

Comments on working draft Stratford-upon-Avon NDP – June 2016

General point – has the County Highway Authority (CHA) been involved in preparing the NDP? There are various sections (e.g. town centre, infrastructure) where it is necessary to know that the CHA is supportive of the general, if not specific approach proposed. It is important that this is confirmed before the Plan is submitted to avoid difficulties at the examination stage.

Page	Section/Text/etc	Comment
1	How many new homes are required?	<p>This part of the Plan needs updating to better reflect the latest position in respect of the emerging Core Strategy (more particularly, the Main Modifications published in March 2016).</p> <p>Subject to the above, the overall Core Strategy provision for the town (excluding Tiddington and Alveston) has increased by 800 homes to about 3,500. There is also no mention of the following major proposals, likely to result in over 900 <i>additional</i> new homes.</p> <p>(1) SUA.2 (Alcester Road) (+68 homes) (2) SUA.4 (Bishopton Lane (+500 homes) (3) Arden Heath Farm appeal (+270 homes). (4) Stratford Cattle Market (+102 Extra Care units and 87 conventional homes).</p> <p>From a practical point of view it would be useful for the District Council, our housing partners and potential developers to know whether there are any specific issues the local community would wish to see addressed in respect of sites (2) and (3) above; detailed approvals already being in place in respect of sites (1) and (4).</p>
2	Note at top of page	Should be updated to reflect position at time of publishing submission version of NDP.
3	What type of housing is required...?	2 nd para – unsure why the word 'working' is used in 2 nd line.
4	Policy H1	<p>1st para, 1st line – amend to read 'will be confined to sites within...'</p> <p>2nd para, 1st line – delete 'will'</p> <p>3rd para, 1st line – allocations (once confirmed) should be within BUABs</p>
5	Policy H1 Explanation	1 st para at top of page 5 – is not directly relevant to this policy – suggest put in explanation to H4.
5	Policy H2	No explanation provided – it is important that the purpose and extent of Strategic Gap is justified.

5	Policy H3	This policy is confusing and not fully consistent with Policy SSB3. Use of the terminology "supports the allocation" is misleading. In any case the figure of 90 homes is at odds with SSB3 (which contains the correct figure of 60 homes). Also, cross-references to SSB4 and SSB5 are wrong – those policies don't exist!
6	Policy H3 Explanation	2 nd para – will need to be updated to reflect position at time of publishing submission version of NDP. As things stand, there is no actual or implied reference to around 90 dwellings.
7	Policy H4	<p>Last para, 1st line – amend to read 'greenfield land outside Built Up Area Boundaries except...'</p> <p>The wording in the final paragraph is improved compared to the original version, but there is still no categorical support for the proposed Extra Care Housing scheme at Bishopton (previous formal comments refer). Although the dispensation on greenfield sites in respect of "specific and relevant circumstances", a specific allocation should be considered for that site to avoid any doubt and assist the promoters of the proposed scheme.</p>
7	Policy H5	<p>For consistency, replace the word 'permitted' with 'supported' in the first line of the policy.</p> <p>Amend c) to read 'Do not significantly impact...'</p>
8	Policy H6	<p>The wording is much improved compared to the original draft. In particular, the proportions of dwellings by unit size (number of bedrooms) more closely reflect the optimum mix identified in Policy CS.17 of the emerging Core Strategy. However, in order to provide flexibility to respond to design and other legitimate considerations, and reflect the role of the town in meeting District-wide needs, the wording of the second sentence be amended to read:</p> <p><i>"In order to <u>prioritise meeting</u> the specific needs of the Neighbourhood Area, affordable housing will be provided <u>within broadly</u> the following size mix:"</i></p> <p>The Policy states <i>"The requirement for and provision of affordable housing within the Neighbourhood Area will continue to be monitored throughout the Plan period ..."</i>. Whilst welcome in itself, further clarity would be useful on how and when such monitoring will be undertaken, and by whom. Whilst such arrangements need not necessarily be set out in the Plan itself, the inference is that more up-to-date evidence could justify departure from the stock mix set out in the Policy.</p>

