

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2031

Consultation Statement



December 2022

Marston Sicca Parish Council

With assistance from



Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation
Statement, January 2023

Contents

Table of Contents


1. Introduction and Background.	3
2. Pre-Regulation 14 Consultations.....	5
3. Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitat Regulations Assessment.....	6
4. Regulation 14 public Consultation 30th May 2022 – 11th July 2022	7
Appendix 0: Bletsoes Letter to Parish Clerk, 11 July 22	96
Appendix 1: Open day consultation flyer	103
Appendix 2: Results of Open day consultation	104
Appendix 3: Introduction to Neighbourhood Planning Presentation	105
Appendix 4: Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan Consultation	118
– Fete Survey.....	118
Appendix 5: Post NDP Survey Meeting 13th October 2019.....	119
Appendix 6; Minutes of Parish Council Meeting September 2019	121
Appendix 7: SEA Screening.....	128
Appendix 8 Stratford on Avon Herald Regulation 14 Consultation notice	129
Appendix 9 Template of letter sent to Land Owners affected by the Local Gap Policy.....	130
Appendix 10: Regulation 14 Consultation Flyer.	132
Appendix 11: Regulation 14 consultation poster	134
Appendix 12: Regulation 14 Consultation Comments Form.....	135
Appendix 13: List of Regulation 14 Consultees	140
Appendix 14: Consultation letter sent to all Statutory Consultees	145

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

1. Introduction and Background.

- 1.1. This Consultation Statement has been prepared in accordance with The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (SI No. 637) Part 5 Paragraph 15 (2)1 which defines a “consultation statement” as *a document which – contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan; explains how they were consulted; summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.*
- 1.2. The Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan (LMNDP) has also been prepared by considering the advice provided in Paragraph: 107 (Reference ID: 41-107-20200925) of the National Planning Practice (NPPG).
- 1.3. The Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared in response to the Localism Act 2011, this gives parish councils and other relevant bodies, new powers to prepare statutory Neighbourhood Plans to help guide development in their local areas. These powers give local people the opportunity to shape new development, as planning applications are determined in accordance with national planning policy and the local development plan, and neighbourhood plans form part of this framework.
- 1.4. Long Marston as a parish council is a qualifying body. As such the parish council applied to Stratford-on-Avon Council for designation of the neighbourhood area in November 2016. A decision regarding the designation of the neighbourhood plan area was received in January 2017. The revised neighbourhood area is aligned to the current Long Marston parish boundary excluding the developments sites known as Long Marston Airfield and Meon Vale. Both excluded sites are dealt with through a separate planning process as strategic sites through the Stratford on Avon Core Strategy. The revised parish boundary can be seen here <https://www.stratford.gov.uk/planning-building/long-marston-neighbourhood-plan.cfm>

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation
Statement, January 2023



Marston Sicca Neighbourhood Plan Boundary

FIGURE 1: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN BOUNDARY

- 1.5. The LMNDP has been prepared by a working group comprising 1 Parish Councillor and local residents. Further information on the background and work undertaken so far on the LMNDP can be found at the consultation website. (<http://www.longmarstonnp.co.uk/>).
- 1.6. All information about the LMNDP at each stage has been provided on the neighbourhood plan web site (including minutes of the working group) and via articles and updates in the parish newsletter and letter drops.
- 1.7. **Parish Council Updates:** There has always been one parish council member on the steering group. Monthly progress reports were delivered at each parish council meeting. The third Monday of each month.

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

2. Pre-Regulation 14 Consultations

- 2.1. **Introduction to Neighbourhood Planning:** To start the process, on the 25th November 2017 a neighbourhood plan open day was arranged in the village hall to introduce residents to the process and recruit volunteers. A flyer was hand delivered to all residents of the plan area.

A copy of the flyer can be seen in Appendix 1.

The result of the open day consultation can be seen in Appendix 2

- 2.2. **Presentation in the village hall:** On the 22nd April 2018 a public engagement meeting was held in the village hall and attracted 20 members of the public. Meeting conducted by Councillor Noel Davis and Debbie Woodliffe (Parish Clerk).

A presentation entitled Neighbourhood Planning, Getting Started written by Noel Davis and another entitled Setting the Scene for The Later Stages of The Neighbourhood Planning Process written by Mathew Neale of Stratford on Avon District Council, was well received, generating a lot of interest.

A copy of the presentations can be seen in Appendix 3.

- 2.3. **Village Fete “mini survey”:** At the village fete on the 23rd June 2018 residents were able to meet with members of the steering group and were asked to fill in a “mini survey” asking what they liked and disliked about living in Long Marston.

The results of this “mini survey” can be seen in Appendix 4.

- 2.4. **Further consultation on NDP process:** On 17th October 2018 a meeting was held in the village hall. The purpose of engagement: To inform the residents of the Plan Area, about the Neighbourhood Plan process and progress to date.

A condensed version of the Neighbourhood Plan Process and Requirements was displayed for visitors to see, as was a chart showing our progress within this process.

57 completed forms, the results of the “mini survey” that was offered at the village fete in June had been returned. The results were available for discussion.

