

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HE1. The key views across the village of Welford from significant vantage points around the parish will be protected by resisting development that will be excessively obtrusive by virtue of its shape, size or material. The key views are:-*

- *View over St Peter's Church and the village from Cress Hill*
- *View over the village from Welford Hill*
- *View over the village from the Old Station on the Evesham Road*
- *View downriver from Binton Bridges*
- *Views over the Glebe Lands towards St Peter's Church*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HE1. Important Views***

*The important views around the parish will be protected by resisting development that will be obtrusive by virtue of its shape, size or material. The following are to be protected:-*

- *View towards St Peter's Church and over the village from Cress Hill*
- *View downstream from Binton Bridges*
- *Views over the Glebe Lands towards St Peter's Church and the river*
- *Views north-west from the Milcote Road towards Welford and Weston villages.*
- *Views north from the public road on Rumer Hill towards Welford village*
- *View south from the crest of the public road on Rumer Hill to the southern boundary of the parish towards Long Marston and the Cotswolds*

*These specific locations and precise direction of important views can be found on the Parish Council and [project team websites](#).*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident highlighted use of the word 'excessively' would be easy to argue against
- Resident highlighted the need for a viewpoints map
- Resident would like greater emphasis given to protecting views of the church and bridges
- SDC requested the wording 'The following views are to be protected' was added
- SDC suggested inclusion of a map which may be produced in the future but it was not considered precise enough for planning purposes. Therefore we have created a very detailed summary of views including pictures, GPS coordinates and compass bearings on page which is hyperlinked to on the project website and potentially the Parish Council website.
- Health check suggested the final view south out of the parish may not be required. Wording was changed to confirm much of the near view south to Long Marston is in Welford-on-Avon Parish.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HE2. Green areas (including their flora and fauna) of particular importance to the local community will be protected by designating the following as Local Green Space (see Figure 5 on page 14):*

*LGS1 - Cress Hill & Avon Valley Way*

*LGS2 -The Glebe Lands & local green space*

*LGS3 - Millennium Project*

*LGS4 - Village Greens*

*LGS5 - Verges in the Conservation Area*

*LGS6 - Islands in the River Avon*

*LGS7 – Avon Valley Way from Bell Green to the parish boundary with Weston-on-Avon*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HE2. Important Green Spaces***

***The following areas (including their flora and fauna) are of particular importance to the local community and are designated as Local Green Spaces:***

- ***LGS1 - Cress Hill and Shakespeare's Avon Way***
- ***LGS2 -The Glebe Lands (including the SSSI 'Welford Field')***
- ***LGS3 - Millennium Project to the north of the River Avon at Binton Bridges***
- ***LGS4 Village Greens at:***
  - ***Maypole Green***
  - ***'The Greens' in Boat Lane and Church Street***
  - ***'The Pound' to the south of the Churchyard at the junction of Boat Lane and Church Street***
  - ***'Bell Green' at the junction of Church Street and High Street***
  - ***'Bird Green' in Long Marston Road***
- ***LGS5 - Verges in the Conservation Area***
- ***LGS6 - Islands in the River Avon abutting Binton Bridges***
- ***LGS7 – Shakespeare's Avon Way from Bell Green to the parish boundary with Weston-on-Avon.***

***Proposals for development which are incompatible with their importance as Local Green Space will not be allowed unless there are very special circumstances where the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any harm.***

***The sensitive management of these areas will be actively encouraged.***

***The boundaries of the Local Green Spaces are shown in Figure 5.***

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added

- Resident highlighted children's playground is not listed and asked why the plan cannot specify new development must include appropriate new public green space. NP-Response – new green space covered well in CS.24 Healthy Communities. Children's playground is not a specifically green space.
- SDC suggested improved wording which has been incorporated.
- Natural England would like to see the SSSI 'Welford Field' called out in the policy.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HE3. Development adjacent to any Local Green Space will only be permitted if it does not encroach or in any way detract from these spaces.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