		<p>The Policy doesn't prescribe any particular tenure profile. This is probably wise given the current uncertainties affecting affordable housing delivery, consequent upon changes at a national level in legislation and policy – for example with respect to Starter Homes. This matter is dealt with in Core Strategy Policy CS.17 in any case. For the sake of consistency, though (given that Policy also deals with stock mix), it might be useful for the explanatory text to acknowledge that tenure and affordability are as important to effectively meeting local housing need as getting the right type and size of homes.</p>
9-11	Policy H6 Explanation	<p>The explanation of the analysis of the findings of the Stratford-upon-Avon Housing Needs Survey is noted, although (for reasons previously explained) there does appear to be a mismatch between the demographic profile of the town as a whole compared to the profile of survey respondents (especially in terms of age). Some caution therefore needs to be exercised when translating the findings of that survey into specific policy requirements.</p> <p>The explanation in the 1st paragraph on page 10 should be expanded to refer to the importance of developers consulting at an early (pre-application) stage with potential Registered Providers to verify the appropriateness and deliverability of any particular stock and tenure profile.</p> <p>With reference to the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of the explanatory text on page 10, it should be noted that those paragraphs refer to <u>tenure</u>; whereas the policy is concerned with <u>stock mix</u>.</p> <p>With reference to the 5th paragraph of the explanatory text on page 10, it should be noted that because of the thresholds in emerging Core Strategy Policy CS.17 very few smaller sites are likely to contribute to the supply of affordable housing.</p> <p>With reference to the 7th and final paragraph of the explanatory text on page 10, it is unclear whether or not this is intended as a policy requirement (if it is, then those points must be included in the Policy). The broad principles are supported (especially the tie to the whole Neighbourhood Area), although it would be better to align those with the criteria currently used by the District Council. Note that Policy SSB3 is not consistent with the proposed approach (see further comments below).</p>

11	Policy H7	<p>Don't forget that in the majority of cases supply of market housing will be essential for the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The stock profile is broadly consistent with the emerging Core Strategy. However, it is not clear how the provisions of the 3rd paragraph re: homes for employees etc will be interpreted and applied and this should be clarified.</p>
14	Section 6	3 rd para, 5 th line – replace 'would' with 'will'
15	Existing Commercial Provision	4 th para, 1 st line – amend to read 'The Employment Land Study produced for the District Council in 2011...'
16	New Commercial Provision	<p>1st para, 2nd line – amend to read 'business park in Stratford-upon-Avon to attract new companies to the town and recommended...'</p> <p>2nd para – insert reference to this approach being consistent with the Core Strategy.</p>
17	Policy E1	<p>2nd line – amend to read 'supported unless one of more of the following are met:'</p> <p>This would allow for each 'or' to be deleted and ensure consistent wording through the Plan</p> <p>There is no Explanatory text associated with the Policy. The text associated with this policy in previous versions of the Plan has been moved to create the introduction to the topic area. Should each policy in the Plan have some explanation as to its origins/reason for being?</p>
17	Policy E2	2 nd para, 1 st line – replace 'in accordance with' with 'as identified on'
20	Shopping and commercial vitality	3 rd bullet – amend to read 'e.g. Next, and the attraction of TK Maxx and others to the Maybird Centre in recent years.'
21	Shopping and commercial vitality	<p>Top of page – needs to be amended to reflect explanation to Policy CS.22 in Core Strategy (see para. 5.8.15). This states that there is no need for additional comparison goods floorspace in the town until 2021 but there is after that date.</p> <p>3rd para, 1st bullet – suggest delete 'and Arden Street' and amend 3rd line to read 'improving the junction with Arden Street are essential ingredients...'</p>
22	Shopping and commercial vitality	Top of page – bullets seem to cover overlapping areas.
24	Access & Moving Around the Town	<p>Second paragraph, final sentence – Replace 'INF' with 'Section 10: Infrastructure' for clarification purposes.</p> <p>Third paragraph, third line – should 'charging' be 'changing'?</p>