- 2.5. **The neighbourhood Plan Survey** - Two copies of the Neighbourhood Plan Survey were delivered to every address within the plan area. More copies

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

were available to download from the consultation website. The survey period ran from the 8th to 30th June 2019.

At the same time, a Housing needs Survey was conducted.

Around 40% of households completed the survey. The survey showed that the most valued aspect of living in Long Marston was its rural character and access to the countryside.

Full results of the survey can be accessed here

<http://www.longmarstonnp.co.uk/evidence.html>

- 2.6. **Post Survey Consultation:** After the survey had been analysed, a meeting was held in the village hall to give residents the opportunity to discuss the results. The meeting was held between 11 am and 1 pm on Sunday 13th October.

Copies of the top-line results of the neighbourhood plan survey questionnaire were available for perusal with key sections displayed on notice boards. All the NP steering group members were available to discuss the results with 25 attendees.

Photos of the meeting can be seen in Appendix 5.

- 2.7. **Stratford on Avon District Council SHLAA Site Allocations Plan:** At the Parish Council meeting of 16th September 2019 the site allocations plan was discussed in detail. It was decided that only one of the proposed reserve housing sites could be supported.

Minutes of this meeting can be viewed at *Appendix 6*

3. **Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitat Regulations Assessment**

- 3.1. In preparing the Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan, the LMNDP has been subject to Strategic Environmental and Habitat Regulations Assessment screening by Stratford on Avon District Council.
- 3.2. The screening has been consulted on with the relevant statutory bodies. The screening concluded that SEA screening was not required.
- 3.3. A copy of the report from Lepus Consulting can be viewed on the consultation website <http://www.longmarstonnp.co.uk/evidence.html>

A copy of the letter from SDC can be seen in appendix 7

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

4. Regulation 14 public Consultation 30th May 2022 – 11th July 2022

- 4.1. The public consultation on the Long Marston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood Plan was carried out in accordance with The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (SI No. 637) Part 5 Pre-submission consultation and publicity, paragraph 14. This states that: *Before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must—*
- (a) publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area:*
 - (i) details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan;*
 - (ii) details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected;*
 - (iii) details of how to make representations; and*
 - (iv) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised;*
 - (b) consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; and*
 - (c) send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority.*
- 3.2. The Long Marston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood Plan was published for formal consultation for 6 weeks from 30th May 2022 to 11th July 2022
- 3.3. The Regulation 14 consultation was publicised with an article in the local newspaper, Stratford Herald (*Appendix 8*), the parish magazine, and letters to owners of land affected by the Local Gap Policy (*Appendix 9*). A pre-submission flyer was sent out to all addresses in the parish, with the village newsletter (*Appendix 10*) giving full details of the regulation 14 process and where copies of the plan and response forms could be viewed. A poster advertising the consultation event was posted at various points in the village (Public notice board, shop, bus shelter, village hall) A copy can be seen in *appendix 11*
- 3.4. At the start of the regulation 14 consultation period. Residents were invited to two open days in the village hall, where they were able to review the draft plan. These were held on the evening of 6th June and the morning of 11th June 2022. See *appendix 10*.
- 3.5. Copies of the plan and supporting documents were made available on the LMNDP consultation web site <http://www.longmarstonnp.co.uk/reg14.html>
- 3.6. A comment form was provided, to be completed on, or downloaded from the consultation web page (*Appendix 12*). Completed comment forms were to be

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

returned to: **clerk@marstonsicca-pc.gov.uk**. or put into a dedicated post box located at the village shop. A paper copy of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and/or the comment form could be obtained from the Clerk by telephoning or contacting the Parish Clerk by email or postal address. A limited number of paper copies were available to collect from the village shop.

- 3.7. All consultation materials set out when and to whom comments should be returned i.e. the Clerk to Marston Sicca Parish Council.
- 3.8. A list of the consultation bodies' contact details was kindly provided by Stratford-on-Avon District Council and all those on the list were sent a letter by email notifying them of the Regulation 14 public consultation and inviting comments. This list included:
- Individuals and businesses (including landowners and developers)
 - Adjoining parishes.
 - Environment Agency
 - Warwickshire County Council
 - Local ward and county councillors

The full list of consultees is reproduced in Appendix 13.

A copy of the Consultation letter can be seen in Appendix 14

- 3.8. A copy of the Regulation 14 Draft Plan was sent to Stratford-on-Avon District Council.

Table 1 sets out the responses received to the Regulation 14 Consultation. Table 1 also include a column setting out the Steering group's consideration of the response and the agreed action. These agreed actions were used to make amendments to the Regulation 14 Draft prior to submission.

