at the top end of Bull Ring Farm Road (nearest the village) from the settlement boundary. This means the boundary will revert to existing built form as shown in the village design statement.</p>
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.01, p.30	<p>It is not considered that criteria a), c) and d) are compliant with the NPPF and Core Strategy as drafted since they are too restrictive. Propose amending the beginning of each of these three criteria: ‘do not have an unacceptable adverse impact...’ to provide a degree of consideration on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Delete ‘they’ from the beginning of criteria f).</p> <p>Delete ‘all development must be’ from criteria g) and replace with ‘are’.</p>	<p>Agreed to amend criteria a), c) and d) as suggested.</p> <p>Agreed to delete “they” from beginning of criterion f).</p> <p>Agreed to delete ‘all development must be’ from criteria g) and replace with ‘are’.</p>
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.01 – Background, p.31	<p>Delete paragraph 5.1 which refers to the Local Plan Review 2006.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2 – Remove the words ‘...any saved policies from the previous Local Plan’</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4 – Remove ‘now’ between ‘(Policy CS15)’ and ‘identifies’.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.5 – Consider adding the 4 no. sites with planning permission to Map 1 with cross-reference numbering to this paragraph for clarity.</p>	<p>Agreed to delete para 5.1</p> <p>Agreed to remove ‘any saved policies from the previous Local Plan’ from para. 5.2.</p> <p>Agreed to remove ‘now’ between ‘(Policy CS15)’ and ‘identifies’ from para. 5.4</p> <p>Agreed to amend Map 1 to show sites with planning permission.</p>

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Parish Council Response
<p>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</p>	<p>Policy H.03, p.35</p>	<p>It is unclear whether Policy H.03 is about meeting local needs or mainstream development to meet District needs or possibly both. Most of the Policy and paragraphs 5.11 and 5.12 appear to imply local needs but para 5.13 suggests District needs.</p> <p>Para 5.13 refers to determining affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy policy although I think that the wrong policy is quoted. The text refers to Policy CS17 in the Core Strategy which is about meeting housing needs from outside the District; it should probably be Policy CS18 which is about affordable housing.</p> <p>From a strategic housing perspective, if Policy H0.3 is intended to meet local needs, the wording of the actual Policy is fine except that it begs the question of what happens on sites with fewer than six homes.</p> <p>The policy states that the final housing mix on sites of 6 or more new dwellings should be agreed with the Parish Council. However, policies CS.18 (Affordable Housing) and CS.19 (Housing Mix and Type) set out District wide objectives and it is unclear how this policy as drafted would be in conformity to the Core Strategy, particularly given the preferred future housing provision as set out in Figure 4 accompanying this policy in the NDP.</p>	<p>Agreed to amend paras. 5.11, 5.12 and 5.13 to state that the NDP seeks to help meet the housing requirement identified for Category 1 Service Villages in the Core Strategy. Remove references to “need” in Policy H.03.</p> <p>Agreed to amend CS17 reference to CS18.</p> <p>6 or more dwellings is the threshold identified in Core Strategy Policy CS18 – Agreed no change.</p>
<p>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</p>	<p>Policy H.03 – Background, p.35</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.12 refers to the most recent Housing Needs Survey being carried out in 2011 and sets out the results of that survey. Concern is raised that this evidence is now out-of-date and an opportunity has been missed to update this evidence based work alongside and informing the NDP.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.13 – This should refer to Core Strategy Policy CS.18, not CS.17.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No change. The Housing Needs Survey is considered reasonably up to date and has been supplemented by information from the Harbury Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire.</p> <p>Agreed to amend CS17 reference to CS18.</p>

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Parish Council Response
<p>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</p>	<p>Policy H.04, p.36</p>	<p>Policy H.04 is definitely about meeting local needs but this then raises the question of the extent to which it overlaps/ duplicates Policy H.03 (Policy H0.4 also suggests that H.03 is about market led schemes). Once the intention of Policy H.03 has been clarified, Policy H.04 will have to be amended or possibly the two policies amalgamated into one policy.</p> <p>The term “Rural Exception Housing” in the heading may lead to confusion as the Core Strategy in Policy CS15 (G) refers to Local Needs Schemes; possibly use the heading “Local Needs Schemes – Rural Exception Housing”?</p> <p>The Policy should definitely refer to the fact that all such schemes must have the support of the Parish Council and that this should be the overriding consideration when determining whether any such schemes should receive planning permission.</p> <p>The policy should refer to the fact that such schemes may include Local Market Homes as well as affordable housing if that is the wish of the community.</p> <p>There may be a typo in the Policy itself “...will be supported in areas where it will not normally be considered when (unless?) it meets the following circumstances...”</p> <p>Criteria b) states that rural exception housing will be supported in locations that are ‘in reasonable walking distance of public transport and local community facilities’. Criteria a) include Deppers Bridge within the policy parameters. However, it is not considered that Deppers Bridge would comply with the provisions of criteria b) due to its remote location and as such it is considered that an application for a rural exception housing scheme in Deppers Bridge would fail the test</p>	<p>See note above on clarifying use of “need” in Policy H.03. Policy .04 is about meeting needs – no change as a result of this comment.</p> <p>Replace the term “Rural Exception Housing” in the heading and replace with that used in the Core Strategy “Local Needs Schemes”.</p> <p>Add in need to have support of Parish Council.</p> <p>Add to the policy reference to Local Market Homes if that is the wish of the community.</p> <p>Last line of policy preamble replace “when” with “unless”.</p> <p>Amend criterion (b) to:</p> <p>“in Harbury village it is within reasonable walking distance of public transport and local community facilities.”</p>