25	Policy TC1	As discussed previously reference to 150sqm is inappropriate and unjustified. You should also be aware of the Core Strategy Inspector's Main Modification 48 where he confirms 1,000sqm for comparison retailing but recommends 2,500sqm is applied to convenience retailing. SDC will be obliged to make a formal objection if different thresholds to those specified in the Core Strategy are not followed. It would be appropriate to use the amended wording proposed in MM48 at the end of 7 th paragraph.
26	Policy TC2	Final para – this is still a different approach to that taken in Core Strategy Policy CS.22. SDC will need clear evidence that this is reasonable, e.g. is it achievable based on the current situation? Explanation to the policy does not justify the proposed approach. A formal objection may be made if evidence is not compelling.
26	Policy TC3	Given work has commenced on implementing Phase 1 it would now be appropriate to focus only on Phase 2. The following wording is suggested: 'The redevelopment and/or refurbishment of Town Square is supported in order to enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre. A second phase, incorporating the demolition of the existing NCP car park, should be promoted to provide town centre compatible uses, e.g. retail, leisure, cultural, offices, residential, and make provision for any necessary alternative car parking. Any scheme should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create an enhanced... • Open up vistas into... • Be of high quality design...'
29	Policy TC4	Consider replacing 'encouraged in the following ways' with 'supported through'. Does Fig.3 now include the buildings fronting Rother Street within the red line in order to allow implementation of bullet point 4?
31	Policy TC5	Station Road is called Brunel Way
33	Policy TC5 Explanation	Expand to describe character and function of the area.
33	Policy TC6	1 st para, 2 nd line – replace 'shall be safeguarded' with 'is identified'. 1 st para, 3 rd line – amend to read 'conference facilities'.
35	Policy TC6 Explanation	Should describe character and function of the area and basis of what policy seeks. Wording that is provided should be in the policy itself.
35	Policy TC7	1 st para, 2 nd line – unclear what is meant by 'open' as it suggests uncovered. 3 rd line – suggest replace 'outlined' with 'identified'. 4 th line – should reference be to Policy TC5?
37	Policy TC7 Explanation	Should set out basis of and justification for the policy.

37	Policy TC8	Suggest insert references to traffic management and attractive pedestrian/cycle crossing points. The Policy needs an explanation.
39	Policy TCPR1	Should the title be 'Project TCPR1'? This is aspirational and operational and is not directly related to land-use. Is it clear having the projects intertwined with the policies? Should the projects be in a separate section of the Plan?
40	Policy PR2	Should this be titled 'Project TCPR2' for consistency? See comment above re: location within the overall document. 1 st line – should the reference be to Policy TC5?
42	Policy PR2 Explanation	Not provided.
42	Policy PR3	Should this be titled 'Project TCPR3' for consistency? See comment above re: location within the overall document. Other opportunities are being investigated following the Birmingham Road Study and through the Canal Quarter Masterplan. Suggest 2 nd line is amended to read 'by implementing various schemes including:'
44	Policy TC9	Policy title is missing.
45	Policy TC10	First paragraph – replace 'actively promoted' with 'supported'. Second paragraph – replace 'permitted' with 'supported'.
45	Policy TC10 Explanation	Expand to cover basis for why cultural and learning activities should be provided.
46	Policy TC11	Why is the Bridgeway area specified? There is no scope at this location due to flood risk. Policy TC6 refers to land behind Rother Street being appropriate for this use. No explanation is provided.
47	Policy TC12	Amend a) to read 'supplementary guidance' In b) what is meant by the updated design guide? In c) insert 'with' No explanation is provided.
47/48	Project TPR4	Should this be titled 'Project TPR4'? This is an aspirational project and should be in a separate section. The prefix to this project is different to the projects listed under the Town Centre section, but follows on from them numerically. It is quite a confusing system.