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
GENERAL COMMENTS				
1	Consultee Gloucester Diocesan Advisory Committee	General	<p>Gloucester Diocesan Advisory Committee was pleased to learn that the Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan survey's respondents were almost unanimously satisfied with the role St James' church plays in their community and that the building is considered one of the most important heritage and community assets in the village. The Committee concurs with the view expressed in the Plan that any future development in the vicinity of St James' church should take into consideration the significance of this grade I listed building, as well as the significance of its curtilage. The views of the church should be protected.</p> <p>The Committee would like to support the view expressed in one of the responses to the survey question about what improvements respondents would like to see to the existing facilities in the village. The response suggested that by reconfiguring seating in the church it could be used for more events. The Committee agrees that the potential St James' church offers should be explored further. The Diocese of Gloucester and the Committee encourage creative suitable extended uses of church buildings, as long as they have the support of the local Parochial Church Council (PCC). Utilising church space</p>	Noted. No action required

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
2	Tom Littleford Resident		for uses other than worship, such as occasional events and gatherings, helps churches to remain at the heart of the community and contributes to their long-term sustainability.	
3	Cassie Neville Resident	Supporting the pre-submission plan		Noted. No action required
4	Mark Cammies Resident	Supporting the pre-submission plan	The document was very well put together and covered all the points that I would have raised for consideration. I would reiterate the point relating to traffic calming in the centre of the village, as the measures currently at the periphery of the village are insufficient to prevent speeding vehicles. Also, given the village has already had 78 new dwellings built in the last decade, I would support the small number of new dwellings (8 No.) being suggested for the Park location at village edge. Finally, it is positive to note that there is potential for a new build village hall with dedicated parking, on Parish owned land away from the centre of the village (as the existing village hall has no parking and many visitors park on the road or on the grass verge, sometimes blocking our own driveway!) Many thanks to those who pulled the document together from the parish team as well!	Noted. No action required