*HE3. Development adjacent to Local Green Spaces*

*Development will only be supported if it does not in any way detract from the character or setting of any Local Green Space as designated in Policy HE2.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident highlighted the addition of the word 'on' required after encroach.
- SDC suggested prefacing Local Green Space with 'designated' and also calling out the character and setting of these spaces.
- Health check suggested the word "encroach" be removed as this would be covered by HE2.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HE4. Developments in the Conservation Area will only be supported if they*

- *conserve or enhance the Conservation Area, and*
- *have no negative impact on the views, vistas and street scene, and*
- *are in conformity with the Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

*HE4. The Conservation Area and other Heritage Assets*

*Development within or adjacent to the Conservation Area and/or within the setting of a listed building will be supported providing it:*

- *Conserves or enhances the positive attributes of the heritage asset;*
- *Has no negative impact on the character, setting, views, vistas and street scene of the heritage asset;*
- *Is in conformity with the Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide; and*
- *Fully supports the protection of listed properties through consultation with their beneficial owners and Stratford-on-Avon District Council.*

*Development in close proximity to other heritage assets will be required to have regard to their setting and significance, and be designed such that there is no adverse impact on these assets.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident highlighted the Fairlea planning application contravenes this policy
- Residents highlighted the need to take into account assets not in the Conservation Area
- SDC highlighted protected listed buildings were not mentioned and also suggested expanding the policy to cover more than the Conservation Area.
- English Heritage commended the policy but suggested broadening the policy beyond the Conservation Area to include all Heritage Assets.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HE6. Open countryside will be protected.*

*Any development outside the physical confines of the settlement (or built up area boundary when defined) will be refused unless*

- 1. it is on a brownfield site where the benefits of the development demonstrably outweigh the harm to the countryside, or*
- 2. the development meets one of the categories defined in SDC's Core Strategy Policy AS.10 sub-sections d to v which relate to allowable development in the countryside*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

*HE5. Open Countryside*

*Open countryside is everywhere outside the built up area boundary (see Figure 8) and will in principle be protected for its intrinsic character and beauty.*

*Development in the open countryside will be supported providing it:*

- is a brownfield site; or*
- contributes to the local economy; or*
- is for the reuse or extension of an existing building; or*
- is for sport and recreation; or*
- is for a new isolated dwelling where there are special circumstances such as the need for a rural worker to be close to their place of work; or*
- is a single dwelling of exceptional quality and design making a positive contribution to the character of the local area.*

*Any such development should not cause demonstrable harm to:*

- landscape quality;*
- sites of ecological value;*
- Scheduled Monuments and other sites of archaeological interest.*

*The specific area of open countryside between Welford-on-Avon and Weston-on-Avon is covered by policy HE6.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident – protection for agricultural land could provide justification for this point.
- Resident suggested pointing to Core Strategy AS.10 for list of permitted development.
- Residents looking to develop in open countryside objected to this policy along similar lines to HE5. The blanket objection from this resident is demonstrable evidence of the need for a strong policy to reflect the wishes of the majority of residents.

- SDC highlight referencing of the Core Strategy which means the policy is not standalone. This needs to be corrected.
- NP Team – long list of developments from the Core Strategy is not considered necessary. A more concise and precise point has been inserted.
- The policy was brought forward as it should precede the policy dealing with the separation of Welford-on-Avon and Weston-on-Avon.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HE5. Any development outside physical confines of the settlement (or built up area boundary when defined) which results in the reduction of the gap between Welford-on-Avon and Weston-on-Avon will be refused.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HE6. Gap between Welford and Weston***

*Development outside the built up area boundary of Welford-on-Avon which results in the reduction of the gap with Weston-on-Avon will not be supported.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Residents looking to develop in the gap and outside the physical confines objected in principle to this policy as too restrictive and outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. The NP Team duly noted this input and would highlight the findings of the Planning Inspector for the Gladman Appeal Paragraph 65 which states “The open agricultural land between Welford and Weston is a feature of the historic and current relationship between the two settlements..... The perception of openness between Welford and Weston would inevitably be reduced as a consequence of the development proposed ..... with consequent harm to the established character and appearance of the area. I (*the planning inspector*) share the concerns of local residents and English Heritage in this regard.
- SDC commented the policy needed to be positively worded.
- As indicated previously this policy was moved to follow the Open Countryside policy rather than precede it.