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Parish Council Response
		in this policy.	
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.05, p.37	It is unclear why criteria f) is applicable just to sites adjacent to Conservation Areas, or why it is considered appropriate for development to be set back from the road.	This is to preserve the street scene including historic trees and boundary walls
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.05 – Background, p.38	The ‘Background/Justification’ heading to the explanatory text is missing.	Agreed to add ‘Background/Justification’
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.06 – Background, p.38	The ‘Background/Justification’ heading to the explanatory text is missing.	Agreed to add ‘Background/Justification’
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.07, p.39	<p>Local Green Spaces should be written with capital L, G and S since they are describing a specific land designation.</p> <p>It is considered that the 10 LGS areas listed in this policy be numbered and the numbers transposed on to Map 2 for clarification purposes.</p> <p>Criteria h) Deppers Bridge Playing Field does not appear to be shown on Map 2.</p>	<p>Capitalise Local Green Space</p> <p>Number Local Green Spaces and add to map.</p> <p>Map Deppers Bridge Playing Fields.</p>

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Parish Council Response
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.09, p.44	<p>Add 'out of the village' between 'views' and 'shown' in the first line of the policy for clarification purposes.</p> <p>The policy refers to prominent views in to and out of Deppers Bridge. What views are these and where are they mapped?</p> <p><i>The policy asks that any new development provide a 'new view' if an existing view is obscured. It is not understood how this requirement could be achieved or controlled.</i></p>	<p>Agreed to amend first line of policy as suggested.</p> <p>It was agreed to delete references to views from Deppers Bridge. It was also agreed to delete "and where a new development obscures a view, a new view is provided".</p>
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.09 – Background, p.45	<p>Paragraph 5.21 looks to introduce policy in explanatory text. If the intention is to protect these particular views through the NDP, this requirement will need to be added to the policy itself. Are the views described from public footpaths/vantage points? They would also need to be mapped spatially.</p>	<p>Add views in para. 5.21 to Policy and Map. Paragraph 5.21 to be re-worded and the picture to be moved.</p>
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.10, p.45-46	<p>Criteria d) requests the retention of heritage assets. However, given the policy is looking to consider landscape design principles against which to assess development, it is suggested 'retention of' is replaced by 'impact on'.</p>	<p>Agreed to amend criterion (d) as suggested.</p>
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.10 – Background, p.46	<p>Whilst the background detail sets out the landscape context within which Harbury sits, it does not go on to explain what the policy is protecting and the rationale behind it.</p>	<p>Agreed to explain rationale for Policy H.10.</p>
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.11, p.46	<p><i>The policy asks that new development mitigates cumulative impact associated with other development in the area. 'In the area' is quite a vague description by which to assess the policy. Additionally it is not considered appropriate for development to compensate for deficiencies elsewhere in the village. It is recommended that the wording 'and to mitigate any cumulative impact that development may have in conjunction with other development in the area' be deleted.</i></p>	<p>Agreed to delete "and to mitigate any cumulative impact that development may have in conjunction with other development in the area."</p>

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Parish Council Response
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.11 – Background, p.46-47	<p>The ‘Background/Justification’ heading to the explanatory text is missing.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.24 – First line says ‘following’ so need to place Figure 5 after the paragraph.</p>	<p>Add ‘Background/Justification’</p> <p>Place Figure 5 after para. 5.24.</p>
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.12 – Background, p.49	It needs to be borne in mind that a shop unit can change what goods are sold without the need for planning permission.	Comment noted.
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.13, p.52-53	Some harm can occur through development and still be acceptable. In order to comply with the provisions of the NPPF, it is considered the wording of this policy requires minor modification to read: ‘Development proposals for new or improvements to existing community facilities will be supported when they preserve local character and distinctiveness and do not <i>cause unacceptable harm to the landscape...</i> ’	Agreed to amend as suggested.
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.14, p.54	<p>Criterion a) encourages applicants to first consult with the Parish Council. It may be more appropriate to re-word as follows: ‘Adopt sustainability measures promoted through the Harbury Energy Initiative and the Parish Council’.</p> <p>In relation to criteria c), it should be noted that under the Building Regulations, all new homes have an energy assessment on completion. However, it is unclear how and by whom performance could be monitored after purchase of new homes.</p> <p>It is not clear how criteria d) can be achieved and or insisted upon through this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed to amend as suggested.</p> <p>Agreed to delete criteria (c) and (d).</p>