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
5	Ester Wright Resident	General	<p>We need more houses in the village. I moved here with my family in 2019, into a new house and we have had such a positive experience. It is a shame that there is only 1 plot of land allocated for 8 new homes, which is way outside the village.</p> <p>I would like to see a couple of small development's intermingled with the more mature houses within the village. Long Marston is so well connected, homes are snapped up quickly before they even enter the open market. I want to see this village thrive and not become stagnated which this neighbourhood plan seems to want to do.</p> <p>We have lots and lots of green space in the village for the wildlife it would benefit the village to build more homes for more families to enjoy.</p> <p>I do not agree with the "valued green infrastructure" or "wildlife corridors". Firstly people's private gardens should not be shoehorned into this plan without full consultation with the owners. Wildlife use hedgerows for their owns corridors</p>	<p>Long Marston is a Category 4 LSV. As such, under the Stratford on Avon Core Strategy policies CS 16 the indicative dwelling figure for the 2011-2031 plan period is 32 dwellings. To date there have been 80 new dwellings constructed in the village. This represents an over-provision of 211%. The highest in the district.</p> <p>Though it would be adjacent to the village, Policy Dev 4 Housing for Local People supports small housing developments to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>The majority of respondents to the NDP survey wanted to maintain the rural character of the village, which include its open green spaces. There is a limited amount of green spaces within the village itself. Filling in the few green spaces that are left within the village will be detrimental to the open character of the settlement.</p> <p>Policy Dev 2: Ensuring Appropriate High-Quality Development cites the importance of movement between gardens for wildlife and notes that "Solid fencing and walls can prevent birds, small mammals and invertebrates from moving freely between gardens."</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>and in Long Marston we have these in abundance.</p> <p>This plan comes across as being developed by NIMBYS, there is a housing need across this nation and Long Marston needs to step up and look to the future.</p>	<p>Policy Dev 6: Future Housing identifies a reserve site for future housing within the village.</p>
6	Peter Dodd Resident/Land owner	Policy L&E 2	<p>OBJECTION:</p> <p>OBJECTION to Ashmead House, Hopkins Field curtilage being highlighted as "Valued Green Infrastructure" by the Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan Steering group.</p> <p>Its my garden and is managed as such.</p> <p>The paddocks and field form part of my private garden and curtilage of my home. It is NOT and Never has been "Valued Green infrastructure". My garden is NOT available for use as "Valued Green Infrastructure".</p>	<p>The garden of Ashmead house was not intended to be included. This was a drawing error which will be corrected. It was understood that the omission of part of Footpath SD40 from the definitive map was to be corrected. This has not been done so the drawing will be corrected to show the current situation.</p> <p>According governmental guidance "Green infrastructure can embrace a range of spaces and assets that provide environmental and wider benefits. It can, for example, include parks, playing fields, other areas of open space, woodland, allotments, private gardens [emphasis added], sustainable drainage features, green roofs and walls, street trees..."</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>The Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Steering Group have not engaged or consulted us about any aspect of our private property being shoehorned into this preliminary draft neighbourhood plan. An unauthorised and unsigned letter from the Parish Clerk was the first indication of such. We are strongly disagreeing with the inclusion of our private garden in this plan.</p> <p>Landowners should be engaged with at the earliest opportunity to ensure the landowners vision for their land is represented in line with the development of the neighbourhood plan (NP), this has not been done. The NP was published online before the Parish Council or Neighbourhood steering group had bothered to contact us. I have noticed that my private garden has been also photographed and published online without my consent.</p> <p>The field and paddocks are privately owned and managed as my garden, it does not have any Ecological significance, and this is</p>	<p>Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 8-004-20190721 https://www.gov.uk/guidance/natural-environment#green-infrastructure</p> <p>The land's value as important green infrastructure was highlighted in refused development applications: (16/01761/OUT) stated that "The application site forms an important green finger near the centre of the village which helps break-up the built form and provide a gradual introduction into the open countryside beyond. The site has a distinctive rural character which positively contributes to the bucolic village setting." (14/02985/FUL) was dismissed on appeal (APP/J3720/W/16/3153788). "The open and undeveloped nature of the appeal site also contributes to the bucolic character and setting of the lane and this part of the village generally."</p> <p>In addition to the numerous open days, residents' survey and Steering Group meetings held, the Reg 14 consultation affords parishioners the opportunity to influence, comment and feedback on the Plan's contents. (see website: www.longmarstonnp.co.uk/evidence.html)</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>supported by ecological studies carried out over recent years.</p> <p>Assumptions:</p> <p>Absolutely no consultation or engagement from ANYONE. We received an unauthorised letter from a Ms Woodlife on the 21st May regarding this NP. It was already published on the NP website.</p> <p>My private land is not available for inclusion into the NP as "Valued Green Infrastructure", the lack of engagement has resulted in incorrect assumption of my private property. We have various plans for our private land which are NOT in line with the NP view. It is in the process of being prepared to be put to use by my daughter and son in law, who live in the village. It has been a well known fact in the village, as we had discussed our plans Counsellor M Clarke and another resident of the village (which was filtered down to others as other residents have shown an interest in our plans) in December 2020, when we were investigating criminal damage on my property.</p> <p>Due to horrific abuse of my private property. We were advised by the police not to put animals on the field until this criminal behaviour stopped as we had safety</p>	<p>See previous response above</p> <p>See previous response above.</p> <p>See previous response above.</p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>concerns over our animals, this we hoped had ceased until the discovery of more criminal and antisocial behaviour in May 2022.</p> <p>Details of criminal/anti social activity listed below:</p> <p>Evidence of my garden not being "valued" but abused.</p> <p>Criminal and anti social behaviour logged to police and District Counsellor.</p> <p>My property is NOT "valued green infrastructure" below are the incidents that clearly demonstrated its not valued but abused</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Christmas Day 2020 Morning the footpath stile was damaged. This was promptly repaired by myself. - Christmas Day Evening the footpath stile was again completely destroyed, with the wood of the stile being strewn around. A 2-3ft hole was left on the footpath causing a hazard, this was rectified again by myself that evening. Police and Counsellor M Perteghella were informed. - Chicken Wire was stapled across bottom of gate and fence – caused someone to fall 	<p>Noted. No action required.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>over the wire and injure themselves. Damaged to the gate and fence, wire removed kept as evidence. Reported to police.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Logs stolen off the field – challenged the perpetrator, logs left and person walked off. - Private land, keep to footpath signs were fitted, a day later these have been bent in an attempt to remove them. Reported to police. - Painted sign drilled on to fence. - Black large carved feather drilled on to fence – reported to police, evidence taken. - Dog poo not picked up – challenged by our family when witnessed, regular occurrence. - Dog Poo bags left hanging on gate – weekly occurrence, bags disposed of by us. Reported to environmental health. - Large amount of full dog poo bags found dumped – reported to environmental health. 	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence of fly tipping including large concrete blocks (builders waste), felled conifer trees and garden waste dumped in far corner of field. Reported to Environmental Health and Anti Social Behaviour team. - Trespass – numerous occasions, when seen, these individuals are reminded that they must remain on the footpath and not stray on to my private property. - Dogs being let off lead within field to run across my private property – received a barrage of abuse when they have been asked to put their dogs on a lead and stay on the footpath. - Dog let off lead and attacked my own dog in her garden, causing facial injuries – reported to police <p>This is my private garden/land, which has been severely abused over the last few years. When we have approached these people we have become victims of extreme abuse.</p> <p>The SD40 footpath attracts such behaviour and whilst it remains open the land will never have a chance of being a wildlife haven.</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Footpath:</p> <p>My property including my house and gardens is my private family property albeit with a short footpath running through from terminating at the gates either side.</p> <p>The only access to the public is via a short rural footpath. The SD40 footpath does NOT continue to the main road as indicated on the NP consultation map. This has been confirmed by Public Right Of Way team, Stratford County Council on Monday 23rd May 2022. From the gate to the main road is a B.O.A.T – By Way Open To All Traffic.</p> <p>The map produced and published by the NP steering group is misleading, false representation of the official footpath by indicating that the SD40 footpath continues to the main road. However the correct map (pictures shown below) showing the correct footpath has been identified in NP leaflet in the parish magazine, but not in the actual draft plan. Why is false, misleading information being published?</p> <p>PLEASE REFER TO PAPERCOPY RECEIVED BY D WOODLIFE ON 1ST JULY TO SEE MAP . (Map 1. Representation of the SD40 footpath zoomed in taken from NP steering group in their leaflet. Map 2.</p>	<p>Please see previous response above.</p>