**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HE7. All development must demonstrate excellent landscape design, encourage preservation of the existing mature tree population and the planting of new trees as defined in the Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HE7. Landscape Design******Development must:***

- *Preserve the existing mature tree population and support the planting of new trees and shrubs as defined in the Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide;*
- *Use natural hedging in preference to timber based panel or board fencing or any solid walls for boundaries and*
- *Ensure that landscape aspects of a development proposal form an integral part of the overall design.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- No specific Resident comments were received on this policy.
- SDC highlighted the policy came across as completely focused on trees and recommended looking at the Barford NDP Draft. The Policy has therefore been extensively expanded.
- Health check suggested we might want to consider whether brick walls would be acceptable subject to materials approval but it was felt the natural boundaries should be the default.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HE8. The allotments off Headland Road will be maintained and preserved in their current form. Any development of the site will be refused unless*

- replacement provision be made of at least equivalent land quality, located at reasonable convenience for the existing plot holders; and*
- clear and significant social, economic and environmental community benefits could be derived from the proposal; and*
- agreement is given by the Trustees of the Shorthouse Bidston Allotment Trust.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HE8. Allotments***

***Development that enhances the use of the current site on Headland Road as allotments will be supported. Any other development will not be supported unless:***

- Replacement provision (including the provision of associated facilities) of at least equivalent land quality, condition and area is made available, and is located at reasonable convenience for the existing plot holders;***
- Clear and significant social, economic and environmental community benefits would be derived from the proposal; and***
- Agreement is given by the Trustees of the Shorthouse Bidston Allotment Trust.***

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident suggested adding an extra bullet to stop additional traffic flows if an alternative proposal was submitted. The NP Team consider that adding this bullet would not be consistent with the NPPF.
- Resident queried if Objective 8 (a multi-purpose community meeting place and sports facilities) was linked to the second bullet on this policy. The NP Team answer is No.
- Resident stated there should be no 'unless' in the policy which would mean a categorical no development allowed. The NP Team consider this is contrary to the NPPF and therefore unworkable.
- SDC requested the policy is positively worded.
- The NP Team consider the first sentence prevent the allotment holders and the Shorthouse Bidston Trust making gradual improvements for allotment holders, the first sentence has therefore been revised.
- Health check highlighted the need for replacement land to also be of equivalent area.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HE9. All new development within the flood plain will be opposed. The relevant flood plain is designated by the 1 in 100 year flood map.*

*Replacement development (residential or commercial) will be considered on an individual basis. Any such development must be demonstrably neutral or beneficial to the capacity of the flood plain.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HE9. Flood Plain***

***Proposals for fluvial management which reduce the risk of flooding in flood zones 2 and 3 will be supported providing there is acceptable landscaping.***

***Development within these flood zones will be opposed unless:***

- It does not result in any additional properties being placed at risk of flooding , or***
- The risk of flooding to existing properties is demonstrably not increased.***
- Replacement development (residential or commercial) will be supported if it is demonstrably neutral or beneficial to the capacity of these flood zones and consistent with other policies.***

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident suggested including a map showing the 2 flood zones. NP Team agree a flood map is required.
- Resident suggested all development should have a detailed survey done to consider impact on neighbouring properties. NP Team confirm this is congruent with the Environment Agency and Warwickshire County Council current policy and requirements.
- SDC suggested rewording the first sentence to be more positive. The NP Team rejected this as the policy needs to be unequivocal . SDC further suggested inclusion of the 1 in 100 year flood Environment Agency flood map which the NP Team supports.
- WCC indicated opposing all development in the flood plain may be counterproductive, preventing developing of flood defences and suggested improved wording for the policy which has been incorporated in the new policy.
- Health check highlighted the need for clarification of the flood zones/flood plain. Clarification has been made together with a map being added.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*INF1. Any development within the parish must minimise light pollution avoiding all obtrusive external and all street lighting. Security lighting should operate on a timed PIR system of not more than 5 minutes illumination per activation.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****INF1. Dark Skies***