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Parish Council Response
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.15, p.55-56	<p>To ask all development (of any scale) to include the highways measures requested is too onerous. Suggest deleting the word 'All' at the beginning of the policy.</p> <p>Criteria b) is a WCC Highways function and not a land-use planning matter and should be removed from the policy.</p> <p>It is not clear how criteria c) requesting access to public transport can be achieved, particularly given there are no site allocations for larger development proposals promoted through the NDP and as such the scale of any future development may be too small to require s.106 contributions.</p> <p>The 5 no. bullet points on p.56 are a mixture of WCC Highway functions and possible projects, not policy requirements. It is considered these items may not pass the Basic Conditions tests and may be removed from the policy by an Independent Examiner.</p>	<p>Agreed to amend first line of policy to:</p> <p>“Where appropriate development proposals should include measures to minimise their impact...”</p> <p>Agreed to delete (b).</p> <p>Agreed to amend (c) by deleting “Access to” and replacing it with “Encourage use of”</p> <p>Agreed to delete the bullet points.</p>
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.16 – Background, p.57	The policy relates to business and employment, but para. 5.32 refer to community facilities and services. Is this correct? Should reference to facilities be replaced with reference to business and employment opportunities?	Agreed to amend para 5.32 to refer to businesses.
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.18, p.60	Unsure why there is specific reference to ‘non-farm shop’ premises within the policy.	Agreed to delete reference to “non-farm shop”.
Section 5 – Policies and Proposals	Policy H.19, p.60	<p>Insert ‘non-designated’ between ‘local’ and ‘heritage’ in the first line of the policy.</p> <p>These assets should be numbered and added to a map for ease of reference.</p>	<p>Agreed to amend as suggested.</p> <p>Agreed to number and map.</p>

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Parish Council Response
		Unsure why there is an asterisk against Hillcrest Cottage Well and Pump.	This denotes a listed building. Add key/footnote.
Appendices	Appendix 1 – Map of Listed Buildings	It is considered including a larger scale map showing the buildings more clearly would be more appropriate and useful.	It was agreed to re-map.

APPENDIX B

Harbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

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

Table 2 - Comments from Residents, Businesses and Landowners

Policy related comments:

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
1 [REDACTED]		Policy H.07	Whilst I fully support the included areas I believe that the open space at the cul-de-sac end of Manor Orchard should also be included. This is certainly larger than the Pump Green and the Bull Ring Green and has been used as a play area and for community events, i.e. Jubilee celebrations.	This open space is owned by the parish council. It was agreed to include it on the list.
1 [REDACTED]		Policy H.15	In addition to the proposed priorities I believe that the support of a regular bus service to Leamington Spa and Southam should be added .	Comment noted. Improved bus services not a neighbourhood plan matter.
2 [REDACTED]		Policy H.01	On street parking should not be reduced by new development.	Comment noted.
2 [REDACTED]		Policy H.07	The Frances Road Green should be added to the list of green spaces.	This site is owned by SDC. It was agreed to add it to the list.

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
2 [REDACTED]		Policy H.09	"where a new development obscures a view, a new view is provided". This needs clarification; it could be argued that the view of the tenement obscuring the old view is the new view.	This point had already been covered when reviewing SDC's comments.
2 [REDACTED]		General comments	When building work has started it should be completed in a reasonable time. There is a trend for building work to be started to stop the planning clock, then abandoned for long periods of time, leaving an eyesore on the street scene. Public footpaths and rights of way within the village should be protected as they mark ancient boundaries and historical features.	Comments noted. The neighbourhood plan cannot influence development timescales. Public Rights if Way have existing protection.
3 [REDACTED]		Policy H.06	The definition of 'green infrastructure' should be expanded to specifically reference private garden and paddock. The character of our village is at risk of 'garden grabbing' and it is therefore important that our Neighbourhood Development Plan has provision to challenge inappropriate development.	It was agreed to amend policy H.06 to reference "paddocks". Development of gardens considered under criterion (e) of Policy H.01. No change arising from this latter comment.
3 [REDACTED]		Policy H.19	Support	Support noted.
4 Ian Mercer, Bruton Knowles		Suggested site allocation	I would like to submit formal representations in regards to the Harbury Neighbourhood Development Plan, namely in regards to the proposed development boundary. I am representing the land owners of the land north of Mill Street, Harbury, highlighted by the Green and Blue land as outlined on the	It was agreed that there should be no change to settlement boundary in this area. Core Strategy Policy AS.10 supports small scale housing schemes in Local Service Villages within the Built-Up Area Boundary. Most of the suggested site falls outside the Built-Up Area, with the exception of the garage and

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>Site Plan attached. The site has backing from a residential developer which (if the site came forward in the further) shows that the site is available and deliverable. The total site is circa 4.7 acres and therefore has a capacity of around 30-40 dwellings, subject to landscape and physical development considerations.</p> <p>From Map 1 in the Harbury Development Plan, part of the site has been incorporated within the proposed settlement boundary. This relates to "old flo's" petrol station and forecourt. The site has steadily become an eyesore, serving no functional or heritage purpose to the village. It is assumed that the inclusion of this site within the proposed settlement boundary suggests a desire for the site to be developed. This assumption has been concluded from the land at Bull Ring Farm also being included within the settlement boundary. I acknowledge that when this boundary was produced, it may have been expected that the proposed development at Bull Ring Farm (consisting of 32 C2 units and 21 C3 units) would be consented. The site has since this month been refused, with an appeal unlikely. This therefore leaves capacity for the proposed development boundary to be revised, to incorporate more of my clients' land.</p> <p>However, the site area that has been proposed to be included within the village's settlement boundary is too small to be a viable development site for any developer. Due to the site's historic use, there will be</p>	<p>forecourt.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Harbury NDP does not allocate other sites for development and the strategic allocation of development identified for Harbury in Core Strategy Policy CS.16 has already been met.</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>considerable remediation costs associated in order to bring the site into a state in which it is clear and safe for development. A small scale development of 5-10 dwellings would not support the pre development works as well as the associated costs of affordable housing and the pending Community Infrastructure Levy. For the site to be deliverable and viable, more of the land (as outlined by the attached site plan) will need to be brought into the confines of the village,</p> <p>Paragraph 5.12 identifies an inherent need for affordable housing within the village, as highlighted via the 2011 Harbury Housing Needs Survey. The most efficient way that significant numbers of affordable properties are delivered is through allocating larger sites. Therefore, not only will incorporating more land here remove the defunct petrol station, but also contribute significantly to the supply of affordable homes within the village. For example, a development here of 35 dwellings will provide 12 affordable units.</p> <p>Objective 1 of the Development Plan, identifies a desire to provide housing for people of all ages and incomes to live in the parish on small housing developments. I would argue that this objective is contradictory.</p> <p>Stratford District Council's affordable housing policy (CS.18) states that on site provision of affordable housing is only sought on sites with 11 or more dwellings. Further to this, policy CS.19 (Housing Mix) can only be</p>	