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>ordnance survey map. Both clearly show the SD40 footpath terminates at my field gate then merges into a B.O.A.T to the main road.)</p> <p>PLEASE REFER TO PAPERCOPY RECEIVED BY D WOODLIFE ON 1ST JULY TO SEE MAP (Misleading map, showing continuation of SD40 footpath to main road, used by NP steering group on its website and letter sent by Parish Council)</p> <p>Invalid survey:</p> <p>Only 40% of Long Marston residents responded to the NP survey, with the low participation rate this NP survey is not a valid survey. Statistically validity indicates how much one can rely on the conclusions derived, but with so few respondents there is no reliability of this study nor does it represent unbiased views. Also the questionnaire was conducted over 3 years ago – this is an outdated survey, with outdated views and does not represent the village as it stands now in 2022. This is because the village has drastically increase since 2019 with over 60+ new homes being built.</p> <p>Valued Green Infrastructure:</p>	<p>A 40% response rate for this type of survey is often considered a good result. There is no set minimum response rate for Neighbourhood Plan surveys.</p> <p>Producing a Neighbourhood Plan can take between 2 and 5 years depending on its complexity. A 'made' Plan is required to be reviewed every 5 years. Evidence within 3 years is therefore considered acceptable.</p> <p>See previous response.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Due to the demographics of Long Marston being a rural village we have lots of green infrastructure throughout the village. Including: The woods in the Heart of England Way – walking distance from the village Lots of designated “historical significant” fields identified by the NP, these can be “historical and valued green space” .</p> <p>6 + acres of land leased by the parish council with public access, which has been rewilded and has an abundance of wildlife of flora and fauna.</p> <p>Large area of open wild space behind Barley Field. And many more acres in the village.</p> <p>The above are NOT private gardens, there is enough “valued green infrastructure” without adding my private property.</p> <p>Photographic evidence of some of criminal and anti social behaviour on my property. PLEASE REFER TO PAPERCOPY RECEIVED BY D WOODLIFE ON 1ST JULY TO SEE PHOTOGRAPHS THAT REFER TO THE BELOW.</p>	<p>Noted: No action required.</p> <p>This policy to be redrafted as a Local Gap policy. See response to respondent 29</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Painted carved black feather – taken by police as evidence March 2021</p> <p>Dog poo left hung on gate, weekly occurrence</p> <p>Wire used to cause blockage and hazard on footpath.</p> <p>Stile vandalised, twice in a 24 hour period. December 2020.</p> <p>Whole heap of dumped poo bags</p> <p>Concrete blocks/ builders waste fly tipped.</p> <p>Felled trees dumped.</p> <p>Garden waste dumped</p>	
7	Jayne Dodd Resident/Land owner	Policy L&E 2	<p>I hereby object to the inclusion of my garden at Ashmead House being included in the Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan for the reasons set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per Ms Woodlife's letter outlining the Neighbourhood Plan (NP), it is not covered by any national policy legislation, the NH plan does not have any legal significance. • It's a private garden • The access is via a rural footpath that runs through the field and terminates at the field entrance. There is no additional access to this private property. It is a footpath only, where dogs should be kept on leads, persons to remain on the footpath (any deviation is trespass) and no loitering. 	Please refer to response to respondent 6