***Development must minimise light pollution, avoiding obtrusive external property and street lighting.***

***Development must demonstrate how it will achieve Environmental Zone Lighting Level E1 (Intrinsically Dark).***

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident – supports the policy but concerned the wording supports flood lighting.
- Resident suggested including LUX levels
- Resident recommended an objective at E1 Level for Dark Sky assessment.
- Resident highlighted Page 84 of the Gladman Appeal judgement as a supporting evidence.
- Resident commented many people are deterred from walking on winter evenings and use their car instead. Need to install smart down lighting on streets. The NP Team highlight the village is overwhelmingly supportive of no street lighting so the comment is noted but it is counter to the majority view.
- SDC highlighted WCC are the street lighting authority with some delegated powers. The NP Team understand this status but it is the wish of the local population which is being exercised here and due to the cost of installing street lighting this policy clearly demonstrates the local population would consider it inappropriate to spend council taxpayers money on lighting against their wishes.
- SDC also considered this policy may not conform with the NPPF or Core Strategy. However, the NP team do not find it in conflict with either document.
- WCC did not raise any concerns on this policy.
- E1 requirements have been added to the document.

*Therefore acceptable external lighting on a new development will:*

- *Be activated by PIR or time based switch ensuring it is only on when required for access or external activity.*
- *Be switched off or switch off automatically when it is not in use (e.g. flood lighting of sports facilities, lighting for drives and entrances)*
- *Minimise light pollution of adjacent properties at all times*
- *Point downwards onto non-reflective surfaces*
- *Be of an appropriate LUX level to the need*
- *Use the latest available technology to minimise energy consumption.*

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*INF2. Development will only be supported if it does not adversely impact the core infrastructure services delivered to existing, neighbouring properties at any time.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****INF2. Infrastructure***

*Development will be supported providing it does not materially affect the core infrastructure services delivered to existing, neighbouring properties. A mitigation plan must be implemented when there is any scheduled interruption to these core infrastructure services.*

*Core infrastructure services are defined as:-*

- *Mains Water Supply;*
- *Comprehensive Water Management including flood defences, waste and surface water drainage;*
- *Mains Electricity; and*
- *High Speed Broadband.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident highlighted the sewerage system is not specifically mentioned and waste water does not adequately cover this vital point. NP Team recognise waste water / sewerage is of key importance at various locations within the village and that this policy attempts to address the need as far as possible.
- Residents looking to develop their land objected to this policy suggesting this policy is unnecessary. The NP Team believe this policy is required to protect local and proximate residents from the direct detrimental impact of an active building site as well as the longer term impact of a new housing estate. Furthermore outline planning permission is often being sought by developers and the focus of this policy is to require infrastructure to always be fully addressed and funded at outline planning level.
- SDC questioned if an additional policy is required to improve existing infrastructure through new development. The NP Team consider it is going as far as is viable with this policy. SDC also asked if a specific policy for high speed broadband was required but the NP Team again consider this is covered as a defined core infrastructure service.
- WCC commented on the need for consistency in referring to waste water and surface water.
- Health check highlighted the policy was a little aspirational. NP Team believe this should be good practice but have reworded so any disruption must not materially affect adjacent properties and a mitigation plan must be implemented.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*INF3. Development will only be supported if there are adequate primary school places at schools accessible within 6 miles or readily accessed by scheduled public transport.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****INF3. Access to Primary Education***

***New Residential Development will be supported where there are adequate primary school places***

- at schools within a 6 mile journey by road and,***
- readily accessed by school bus or scheduled public transport***

***or***

- where the proposed development includes plans to create adequate places, ideally at Welford-on-Avon Primary School***