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>loosely employed on smaller scale sites. This leads to developments of circa 6 dwellings constituting of larger 4 or 5 bed properties, clearly going against the aspirations of Objective 1. Evidently, the only way for objective 1 to be a success, is to allocate larger sites.</p> <p>This then relates to Objective 5 — investment into community facilities. With larger developments, it is possible for the Parish Council to engage with developers in regards to wider community benefits, either directly or indirectly, through physical provision or via Section 106 Payments.</p> <p>I note that this suggested land is subject to a 'significant view' which provides a countryside view, maintaining a sense of the village's rural character. This is outlined by policy H.09. However, this policy states that these views are not sacrosanct, and that "where a new development obscures a view, a new view is provided". This could be achieved via considerate planning and landscaping within any proposed scheme on this site, framing the rural landscape and providing a more significant view to the one that currently exists.</p> <p>In July 2016, Stratford District Council adopted their Core Strategy, meaning that all of the contained policies are now being employed robustly. Further to this, Stratford also have a confirmed 5 Year Housing Land Supply. A recent Pre Application meeting that I was involved in regarding a Local Service Village, highlighted the Council's stance in not</p>	

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>backing any further large housing applications within the district. This goes against ruling in the NPPF which states that development should be granted in favour of the presumption of sustainable development.</p> <p>This stance that the DC are employing will lead to a point whereby there will not be a 5 year housing supply and speculative applications will be granted; in places where it is not wanted.</p> <p>A means to control this would be for the Harbury Development Plan to have a schedule of preferred sites, which would come forward at the point of need. A longer term strategy such as this should be employed to preserve local control over the direction of new development. This will aid in the conservation of the village's character and ensure sustainable rather than explosive growth. Being a category 1 village, Harbury would be open to speculative housing applications in undesirable locations. Even without local support, these applications (without a district 5 year supply) are likely to be consented at appeal. It is imperative to consider these potential outcomes, especially when the plan runs to 2031.</p> <p>In considering the village's Landscape sensitivity (plan attached) the location of my clients' land is located within parcel Hr04, Despite being within subject to a classification of High/Medium sensitivity to residential development, it lies next to land of Medium sensitivity (Hr03). Therefore, future development in this location provides the</p>	