		<p>Concern is raised that attempting to retain projects within main body of the Plan is not very easy to follow.</p> <p>This project offers free architectural advice. This will rely on the goodwill of a number of architects. Has the viability of this been investigated? The project also commits SDC to potentially substantial grants. Has this been discussed with SDC, given the continued squeeze on finances? As far as I am aware, funds have not been identified by SDC and there is no evidence they will be forthcoming. Without any evidence, is there any real prospect of this ever happening?</p> <p>No explanation is provided.</p>
48	Policy TC13	This is not phrased as a policy. Is it more likely to be a project, in any case (along the lines of TPR5)?
49	Policy TC13 Explanation	Appears to be incomplete, e.g. it doesn't refer to situation and what is intended in Bridge Street.
49	Policy TPR5	<p>Should the title be 'Project TPR5'? Should the word 'schemes' be replaced by 'projects' in the first sentence?</p> <p>Widening footways in Bridge Street is going to be restricted if on-street parking is retained. In b) suggest 'closure' in 1st and 4th lines is replaced with 'pedestrian priority area'.</p>
50	Policy TPR5 Explanation	Repeats incomplete explanation to Policy TC13.
50	Policy TPR6	<p>Should the title be 'Project TPR6'?</p> <p>No explanation is provided.</p>
51	Policy TPR7	Should the title be 'Project TPR7'?
51	Policy TPR8	<p>Should the title be 'Project TPR8'?</p> <p>Do you have any ideas as to how this can realistically be achieved?</p> <p>No explanation is provided.</p>
52	Policy TPR9	Should the title be 'Project TPR9'?
56	Policy BE1	As stressed before, the definition of 'large-scale development' in the context of this policy is too low to be applicable in practice – suggest 50 or more dwellings is used.

57	Policy BE3	Again, the definition of 'large-scale development' in the context of this policy is too low to be applicable in practice – suggest 50 or more dwellings is used. Whilst it is acknowledged that the policy and the definition mirrors Policy D3 from the Kineton NDP, there is a contextual argument to be made in terms of the overall scale of the settlements and the development pressures associated with the main town and a MRC.
58	Policy BE3 Explanation	2 nd para – the issues raised here are considered in relation to all development proposals as appropriate and is a different matter to the need for masterplanning. CIL will provide the basis for all new dwellings to contribute to infrastructure improvements. 4 th paragraph – should be deleted.
58	Policy BE4	This is aspirational and should be in a separate section of the Plan. The first line refers to developments of a 'significant' nature but the Explanation at paragraph 4 refers to large-scale development. Are these the same thresholds? If so I consider the terminology should be consistent. It is considered excessive for a planning application for 10 dwellings to need to be referred to a design review panel.
59	Policy BE4 Explanation	4 th para – there isn't a reference to 'large-scale' in the policy itself. The threshold specified is more appropriate in relation to this policy but may not be necessary.
60	Policy BE5 Explanation	3 rd para – definition of 'large-scale' is reasonable to apply to this policy.
60/61	Policy BE6	This Policy hasn't been updated to reflect changes in national policy. For example, the Code for Sustainable Homes is being phased out, and the Lifetime Homes Standard is no longer the most appropriate benchmark for accessibility. If the Plan is to retain those standards as a policy requirement, it must explain how regard has been had to national policy and make the case for any departure. Again, this is of practical importance to the District Council's housing partners and the effective delivery of schemes.
63	Policy BE8	Who would be responsible for removing unnecessary, unauthorised and dilapidated signage? Who decides any signage is unnecessary or dilapidated? How would it be co-ordinated? Many adverts can be erected due to them being 'deemed consent' under the advert regulations. This policy does not seem to take this into account.
65	Policy BE9 Explanation	3 rd para on page 65, 3 rd line – SDC is producing a Masterplan SPD on Canal Quarter so reference to this specific proposal is not necessary.
66	Policy BE10	1 st para, 2 nd line – refer to Shottery Conservation Area; suggest replace 'particularly' with 'including'. Where is the town's 'historic spine'? Is this mapped anywhere, to inform those who need to interpret the policy?