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident concerned the lack of school places being used to refuse planning is undermined by 6 miles away being considered acceptable. The NP Team sympathise with this view but in truth the lack of school places is currently not halting any develop proposals.
- Resident highlight the policy appears inconsistent with objective 5. The NP Team would very much like to mandate primary schooling must be at Welford school for Welford residents but this is simply not within the power of the Neighbourhood Plan but clearly financial support from developers to fund places at Welford school would be well received.
- Residents looking to develop their land objected to this policy suggesting this is entirely the responsibility of Warwickshire County Council. The NP Team specifically asked WCC to comment on this policy and they suggested the wording should read "...development will only be permitted where there are adequate places .... or where the proposed development includes plans to create adequate places."
- Resident felt SDC needed to address the issue of new primary school places before allowing any more family housing. NP Team confirm they are trying to push WCC and developers through this policy, it is not SDC's responsibility.
- SDC highlighted the policy referred to all development. NP Team have corrected this to all new development.
- Health check, a policy requirement for no more than 45 minutes journeys had been inserted but this was considered unwise. Also the 6 miles distance is now by road rather than more arbitrary.
- The expectation is S106/CIL contributions will be determined by a local authority formula.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HLU1. A development proposal that would result in the construction within Welford-on-Avon of more than the Upper Level of new homes in the plan period will only be supported in exceptional circumstances.*

*The Upper Level is defined in the Foreword to this document.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HLU1. New Residential Development***

***New Residential Development within the built-up area boundary will be supported providing it is on an infill site and is small scale, normally not more than five dwellings.***

***New Residential Development in the Neighbourhood Plan Area over the Plan Period must have due regard to the Approximate Upper Limit defined for Category 2 Local Service Villages.***

***Where an application is in close proximity to another site(s) where, during the plan period, permission has been granted or for which an application has been made, the aggregate number of dwellings on all these sites must not exceed small scale.***

***New Residential Development of greater than five dwellings should provide a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement identifying the impact the proposal would have on the highway network.***

***New Residential Development outside the Built-Up Area Boundary will be supported if it is in accordance with policy HE5.***

***The Built-Up Area Boundary is shown in Figure 8.***

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident felt this policy was meaningless without a definition of exceptional circumstances. NP Team agree and as Welford is now past a level where large scale development would be appropriate the wording of the policy is being revised and merged with HLU6.
- Resident highlighted the number of new homes rather than level would be better.
- Resident highlighted we have already exceeded the Upper Level
- Resident looking to develop their land thought the policy inconsistent with support for sustainable development. The NP Team view sustainable as realistic and appropriate for the area and the policy is absolutely in line with that perspective. The Resident also objected to the “exceptional circumstances” clause which has now been removed.
- SDC considered the policy was too restrictive and would fail the Basic Conditions test. NP Team have revised the policy to reflect the current status of approved development in the plan area and reiteration of the LSV targets from SDC.
- WCC proposed TA/TS should be included as required.
- Health check also highlighted the issue of a low threshold for TA/TS. NP Team rationale updated to clarify why this is critical consideration.



**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HLU2. Development will be supported if it is phased in line with the SDC Local Plan.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

*HLU2. Phasing of New Residential Development*

*Residential development will be supported if it is phased in line with the emerging Core Strategy*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident asked if this was a practical policy as “limits” had already been breached. NP Team believe it is valuable to reinforce the full period of the plan and the need for development at an appropriate rate.
- SDC requested the policy was made more precise. NP Team have added the five year housing land supply figure as the key metric.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HLU3. Only developments which demonstrate high levels of design excellence will be supported.*

*New development should be of a similar density, footprint, separation, scale and bulk to neighbouring properties, unless it can be demonstrated that the proposed development would not harm local character.*

*All new development must:*

*(a) Respect established building lines and arrangements of front gardens, walls, railings or hedges, where such features are important to the character and appearance of the area*

*(b) Respect established plot widths within streets where development is proposed, particularly where they establish a rhythm to the architecture in a street*

*(c) Respect the separation between buildings, and between buildings and the site boundaries, in relation to likely impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties.*

*(d) Observe the Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide, and*

*(e) Embrace design which reflects the vernacular and unique characteristics of Welford-on-Avon or demonstrate clear innovation (as contrasted with pastiche or off-the-shelf designs).*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HLU3. Design Excellence***