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>most sensible locations in regards to a working access and landscape considerations, as well as the current physical state of the site.</p> <p>To summarise, I am calling for more of my clients' land to be incorporated into the proposed development boundary as outlined by Map 1. Furthermore I feel it is essential for the Parish to consider a schedule of favourable development sites that would come forward in the instance that Stratford cannot demonstrate a 5 Year Housing Land Supply. These will ensure that Objectives are met within the Harbury Neighbourhood Development Plan,</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to discuss our thoughts in more detail and would appreciate a meeting with Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Group at the earliest convenience.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you, Yours faithfully</p>	
5 Harbury Society [REDACTED]		Objective 1, Policy H.01	<p>By stating that new housing development should be concentrated within the tightly drawn settlement boundary we will put at risk our remaining open spaces and encourage further “garden grabbing”.</p> <p>I do not understand the justification for this policy. Far better would have been to suggest that suitably designed growth for our organic increase <i>might</i> be considered suitable if confined to the south side of the village; our justification being to limit its distance from</p>	<p>No change. Development of gardens considered under criterion (e) of Policy H.01.</p> <p>Comment noted. Policy H.01 allows for suitable development within the settlement boundary.</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>our facilities, to encourage walking and cycling and to limit congestion.</p> <p>B) With regard to "securing a suitable mix of housing" we must insist on an independent and up-to-date Housing Need Survey to show what is not just wanted by members of the community, but assesses what those residents needing homes can actually afford. There would be no point in building what they do not want or cannot buy or rent as is happening now.</p> <p>C) 5.12 should make much clearer what housing already has planning permission.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No change. See comments on SADC response regarding housing need.</p> <p>This point had already been covered when reviewing SDC's comments.</p>
		OBJECTIVE 2	Paras. 5.16 & 17 Are very poor and do little to help preserve the rural nature of our village. These must be strengthened to have some bite.	Comments noted. Paras. 5.16 and 5.17 are background material Not plan policies. No change.
		OBJECTIVE 3	<p>Policy H 07, para. 5.18 "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them."</p> <p>E) Given the amount of work I put into listing and assessing the value of our Open and Green Spaces I am extremely disappointed to find that very few of these areas have been included in this plan.</p> <p>Apart from the Church Paddock and Allotments, all those which are included belong to the Parish Council and already have statutory protection as Village Greens! Does that suggest the Parish Council doesn't trust itself to protect them? Yet bizarrely not all</p>	<p>It was agreed to make no changes to the list but to add a reference to the list at appendix 2.</p> <p>Other open spaces not protected as Local Green Spaces would be protected under Policy H.08.</p> <p>The Spinney is outside the settlement boundary and therefore already has some protection.</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>Parish Council property (for instance the Burial Grounds and Pound Green) are included. This is a wasted opportunity which defies logic.</p> <p>We need to protect the "Hollow Squares" highlighted in our Village Design Statement.</p> <p>We need to protect the setting of our Listed Buildings</p> <p>We need to protect our sweeps of grass verge that add so much to the rural aspect.</p> <p>We need to protect our remaining forest trees and remnants of hedgerows.</p> <p>We need to protect our remaining wildlife havens and corridors.</p>	
		Policy H.09	<p>H.09 - Protecting Significant Views</p> <p>F) The map shows only the views out of the village but I was pleased to see that some consideration was given to protecting to internal views, like those to the Windmill and Church – as the Village Design Statement makes clear.</p> <p>But there are others which are not included: - sweeps of grass verges as in Farm Street, Vicarage Lane, Mill Street and Park Lane etc; the internal footpaths – Darkie Lane, Lovers Lane and Dovehouse Lane to the Pound.</p> <p>We have also failed to protect views of our significant forest and ornamental trees; - those at Trice's Farm, Harbury Hall, Harbury House, The Manor, Churchyard and Church Paddock, School, The Shakespeare, Spinney, etc. many of which can be seen from a great distance.</p>	The views shown have been previously been identified in the Village Design Statement. This point had already been covered elsewhere.

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
		Policy H.10	<p>H.10 – Landscape Design Principles</p> <p>G) This needs to be much more robust. Just stating that development proposals will be “informed by and assessed against” the Landscape Design (Statement) principles has no meaning without stating clearly what we value and why we cherish it.</p>	<p>No change. This is a development management policy and sets out the criteria against which planning applications will be assessed.</p>
		Policy H.14	<p>H.14 - Sustainable Design and Energy Efficiency</p> <p>This is fine as far as it goes but must also demand just the same quality of design and respect for the surrounding “heritage” buildings as for any other development. The illustration would suggest that anything would be acceptable anywhere. Certainly within the Conservation Area, adjacent to Listed Buildings, or fronting the old village streets much more consideration to architectural design is required.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The policies in the neighbourhood plan should not be read, and will not be implemented in isolation. The policies in the plan should be read as a whole, including those protecting heritage assets. They will also be implemented alongside other legislation including that relating to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.</p>
		Policy H.19	<p>H.19 - Protecting Local Heritage</p> <p>This lists some of our Heritage Assets to be “conserved” but then suggests that our Listed Buildings are “non-designated heritage assets”. I cannot understand why this should be.</p> <p>Surely as Listed Buildings or Artefacts they have a very definite protection in law which we should be emphasising. Have I misunderstood what this Policy is about? Either way we should be listing what these assets are, what they mean to us and what we expect from any development proposals.</p>	<p>The list of assets was clarified and amended and will be added to the appendices. Policy H.19 seeks to protect non-designated heritage assets. Listed buildings are designated heritage assets.</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
6 [REDACTED]		H.01 and H.02	An NDP cannot stop all future development, it should aim to make it clear where and under the circumstances that development would be acceptable. Due to little space left within the settlement boundary map H01 and H02 taken together would make any future development on the outskirts of the village very difficult. The cumulative effect of all the listed criteria may result in undue pressure on open spaces and gardens within the built up village.	Comment noted. The neighbourhood plan clearly sets out where and under what circumstances development would be supported. This approach has been developed to sit within the strategic planning policy framework set out in the Core Strategy.
6 [REDACTED]		H.05b	The word "all" should be inserted before "open spaces" and following added " all trees with TPOS and others including hedges that add to the landscape, and are wildlife corridors	No change to "open spaces". Amend Policy H.05 to add new criterion on trees and hedges.
6 [REDACTED]		H.07	Burial ground must be added, what about the Spinney? Would also add all wide verges in this policy as well to accentuate their importance to the look of the village.	This had already been covered elsewhere. Areas such as verges protected under Policy H.08.
6 [REDACTED]		H.08	Once a wildlife corridor has been lost in a specific location it is almost impossible to make "better provision .. elsewhere" All small open spaces must be preserved.	Comment noted. No change.
6 [REDACTED]		H.10	The list is fine as far as it goes, however landscape design must include consideration of the natural features which create a landscape. Add f) Retention of important natural features which add to the landscape	It was agreed to add new criterion (f).
6 [REDACTED]		H.12	Add Wight School car park don't think it can be assumed that listing the "library" includes the car park	It was agreed to map the car park.
6 [REDACTED]		H.19	All listed building MUST be added to the list	Policy H.19 seeks to protect non-designated

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
██████				heritage assets. Listed buildings are designated heritage assets and protected under other legislation.
7 Gladman		Legal Requirements	<p>Legal Requirements</p> <p>Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, set out in §8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The Basic Conditions to which the HNP must be found in compliancy with 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 neighbourhood plan</p> <p>b) Having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order</p> <p>c) Having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, it is appropriate to make the order</p> <p>d) The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development</p> <p>e) The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained within the development plan for the area of the authority</p> <p>f) The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations</p> <p>g) Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with</p>	Comment noted. The plan meets the legal requirements. On submission a Basic Condition Statement will be prepared setting this out in detail.