		3 rd para – this is not consistent with national policy. Suggest replace ‘must as a minimum’ with ‘should’.
66	Policy BE10 Explanation	4 th para – should refer to Shottery Conservation Area. [NB. It should be noted that SDC has not committed resources to undertaking such reviews and by supporting doing so, the NDP could be used by other parties to emphasise the need for them to be done.]
67	Policy BE11	Historic Parks and Gardens are a heritage asset and would be more appropriately covered in Policy BE10. SSSIs are a natural not an historic asset and would be more appropriately covered in a separate objective and policy dealing with all such features including Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves.
67	Policy BE11 Explanation	It would be helpful to identify the unregistered parks and gardens in the Neighbourhood Area that this policy would apply to.
68	Policy BE12	1 st para on page 68 – already covered in Policy BE6. The Reference to BREEAM Excellent standard is not consistent with current national policy. 2 nd para – assume you mean ‘permanent’ rather than ‘lawful’.
69	Policy BE14	2 nd para on page 69 – amend to read ‘above shops and other uses within the town centre.’
69	Policy BE14 Explanation	3 rd para, 1 st line – delete ‘above shops and offices’
70	Section 9	2 nd para, 2 nd line – no justification given for specifying over 25 houses. Individual gardens will be provided on most residential schemes. It would be unreasonable to expect individual housing developments to provide for allotments although CIL would allow for monies to be used for that purpose.
71	Policy NE1	It is unclear who will designate additional LNRs. The Town Council can create LNRs if the District Council has given it the power to do this – is that the case?
75	Policy NE3	2 nd para, 1 st line – principle is applicable to smaller developments so suggest amend to read ‘Development will need to demonstrate...’ It is noted that large-scale development is described as 25+ dwellings here, which is different to the number quoted in other policies within the Plan.
76	Project NEPR1	Has any party committed to lead on this project? If yes, this should be specified; if not, it should go in a separate section as an aspiration.

78	Roads and Transport	3 rd line on page 78 – 32,000 population equates to around 10,000 homes. This is far too high to accurately reflect the scale of new development proposed in the town and surrounding area.
79	Need for a transportation strategy	End of 1 st para on page 79 – South Western Relief Road in conjunction with West of Shottery Relief Road provides such a route between B439 (A3400 actually) and A46.
81	Importance of public transport	4 th para – a bus/rail interchange is provided as part of the Cattle Market redevelopment scheme.
83	Policy INF2	Top of page 83 – amend to read 'Proposals which promote...'
84	Policy INF3 Explanation	1 st paragraph should be placed in the policy itself.
85	Policy INFPR1	Should the title be 'Project INFPR1'? 1 st line – amend to read 'highway Authority should be produced on the ways...' 2 nd and 5 th bullets cover the same issue. Explanation should be provided.
86	Policy INFPR2	Should the title be 'Project INFPR2'? 1 st line – amend to read 'Measures should be taken to reduce...congested roads, including:' 1 st bullet – amend to read 'dynamic traffic management directing...' 2 nd bullet – split up and create separate bullet commencing 'The improvement of pedestrian access...' 4 th bullet – which junction is being referred to? Explanation should be provided.
86	Policy INFPR3	Should the title be 'Project INFPR3'? 1 st line – amend to read 'Car parking should be provided...' 1 st bullet – how can this be achieved? 3 rd bullet – how can this be achieved? Explanation should be provided.
87	Policy INFPR4	Should the title be 'Project INFPR4'? Explanation should be provided.
87	Policy INFPR5	Should the title be 'Project INFPR5'? 1 st para – amend to read 'A scheme for traffic calming...Arden Street/Clopton Road junction should be implemented which:'
88/89	Policy INFPR6	Should the title be 'Project INFPR6'? 2 nd para – delete 'All' at the beginning. 3 rd para – delete 'receptors' at the end as not all the examples given are such. 2 nd bullet – amend to read 'Adjacent residential areas to Birmingham Road;'