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement from the neighbourhood steering group. • The chair of the steering group and member of Parish Council should highlight his conflict of interest as his garden backs on to my private land. • Another Parish Councillor's garden also backs on to my private land – another conflict of interest. • This private garden is not available for the use outlined in this draft plan. • The results of the neighbourhood survey is out of date as it was conducted over 3 years ago. A valid survey should have shelf life 2 years maximum, also the validity of the survey must be questioned as only 40% of residents voted. As too few people participated in the survey, the survey should be deemed invalid. • This private property has attracted a lot of crime and anti social behaviour, this has increased significantly over the last 2 years, definitely not a valued green space due to behaviours and activities reported to the Police, District Councillor and Environmental Health. • Photos have been taken of my private garden without permission. • Unfortunately this neighbourhood plan has been developed to benefit certain individuals who have their own agenda 	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
9	Chris lea Resident	Supporting the pre-submission plan Policy L&E 2: Page 25, Para 5.2.6	<p>have plenty of scope for small, thoughtful developments within our village. Without damaging the local wildlife.</p> <p>With reference to the Draft Plan I would like to make the following observations: A) Page 25, Para 5.26: "SD40" footpath. This section of footpath had been left off the Definitive Map and Statement for the County Of Warwick, and an application for it to be added as a correction was made by the Marston Sicca Parish Council back in January 2016, and has still not been added by the Council! This illustrates how crucial it is to safeguard such village footpaths and rights of way, and I would hope that this Neighbourhood plan would reinforce the still outstanding application for the correction. I feel that this could be emphasised in the plan, possibly including a copy of the document submitted in 2016 by Marston Sicca Parish Council as supporting documentation.</p> <p>B) (Same topic): The section of the existing recognised part of SD40 is open to and adjacent to a section of paddock/green space, though I learn from other villagers that there was originally a green hedge boundary along the margins of the footpath, similar to the footpath between Rowen and No 8 Pear Tree Close. As such it would have been an important visual statement and also a helpful wildlife corridor (see 5.1.4b, page 19:</p>	<p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p>This application has been delayed by Warwickshire County Council "staff shortages".</p> <p>Yes, this area was wooded with the footpath meandering through the trees and hedgerow. The entire wooded area around the footpath was removed to gain access to the paddock prior to a planning application.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>Vision, 4.2.1 p.17</p> <p>Para 5.2.6, p.25</p> <p>Policy L&E 5.6, p. 35</p> <p>Policy Inf.5, p.45</p>	<p>"Protection of wildlife habitats..." This point also supports Policy L&E 4 (5.4c, page 32).</p> <p>C) Referring to the vision 4.2.1 (page 17) This paddock adjacent to SD40 would be a prime candidate for consideration for protection as a green space, together with the open space opposite (see also paragraph 5.2.6, page 25).</p> <p>D) I fully support Policy L&E 5 on Climate Emergency, specifically point 5.5g (page 35) the provision of car charging points. Could not this be extended to introduce these for those in accommodation which does not allow for a charging point adjacent to their house or flat (specifically first floor flats)?</p> <p>E) Community Safety (page 45) I am aware that the main street through Long Marston is the responsibility of the County Council, but the safety of villagers is at increasing risk by speeding cars, lorries (specifically Skip lorries) and agricultural vehicles. As this issue increases, I would like to see stronger wording in the Neighbourhood Plan, if that were possible. It is a perennial topic of discussion at all levels, Councils included.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Provision of charging points outside the curtilage of a property is difficult and often impractical. A policy to this effect could not reasonably be compiled with in future developments. The steering group will pass this suggestion on to the Parish Council.</p> <p>This is one of the topics which is most often raised at Parish Council meetings. Traffic speed is not a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council has, in consultation with Highways, paid for the installation of traffic mitigation measures at either end of the village.</p> <p>Community Project 1: Appendix A calls for A full report on traffic.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
10	Jonathan Thompson Agent	Support with modifications	I represent the landowners of both Park House and the land North of Barley Fields. I understand that the individual developers will be submitting detailed representations on both sites. However, on behalf of the landowners of Park House, we support the residential allocation, and we would urge the best use of land and for the allocation to be 15 dwellings. In terms of land North of Barley Fields, we would urge a review of the NHP and the reallocation of this land for 15 residential dwellings.	SDC revised preferred options SAP June 2022 Proposal SCB.6 lists this site as 0.8 hectares with a capacity for 10 dwellings. This is based on a net site area of 0.5 hectares @20 dwellings per hectare. Policy Dev 6 to be amended to 10 dwellings.
11	Sam Daubney Resident	Support the pre-submission plan		Noted. No action required
12	Estefania Gomez Resident	Support the pre-submission plan	Great work, no additional comments, hope this goes through	Noted. No action required
13	Richard Daubney Resident	Support the pre-submission plan	Great work team, hopefully this can be pushed through to completion	Noted. No action required
14	Sue Mills Resident	Support the pre-submission plan	Support the plan and hope this can be put into place	Noted. No action required
15	John Bredavs Resident	Support with modifications	Title page - up to date photo as current does not show full extent of recent new housing.	Title page: The photo does not show all of the village. This is a cover illustration and does not form part of the plan. It is the only aerial photo available. Title page updated with Google Earth image which is more up to date but of lower resolution