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>the proposal for the neighbourhood plan</p> <p>If the HNP is unable to be found in accordance with all of the basic conditions set out above then it will not be able to proceed to referendum. National Policy and Guidance.</p>	
7 Gladman		National Planning Policy Framework	<p>National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>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 identified 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 (OAN) for housing, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is also applicable to neighbourhood plans.</p> <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</p>	<p>Comment noted. The plan has been prepared having regard to national planning policy. On submission a Basic Condition Statement will be prepared setting this out in detail.</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>that 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. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive 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.</p> <p>neighbourhood plans. This has also been confirmed in the High Court .</p> <p>Paragraph 184 of the Framework makes clear that the ambition of the neighbourhood plan should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area. To facilitate this, local planning authorities (LPAs) will need to set out clearly their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Where a neighbourhood plan proceeds in advance of the adoption of a Framework-compliant Local Plan, this will create uncertainty as to whether the neighbourhood plan provides an appropriate basis for the spatial approach contained in its administrative area.</p>	
7 Gladman		Planning Practice Guidance	<p>Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Comment noted. The plan has been prepared having regard to national planning guidance. On submission a Basic Condition Statement will be prepared setting this out in detail.</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>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. In particular, the changes to the PPG stress the importance of considering housing reserve sites, and providing indicative delivery timetables to ensure that emerging evidence of housing needs is addressed to help minimise any potential conflicts that can arise and are not overridden by a new Local Plan.</p> <p>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 to 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.</p>	
7 Gladman		Relationship with Local Plan	<p>Relationship with Local Plan</p> <p>To meet the basic conditions the HNP will need to be found in general conformity with the strategic requirements that govern the</p>	<p>Comment noted. The plan has been prepared to be in general conformity with strategic planning policy. On submission a Basic Condition Statement will be prepared setting this out in detail.</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>wider local authority area. In this regard, the relevant strategic policies that the HNP should seek to support and meet are contained in the recently adopted Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan/Core Strategy. Policy it would be considered prudent planning if the housing target for the neighbourhood area is seen as a minimum.</p> <p>In addition, it is also important that the HNP allows for sufficient flexibility so that it is able to respond to changes affecting the wider area. In this regard the adopted Core Strategy is clear that further housing land across the local authority area will be identified within the context of the Site Allocations Plan or depending on the circumstances a review of the Local Plan to meet the housing needs arising within the borough and from the wider Coventry and Warwickshire Housing Market Area.</p> <p>that it can meet its full agreed housing requirement. However, no contingency measures are included within the neighbourhood plan. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Parish Council consider the need to allocate additional housing land/housing serve sites to help minimise any potential conflict between the HNP and the emerging Site Allocations Plan or any subsequent review of the Local Plan.</p>	
7 Gladman		H.01	This policy states that new housing development will be concentrated within the Harbury village settlement boundary subject to the criteria attached to this policy. Whilst Gladman note that the proposed settlement	Comment noted. No change. Policy H.01 is in general conformity with the Core Strategy. The housing target at the strategic level has been exceeded. Policy H.01 will allow for further limited growth in line with the Core

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>boundary includes land at Bush Heath Lane, we would be opposed to the use of a settlement boundary if this would preclude the delivery of otherwise suitable and sustainable growth opportunities from coming forward.</p> <p>In this regard, Policy H.01 will seek to contain the physical growth in the settlement with no regard to the contingency measures incorporated within the Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan. In this regard, the community have identified a number of services, facilities and areas that are in need of improving. Accordingly, flexibility and additional criteria is required to enable the delivery of schemes beyond this artificial limit so that the proposed SUEs may not come forward as envisaged and therefore further housing sites are needed in order to provide a flexible housing land supply and to contribute to the minimum housing target required at a strategic level.</p>	Strategy.
7 Gladman		H.02	<p>Policy H.02 allows for some limited development but this will not enable the level of financial contributes, beyond the settlement boundary the Plan makes only a limited provision for housing i.e. replacement dwelling, rural workers dwelling etc. These forms of development will not enable the delivery of market and affordable housing and will limit the level of financial contributions that the Parish Council is likely to receive to meet its wider objectives.</p> <p>In this circumstance we believe that a criteria based approach consistent with the requirements of national policy, specifically</p>	Comment noted. No change. Policy H.02 is in line with the Core Strategy.