***Development which demonstrates high levels of design excellence will be supported.***

***Development should:***

- Respect established building lines and rhythm of the architecture including the separation between buildings, and between buildings and the site boundaries,***
- Respect established plot widths, density, footprint and scale in the immediate neighbourhood of the proposed development,***
- Not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area, including the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties,***
- Observe the Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide,***
- Take into account Building for Life 12 criteria,***
- Embrace design which reflects the vernacular and unique characteristics of Welford-on-Avon as highlighted in the Village Design Statement or demonstrate clear innovation (as contrasted with pastiche or off-the-shelf designs).***

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident highlighted it will be a significant task to monitor this policy. NP Team believe this further supports the need for greater up front information from developers and less outline planning permission.
- Resident highlighted Millers Close will have a significant impact on the clause (c)

- Resident highlighted (c) a minimum size of plot should be specified and the density should reflect the floor area as no more than 10% of the plot area.
- SDC highlighted the list of assessments is very specific and directed the NP Team to Barford draft NDP Policy B7. The NP Team found policy B7 more general and has merged it with the original.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HLU4. Any new development abutting Welford's extensive network of footpaths, pavements and cycle ways shall ensure that all boundary treatments enhance the intrinsic environmental quality and public amenity of these paths by the predominant use of natural planting.*

*Any new development in the near vicinity of this network shall, where possible, include proposals to connect to, extend and develop it for access and improved safety for all. Any new footpath will be a minimum of 2 metres wide and conform to the same requirements as described above.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HLU4. Footpaths & Cycle-ways***

*Development that abuts footpaths and cycle ways should use natural hedging in preference to timber based panel or board fencing or any solid walls in order to enhance the intrinsic environmental quality and public amenity of these paths.*

*Development in the vicinity of this network shall, where possible, include proposals to connect to, extend and develop footpaths to improve access and safety for all users.*

*New footpaths should be a minimum of 2 metres wide and have the same boundary treatments as specified in the first paragraph of this policy.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident highlighted the need to see footpath widths maintained and property owners keep their hedges trimmed next to footpaths.
- Resident commented footpath width is the responsibility of SDC.
- Resident requested the addition of the footpaths map to the document.
- Resident requested all new footpaths should be a minimum of 4 metres wide to allow vegetation to be planted which does not encroach on the footpath. NP Team believe this is too wide and does not balance the need for a footpath with the needs of property owners.
- SDC do not believe you can set a minimum width for footpaths and that public footpaths are the responsibility of WCC which cannot be overridden by the NP. Seeking to override WCC would make the policy non-compliant with WCC Technical Guidance and therefore also with the NPPF.
- Health check raised the issue of solid boundaries in HE7 and again here. Again natural boundaries should be the default is the NP Team view.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HLU5. The Market Housing component of all new developments must include a mix of housing types broadly consistent with the evidence from the Community Survey which requires:*

- *5% - one bedroom*
- *40% - two bedroom*
- *40% - three bedroom*
- *15% - four bedroom or larger.*

*Development of accommodation (including the building of bungalows) which meets the needs of the elderly and disabled will be strongly supported*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS*****HLU5. New Residential Development Mix and Type***

***New Residential Development should reflect the mix defined in the Emerging Core Strategy  
Proposals for the following types of development will be particularly supported:***

- ***Local Choice schemes based on objectively assessed local housing needs***
- ***The provision of dwellings appropriate to older residents wishing to down-size, including bungalows***
- ***Houses specifically designed for first-time buyers***
- ***Extra Care accommodation, as defined by Warwickshire County Council.***

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Resident commented on how the percentage based policy works for small scale developments. NP Team recognise this and now that HLU1 has been redrafted this policy focuses on local housing need.
- Resident commented that it should be mandatory for developers to deliver 1 in 5 properties as a bungalow.
- SDC reflected this policy matched Core Strategy policy CS.18. The NP Team have revised the policy to reflect more local requirements.
- Health check questioned if starter/social homes should be called out. Bullet added for first time buyers.