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>Para 1.5, p.6</p> <p>Page 10</p> <p>Para 3.1.3, p.10</p> <p>Figure 7, p.14</p> <p>Para 3.1.29, p.16</p> <p>Figure 14, p.24</p>	<p>P6 para 1.5 should 'Future' LMA be replaced with commenced.</p> <p>P10 - should a further plan be provided to clearly show NP area within the PC full boundary and the 'excluded' LMA & Meon Vale areas for clarity.</p> <p>P10 para 3.1.3 needs rewording to make clearer.</p> <p>P14 fig 7 - more clearly define devt areas by shading perhaps</p> <p>P16 para 3.1.29 - not aware of any sports clubs or horticultural society – check</p> <p>P24 fig14 - add sizeable attenuation pond at Barley Fields as seasonal wetland/aquatic area plus pond to west of Barley Fields (rear no22)</p>	<p>The word "future" removed.</p> <p>This illustrates the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The NDP boundary, Parish boundary and nearby developments are shown in Figure 35, page59.</p> <p>Agree. Farmhouse in the village, line 6, to be deleted</p> <p>Shading may obscure the area we want to highlight. A coloured border around each area of development will be added</p> <p>Clubs for Keep fit, Zumba, gardening meet in the village hall</p> <p>The pond is a matter for the Parish Councils Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> <p>This area referred to is a field adjoining open countryside to the north and west with a track to the north giving access to the attenuation pond.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>Para 5.3.2, p. 29</p> <p>Figure 19, p.30</p> <p>Figure 22, p.31</p> <p>Figures 19 – 21</p>	<p>The area to the south and east of the attenuation pond at Barley Fields should be designated a green space of importance to link existing environmental corridors to the north and south and provide a green buffer to balance that shown in fig 17 and the Large POS area east of Welford Rd.</p> <p>P29 para 5.3.2 should be enlarged to acknowledge the wide view from the POS at Barley Fields to the west towards Dorsington and north to Welford/Rummer Hill from publically owned and accessible land. (i.e. no third party restrictions by way of ownership)</p> <p>P30 fig19 - the single arrows should be replaced with a 'cone' of visibility. This would define the extent of the unhindered view from respective locations</p> <p>P31 fig 22 should be supplemented with a further photo confirming the view to the north from the same viewpoint.</p> <p>P34 5.4 - the figure numbers appear wrong.</p> <p>This section should also record/reference the 'permanent' permissive footpath between the</p>	<p>Para 5.3.2 refers to the view from the Masons arms. The reference to the figure numbers is wrong (referring to the view from Barley fields). Figure numbers to be corrected to (Figure 20, number 1 on map, figure 19) so that the correct picture is referred to.</p> <p>Agree. Drawing to be amended showing cones of visibility</p> <p>This is on page 31. The view to the north is much the same as to the west. It is open countryside.</p> <p>Agree. Figure 19 to be changed to 24. Figure 20 to be changed to 25. Figure 21 to be changed to 26.</p> <p>There is no footpath from the POS to the Greenway. Only footpaths on the definitive map are shown.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
	Figure 27, p.40	Lagan POS and the Greenway to the east. (S106 requirement) - also add route to fig 26 Public Footpaths.	The village green added to figure 27, Community assets and facilities	This has been included
	Para 6.1.8, p.38	P41 - the existence of a registered small village green should be noted and shown on plan as a community asset.	P42 para 6.1.8 - should include the Lagan POS and orchard areas.	Figure 27 to be renamed as Community Assets & Facilities and include the named assets. The reference to Figure 27 in the Policy where it incorrectly says 'Figure 29' to be corrected
	Figure 27, p.40	P43 fig 27 - 4 registered assets referenced in text (notwithstanding above) but only 2 numbered on plan	P45 para 7.2.2 - line 2 suggest 'parts of' added after rises.	Agree. Text amended as suggested
	Para 7.2.2, p.42	???	Figure 35, p.59	As noted above, there is no public footpath on the definitive map

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>P56 - add permanent permissive footpath already referenced above to plan.</p> <p>P62 fig35 - add red shaded area and buffer description to plan key for clarity</p>	<p>Agree. Plan key to be amended.</p>
16	E A Hodges Land Owner	General Figure 18, p.27	<p>I realise this is a late submission. However during the development of this plan there has been no formal consultation with ourselves as landowners at either side of the village.</p> <p>The setting of a community is important and as such the land to the south east of the village aids to preserve the rural character - 5-2-5</p> <p>Nonetheless in drawing such a tight line of development around the village it will result in the unexpected /unintended consequence of dense urbanisation rather than a more thoughtful village development. It also has the effect of divorcing some properties from natural more usable development - e.g. divorcing the property known as the Goodwins from it's ancient barn.</p> <p>Whilst obviously we should have preferred support for our proposals for development at North End, We note in policies 6 that there is a wish for development of a Community Building from CIL monies. That would be something we would actively support.</p>	<p>In addition to the numerous open days, residents' survey and Steering Group meetings held, the Reg 14 consultation affords parishioners the opportunity to influence, comment and feedback on the Plan's contents. (see website: www.longmarstonnp.co.uk/evidence.html)</p> <p>The Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) is drawn up in accordance with SDC guidelines. It defines the settlement area as it is now and includes any site(s) allocated for development. In addition, Policy Dev.3 supports 'new housing in the countryside [but] will be limited to dwellings for rural workers, replacement dwellings and individual dwellings of exceptional design'.</p> <p>Noted. No action necessary.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			We would look forward to discussions with the Parish Council as sponsors of the Neighbourhood Development Plan regarding land use and especially how support could be given to the long term ambitions to enhance the community assets as they amend their final verions pre-submission and voting for acceptance by the community . .	Noted. Comment passed on to Parish Council.
17	Agent Bleisoes	Letter sent to clerk L&E 2 p25	See Letter in full in the Appendix Comment 1: Object to inclusion of land north of Wyre Lane.	In view of SDC advice to change this policy to Settlement gap, this policy will be redrafted as a Local Gap policy. See previous response to Respondent 6 for full response. <i>According governmental guidance "Green infrastructure can embrace a range of spaces and assets that provide environmental and wider benefits. It can, for example, include parks, playing fields, other areas of open space, woodland, allotments, private gardens [emphasis added], sustainable drainage features, green roofs and walls, street trees..."</i> Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 8-004-20190721 https://www.gov.uk/guidance/natural-environment#green-infrastructure
			Comment 2: Objection to Local Green Space designation	