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>the presumption in favour of sustainable development should replace H.01 in its current</p> <p>positive approach to new development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Applications that accord with the policies of the Development Plan and the Harbury Neighbourhood Plan will be supported particularly where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing new homes including market and affordable housing: or • Opportunities for new business facilities through new or expanded premises; or • Infrastructure to ensure the continued vitality and viability of Harbury. <p>Development adjacent to the existing settlement will be permitted provided that any adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development."</p>	
7 Gladman		H.04	<p>Whilst noting the intention of this policy, the delivery of rural exception sites may be difficult without evidence</p> <p>as this could be difficult as they will unlikely achieve the most optimum value of land that could be secured. A key part of the preparation of the Plan should be to identify areas which the local community wishes to shape and benefit from to provide certainty that the plan will remain effective and achieve its aspirations going forward.</p>	Comment noted. No change.

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>Further, it is noted that this policy accepts the principle of housing development beyond the proposed settlement boundary subject to it adjoining the existing built development, within reasonable walking distance of public transport and local community facilities and the future use of such housing is secured in perpetuity to meet a local need. Should the Parish Council wish to deliver affordable housing the delivery of market housing should be recognised to act as a form of enabling development to achieve this goal.</p>	
7 Gladman		H.09	<p>Gladman submit that new development can often be delivered without resulting in the loss of openness, character or impacting on views considered to be important. Whilst noting the intention of this policy there is no robust evidence to demonstrate why these views are of particular importance. Furthermore, the word "preserving" should be replaced with "enhancing".</p>	<p>The views shown have been previously been identified in the Village Design Statement. Parish Council to consider other views and agree final list.</p> <p>Policy H.09 final sentence has already been amended to:</p> <p>"Development proposals should ensure that special attention is paid to retaining public viewpoints of the defined significant views, and where new development would obscure an existing public viewpoint, a new public viewpoint of the significant view should be created."</p>
7 Gladman		H.11	<p>What comes across from the HNP is the need to boost services and facilities i.e. the wish list identified in the supporting text. This will most likely be achieved via developer contributions however it is the case here that limited contributions will be received beyond committed sites and small infill style development or the rural exception site and this will have its own viability concerns and</p>	

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>the financial benefits and upgrades to infrastructure may well be reduced. The HNP is the opportunity to guide the development over the plan period and beyond to meet the needs of the community now and in the future. Accordingly, there is a significant need to reconsider the approach through the allocation of housing land and/or housing reserve</p> <p>. This will also enable a further degree of certainty that the Plan will remain effective over its lifetime and will help assist the Council in deciding where future housing land should be identified through the Site Allocations Plan process.</p>	
7 Gladman		H.14	<p>In principle, Gladman support the provision of this policy which seeks to encourage the use of sustainable energy initiatives. However, it is with regret that Gladman inform the Parish Council that the criteria the Parish Council is seeking will likely be found contrary to the basic conditions.</p> <p>The written statement to parliament dated 27th March 2015 makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not apply any additional technical standards relating to the construction of new homes and that the optional technical standards should only be implemented through an emerging Local Plan based on a clear and up-to date assessment of need. Neighbourhood Plans should not be used to apply the new national construction standards.</p> <p>Gladman recommend that Policy H.14 be deleted in its current form.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The policy has been developed in light of the Ministerial Statement and seeks to encourage the identified measures it does not seek to compel developers to meet additional standards.</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
		Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability	<p>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability</p> <p>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</p> <p>Both the SEA Directive and Neighbourhood Planning PPG make clear that an SEA Screening Assessment should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity. It is currently unclear from the consultation documents whether an SEA is required or whether a Screening Assessment has been undertaken. Gladman therefore reserve the right to comment on this issue at a later date.</p>	Comment noted. SADC are carrying out the necessary SEA work. SA is not a neighbourhood plan requirement.
8 Spitfire Homes		Suggested Site Allocation	<p>SITE: LAND AT VICARAGE LANE, HARBURY</p> <p>Spitfire Properties LLP wish to make comments in relation to the draft Harbury and Deppers Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan 2031 with specific reference to the proposed development of land at Vicarage Lane in Harbury. Spitfire would be grateful if the Parish could take the below comments into consideration.</p> <p>Members of the Parish Council will be aware that representatives from Spitfire and Andy Wilkins of Lone Star Land meet with members of the Parish Council in July to discuss the proposed development of the above site. At this meeting, it was confirmed that Spitfire has acquired an option to develop the site for residential development subject to obtaining planning consent. The following section describes the site and associated details</p>	