		6 th bullet – amend to read 'Residential areas south of the river, including Tiddington, to the town centre;' 7 th bullet – use capital 'B' 8 th bullet – amend to read 'Between the Greenway and the town centre.' Explanation should be provided.
89	Policy INFPR7	Should the title be 'Project INFPR7'?
90	Policy INF5	Amend to read 'The section of line of the former railway between Stratford-upon-Avon and Honeybourne within the Neighbourhood Area should be protected from development...' Explanation should be provided.
90	Policy INF6	Amend to read 'A site for a bus interchange at the railway station should be protected.' [NB. A bus rail interchange forms part of the Cattle Market redevelopment and there is no obvious scope to provide anything more.] Explanation should be provided.
90	Policy INFPR8	Should the title be 'Project INFPR8'?
91	Policy INFPR9	Should the title be 'Project INFPR9'? 1 st bullet – amend to read 'Limiting their use of town centre streets to picking up and dropping of;' 2 nd bullet – amend to read 'Promoting a layover facility...;' 5 th bullet – amend to read 'Encouraging the use of hybrid and start/stop bus operations;' 6 th bullet – amend to read 'Seeking agreements on acceptable routes...' Explanation should be provided.
92	Providing and Protecting Community Facilities	3 rd para – needs to be updated to reflect findings of the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Update produced in 2014.
95	Policy CLW2	Top of page 95 – suggest this should be amended so that it is more precise, e.g. a) Young people (aged 15-25?) b) Older people (aged 65 and over?) c) Young families
95	Policy CLW2 Explanation	1 st para, last sentence – amend to read 'Provision of such facilities must avoid detrimental impact on...'
96	Policy CLW3	The objective is laudable, but it isn't really expressed as a land use policy. It is also too vague to be of much practical use when determining planning applications. Certain projects such as the Bishopton Extra Care Housing could even be considered to be in conflict if strictly interpreted. It may be better off as explanatory text to Policies H6 and H7.
98	Policy CLW4	This policy appears to be attempting to do two separate things: designate areas of LGS and

		<p>protect other areas of 'valuable open space' that do not adhere to the LGS designation criteria. Since designation of LGS is listed as a specific process, should this policy be split into 2 separate policies, one covering LGS designations and the other listing areas of open space for protection? The map at Fig.11 is covering a very wide area and it is difficult to pick out the areas of land referred to in this policy. It would be appropriate and helpful to include larger-scale, detailed maps for each parcel of land referred to in this policy.</p> <p>m) delete text in brackets as this point is covered in Policy SSB1.</p>
100	Policy CLW5 Explanation	<p>3rd para – needs to be updated to reflect findings of the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Update produced in 2014.</p> <p>Last para – definition of large scale is too low to apply to provision of on-site facilities. All housing developments could contribute to off-site recreation facilities through CIL. [NB. 1 hectare equates to 30 dwellings on average.]</p>
100	Policy CLW6	<p>1st para – amend to read 'New development must demonstrate...have been incorporated.'</p> <p>2nd para – replace 'encourage' with 'incorporate'</p>
101	Policy CLW6 Explanation	Last para – delete 'All' at the beginning.
101	Policy CLW7	Delete 'all' from 2 nd line
102	Policy CLW7	Amend to read 'Development should not reduce the amenity...'
102	Policy CLW8	2 nd para – amend to read 'existing leisure facility at Bridgeway will be encouraged.'
103	Policy CLW8 Explanation	<p>2nd para – replace 'not be permitted' with 'not be supported'</p> <p>Last para – replace 'would' with 'will'</p>
103	Policy CLW9	<p>Add 'allotment' between 'in' and 'provision' at end of first paragraph and add 'in the neighbourhood area' after 'elsewhere'.</p> <p>Last paragraph – specifying a minimum garden size is too prescriptive and, in any case, 60sqm is too large for smaller dwellings. The District Council's Meeting Housing Needs SPD specified 40sqm for 2 bedroom houses (see page 32).</p> <p>Use of s106 will be limited due to CIL Regulations. All housing developments could contribute to provision of allotments through CIL.</p> <p>The objectives of the policies are laudable, but do give rise to issues of practice/implementation and, as such, will be of importance to the Council's partner Registered Providers. Any likely requirements by way of planning obligations require quantification.</p>