## POLICY

Now merged into HLU1  
(formerly separate HLU6)

### PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING

*HLU6. Developments will only be supported which are of a small scale. For the purpose of the Welford Plan, 'small scale' is defined as less than 3% of the existing housing stock of the settlement. Developments larger than this will not be supported.*

*Where an application site is in close proximity to another site(s) where, during the Plan Period, permission has been granted or for which an application has been made, the aggregate number of houses on all sites must not exceed the definition of 'small scale'.*

### SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS

*Policy merged with HLU1 as Welford is already past all reasonable requirements for large scale sites. Therefore HLU1 will mandate only small-scale development up to 2031.*

### REASONS FOR CHANGE

- Concise Title added

## POLICY

Now merged into HLU3  
(formerly separate HLU7)

### PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING

*HLU7. 1 for 1 Replacement Dwellings will only be supported where the character and street scene of the neighbourhood is enhanced and maintained without any detrimental loss of amenity to existing residents.*

*'Detrimental' for this purpose refers to any of the following:*

- *Loss of amenity of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy and/or loss of daylight*
- *Visual intrusion by a building or structure*
- *Loss of car parking*
- *Loss of mature vegetation or landscape screening*
- *Additional traffic resulting from the development*
- *Not being of a scale and size suitable for the plot*

### SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS

Policy now merged into HLU3.

### REASONS FOR CHANGE

- Concise Title added

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HLU8. Development of Residential Gardens, Backland Development and Tandem Development will be resisted except for small, well designed residential sites which:*

- *do not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area and neighbouring properties, and*
- *do not have the potential for loss of amenity of neighbouring properties; through loss of privacy, loss of daylight, visual intrusion by a building or structure, loss of car parking, loss of mature vegetation or landscape screening, additional traffic resulting from the development, and*
- *are of a scale and size suitable for the plot, and*
- *have direct highway access.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

*HLU6. Garden and Back-land Development*

*Development in residential gardens, back-land development and tandem development will be supported if it:*

- *Does not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area and neighbouring properties;*
- *Does not have the potential for loss of amenity of neighbouring properties; through loss of privacy, loss of daylight, visual intrusion by a building or structure, loss of car parking, loss of mature vegetation or landscape screening; and*
- *Is of a scale and size suitable for the plot.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- WCC concerned over traffic adverse impact. Recommend a Transport Assessment of Transport Statement



**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HLU9. Developments on the periphery of the village will be refused unless they provide a sensitive transition from agricultural to residential land use in terms of property density, height and boundary treatment.*

*Such development proposals will be designed to complement and enhance the relevant landscape characteristics of the locality through:*

- *Locating structures where they will be viewed against existing built form*
- *Retaining the proportion and scale of built structures and the space between them*
- *Referring to the built vernacular of the neighbourhood area*
- *Conserving and restoring traditional boundary treatments*
- *Using appropriate plant species in a comprehensive landscape scheme with appropriate boundary treatments to integrate with the rural character*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

*HLU7. Development at the village edge*

*Development at the edge of the village and visible from the surrounding open countryside will be supported providing it creates a sensitive transition from the countryside to the village.*

*Development should:*

- *Be of a similar density and scale to buildings in the immediate neighbourhood and 'round off' the village rather than create new, visually intrusive additions to it*
- *Not reduce the impact of distinguishing natural features (such as tree lines) or require any reduction of trees, hedgerows or other vegetation which changes the character of the surrounding landscape*
- *Use appropriate plant species in a comprehensive landscape scheme, conserve traditional boundary treatments wherever possible and use boundary treatments which integrate best with the rural character*
- *Mitigate any potential increased flood or surface water threat.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HLU10. Development of any building of more than two and half storeys will be refused.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

*HLU8. Height of Buildings*

*Development of any building of more than two and half storeys will not be supported.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added
- Health check highlighted in the policy justification a position against flats and maisonettes. This was demonstrably wrong as dwellings for first time buyers will be strongly supported as long as they conform with all the relevant NP policies including specifically building height for this policy.

**PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION WORDING**

*HLU11. Proposals to amend permission for holiday caravan sites to allow permanent residency will be refused.*

*New caravan sites for either holiday or permanent residence will be refused.*

**SUBMISSION VERSION REFLECTING CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

*HLU9. Caravan sites*

*Proposals to amend permission for holiday caravan sites to allow permanent residency will not be supported.*

*New caravan sites for either holiday or permanent residence will not be supported.*

**REASONS FOR CHANGE**

- Concise Title added