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>relating to its potential development.</p> <p>Site Details</p> <p>The site extends to approximately 0.56ha (1.38 acres) and comprises of n04 Vicarage Lane — a vacant dormer bungalow and a private paddock to the rear which is unused and overgrown. Former stable buildings remain on one boundary of the site which are otherwise marked by hedgerows interspersed with mature trees (largely in neighbouring gardens). There are a small number of apple and pear trees dispersed across the site which are in a poor condition, and a single specimen tree (Ash) which is of a substantial size.</p> <p>The site is accessed via a metal gated driveway from Vicarage Lane to the east which serves the vacant bungalow and garage building to the rear of the site.</p> <p>With regards to site constraints, it is noted that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The site is located within the Harbury Conservation Area and is situated in close proximity to a number of listed buildings situated along Vicarage Lane and Church Street.</p>	
8 Spitfire Homes		H.01	<p>With regards to Policy H.O1, Spitfire Properties support the principle of concentrating new housing development within the Harbury village settlement boundary. However in accordance with Para 48 of the NPPF and Policy CS.16 of the Stratford Core Strategy, an allowance should be made for windfall/infill sites to come forward during the plan period.</p>	<p>Support of the settlement boundary is welcomed. In not allocating sites, but setting out criteria when proposals for new housing within Harbury village would be supported the neighbourhood plan sets a framework for assessing windfall sites. No change.</p> <p>Based on the respondents own figures there is no need to allocate a further large site for</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>Spitfire Properties consider the land at Vicarage Lane to be of a scale and nature which could be considered as infill development. In addition, Councillors are aware that the site is situated in a sustainable location in close proximity to the centre of the village and its development which would not have an adverse impact on the Parish's aspirations for the village.</p> <p>With regards to the figures contained within para 5.7 of the Neighbourhood Plan, these need to be updated to take account of Housing Completions and Commitments — Settlements (as of 31 March 2016). It is noted that whilst 38 homes have been built, there are 95 units recognised as 'commitments'. This gives a total of 133 units instead of 128. Amendments to these figures will mean that Harbury will contribute 29.5% of the identified growth in Category 1 Service Villages over the plan period.</p> <p>Whilst the Parish consider that they have meet their housing requirement, recognition should be made to Para 47 of the NPPF and Policy CS.16 of the Core Strategy which notes that the District are required to boost significantly the supply of housing with at least 14,600 units for the 20 plan period. As such, the Neighbourhood Plan should be positively prepared to allow for additional windfall / infill sites to come forward in sustainable locations within the village boundary.</p>	<p>development. The Core Strategy seeks 450 new homes in Category 1 service Villages with no more than around 25% to be provided in an individual settlement.</p> <p>There is no need to allocate additional sites.</p>
8 Spitfire Homes		H.03	With regards to Policy H.03, whilst it is acknowledged that the Parish wish to seek a mixture of housing types, tenures and sizes within new developments of 6 or more	Comments noted. No change.

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p> dwellings, reference should be made to Policy CS.19 which notes that "larger the scale of development the more opportunity exists to a wide range of dwelling types and sizes". As such, the ability to achieve a broad mix on small developments can be difficult to achieve when set within the achieving a viable proposal.</p> <p> Whilst this point should be acknowledged, Spitfire Properties recognise the need noted within the Harbury Housing Needs Survey and are content that a proportion of this need can be addressed through the development of land at Vicarage Lane.</p>	
8 Spitfire Homes		H.05	With regards to Policy H.05, Spitfire wish to make no comment in relation to this policy. It is contended that development at Vicarage Lane would be of a high quality design which would be in keeping with the character of the local area.	Comments noted. No change.
8 Spitfire Homes		H.06	With regards to Policy H.06, the land at Vicarage Lane does not serve any recreational or tourist interest. As noted, the site is in private ownership and is not accessible to the general public. With regards to ecology, should an application be pursued, this would be supported by a Phase I Habitat Survey and any subsequent ecological surveys (Bats, Birds, Badgers, Great Crested Newts etc) which are deemed to be required. In the event that anything of note be identified then this would be mitigated through ecological mitigation measures which comply with guidance provided by Natural England.	Comments noted. No change.
8 Spitfire Homes		H.08	With regards to Policy H.08, Spitfire Properties acknowledge the details contained	Comments noted. No change.

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>within this policy but with specific regard to the site at Vicarage Lane it should be noted that this site is in private ownership and does not perform a useful function for the betterment of the village. Therefore it should not be classified as open space.</p>	
8 Spitfire Homes		H.11	<p>Spitfire Properties acknowledge the details contained within Policy H.11, but highlight that any infrastructural requirements sort by the Parish Council should be in accordance with Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy and Policy CS.27 — Developer Contributions of the Stratford Core Strategy.</p>	Comments noted. No change.
8 Spitfire Homes		H.14	<p>Spitfire Properties acknowledges the details contained within Policy H.14 — Sustainable Design and Energy Efficiency but would like to note that the policy should have regard and be in 'general conformity' with policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (Section 10 — Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change) and the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy (Policy CS.2 Climate Change and Sustainable Construction).</p> <p>As it stands, Part B of Policy H.14, notes that the Parish will encourage ... a fabric first approach through a higher than basic Fabric Energy Efficiency Standard target". Clarification is sort on what is the standard target? For example Warwick District Council impose planning conditions requesting details which demonstrate that a scheme shows either 10% of the predicted energy requirement of the development will be produced on or near to the site from</p>	<p>Comment noted. The policy seeks to encourage the identified measures it does not seek to compel developers to meet additional standards.</p> <p>It has already been agreed to delete criteria (c) and (d) see Table 1 SADC comments.</p>

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Suggested Parish Council Response
			<p>renewable energy resources or shows at least 10% of the energy demand of the development and its CO2 emissions would be reduced through the initial construction methods (fabric first).</p> <p>Furthermore, it noted in Part C of Policy H.14 that performance test on new homes will be monitored for at least one year after purchase. In response to this, clarification is sort on who is expected to monitor this? If it is the developer, then there is no mechanism in national or local planning policy which requires developers to undertake this monitoring exercise.</p>	
8 Spitfire Homes		H.19	<p>Spitfire Properties acknowledge the details contained within Policy H.19 and consider that the development of land at Vicarage Lane will result in less than substantial harm to those heritage assets listed in Church Street and Vicarage Lane. Any application would be supported by a Heritage Statement to support the development of the site.</p>	