104	Policy CLPR1	Should the title be 'Project CLPR1'? Last line in a) – amend to read 'provision for connections to open countryside; and' [NB. It is suggested that the reference to future adjacent development is deleted as locations have not been identified.]
106	Policy CLW10	Is the emphasis of this policy on traffic or are there other sources of pollution covered? Policy and its explanation need to be clearer and more specific.
106	Policy CLW11	1 st para – insert 'will be sought' at the end.
108	Policy SSB1	1 st para – amend to read 'Developments that would deliver...comprising mixed uses will be supported.' [NB. there is no reference to the Design Review Panel]
109	Policy SSB1 Explanation	6 th para, 3 rd line – amend to read 'restricted to a maximum of four storeys.'
110	Policy SSB2	1 st para, 1 st line – replace 'at least' with 'approximately' 2 nd para, 1 st line – replace 'permitted' with 'supported'
		Why is the Bishopton Lane site not covered by a policy?
112	Policy SSB2 Explanation	Last para – amend to read 'employees and visitors, and an effective...'
113	Section 12b Tiddington	1 st para on page 113, 3 rd /4 th lines – approach taken in submitted Core Strategy to identify scale of housing development in LSVs has changes since then. Suggest the text is amended to read 'recognised that Tiddington's proposed contribution (at that time) of 76-100 dwellings in the plan period up to 2031...'
114	Section 12b Tiddington	2 nd para, 7 th line – due to the above whereby Core Strategy Policy CS.16 expects Tiddington to provide up to 113 dwellings, the text should be amended to read 'it would still leave up to 61 houses for which...' 3 rd para, 3 rd bullet, 2 nd sentence – amend to read 'The southern part would be used for green open space...'
116	Policy SSB3	2 nd para, 1 st line – replace 'provisos' with 'provisions' In d) specifying a minimum garden size is too prescriptive and, in any case, 60sqm is too large for smaller dwellings. The District Council's Meeting Housing Needs SPD specified 40sqm for 2 bedroom houses (see page 32). In e) County Highways adopted parking standards don't exist. In f) delete final sentence. Replace g) with the following 'A new public open space or community woodland of some 5ha at the southern end of the site.' Criterion h) has no text associated with it

		<p>This new policy needs to properly reflect recent grant of outline permission and point out that Reserved Matters approvals and an Affordable Housing Specification will be required to facilitate delivery. Whilst criterion (b) can prioritise the needs of Tiddington residents, it cannot do so exclusively. The local connection criteria are out of line with both our current practice as well as Policy H6 (see above) and arguably remain unworkable; whereas in practice the criteria will be set in the S.106 Agreement negotiated in respect of the outline permission and be in line with the District Council's current policy and practice. For these reasons it is recommended that the second sentence of criterion (b) is deleted in its entirety.</p> <p>Criterion (d) duplicates CWL9.</p>
		<p>Why is the Home Guard Club site not covered by a policy?</p>
	General	<p>There are still several policies that don't appear to have a land-use planning basis, e.g. TCPR1, BE4, whilst others, e.g. BE2, INF1, INF2, are too vague and create no real "added value" over and above the high-level policies of the Core Strategy. This is of considerable practical importance to the District Council's housing partners, because one of the real benefits of neighbourhood planning is that it allows local communities to identify <i>specific</i> issues of importance to them, which can then be taken into account from an early stage in the design and development process.</p>