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Comment 3 & Photographs 1-5: Functionality of the site both in terms of views and supporting wildlife</p> <p>Comment 4: Evidence base is lacking</p>	<p>At present it is not being designated as an LGS only cited as a local gap with valued green space and wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Nettles, brambles and hedgerows support numerous species. They provide a habitat and food source (berries and flowers) for butterflies, birds, insects and small mammals. The purpose of wildlife corridors to support wildlife. It is not necessarily about the views it provides for residents. Its beauty is derived from its natural state.</p> <p>This policy is about citing this area as a local gap separating the two built forms of the village. The results of the Neighbourhood Plan survey clearly show that the residents of the plan area (71%) value the rural character of the village and its connection to the countryside. This policy aims to conserve an area of green space/wildlife habitat which separates the two built forms of the village. When asked about which areas were most suitable for development only 9% thought that Wyre Lane was suitable. 68% of respondents wanted to prevent the urbanisation of the rural character and historic setting (68%) of the village. 65% of residents disagreed or strongly disagreed that there should be 'infill development' in the village.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Comment on Photograph 3: The two sites should be regarded as separate</p>	<p>Residents were given a list of seven potential priorities that could be in the Neighbourhood Plan that would help protect the quality of the environment. Asked for the top three considered most important to them, 69% wanted to ensure that any new building minimises the impact on the rural character of Long Marston, 67% wished to preserve the views of the countryside as much as possible and 65% wished to preserve the green areas within the village.</p> <p>In terms of the natural environment, residents were asked what they would like to see improved within Long Marston. 82% of residents said to plant/manage/protect roadside hedges and wildlife corridors for. There are two dismissed planning appeals associated with this strip of land</p> <p>As for future housing, we have a reserve site put forward and as noted in previous comments Long Marston has already taken its fair share of development</p> <p>This policy does not address the site in terms of development but as valued green infrastructure and wildlife corridor. The boundaries to both paddocks consist of hedgerows which, together with the overgrown vegetation form an ideal habitat for a variety of wildlife.</p> <p>Although separated by a hedge, they are essentially the same in character.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
18	Consultee District Councillor	Letter sent to clerk	<p>Dear Noel, Debbie & NDP team</p> <p>Many thanks for sending me the invitation to comment on the Long Marston NDP.</p> <p>Apologies I'm late.</p> <p>If this helps, these are my (very short) observations:</p> <p>I'm impressed with the work that has gone into this Neighbourhood Plan, well done. I'm pleased to see that there are several Landscape and Natural Environment policies, to conserve the environment, enhance and/or recover biodiversity, as well as preserve the tranquil, rural character of the area.</p> <p>Because of the several heritage and listed buildings, I'm pleased to see Policy HA1, for heritage buildings, as well as archaeological</p>	<p>Photograph 2, showing the boundary with Wyre Lane, is misleading as it has been taken at an angle which gives the impression of a dense hedge. In fact, it is quite sparse in places, giving views into the paddock in several places as well as through the large gateway.</p> <p>Photograph 5 shows one such gap which during summer is crowded with annual weeds but during autumn and winter is bare.</p> <p>Noted. No action required</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>landscapes. Have you thought about a specific conservation area policy? This is something the NDP team might have already explored.</p> <p>It's also good to see a policy which focuses on limiting development outside the BUAB of the village, in order to preserve the separate identity of Long Marston, the open countryside landscape, against the coalescence of villages.</p> <p>Warmest wishes</p> <p>Manuela</p>	
19	Consultee Cotswold Conservation Board		<p>LONG MARSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSE</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Cotswolds Conservation Board on the Pre-Submission Draft of the Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).</p> <p>As you may be aware, Parish Councils and other 'relevant authorities' have the following statutory duty, under s.85 of the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000, commonly referred to as the 'duty of regard' namely that <i>"In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural</i></p>	<p>Noted. It is the opinion of the steering group that the effect on the Cotswolds ANOB by the existing large-scale development between it and Long Marston greatly outweighs the potential impact of any possible further development in Long Marston. There seems to be little point in including reference to the AONB.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p><i>beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty”.</i></p> <p>This includes having regard to the potential impacts of development outside an AONB on the AONB.</p> <p>Further information on this ‘duty of regard’ is provided in Appendix 4 of the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan 2018-2023 (link). As outlined in Appendix 4, relevant authorities are expected to be able to demonstrate that they have fulfilled the duty of regard and should be able to clearly show how they have considered the purpose of AONB designation in their decision making.</p> <p>Although Marston Sicca Parish or the Neighbourhood Area boundary do not overlap with the Cotswolds National Landscape (i.e. the Cotswolds AONB), the Neighbourhood Area boundary does come within approximately 900m of the National Landscape boundary and within approximately 1.5km of footpaths on Meon Hill, within the National Landscape, that provide elevated views across the parish. As such Marston Sicca Parish and the Neighbourhood Area are located within the setting of the National Landscape. This is reflected at</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>paragraph 3.1.1 of the draft NDP, which recognises that the parish is a gateway to the Cotswolds AONB.</p> <p>The Cotswolds AONB Landscape Character Assessment identifies 19 landscape character types (LCTs) within the National Landscape. Meon Hill forms part of LCT 1 Escarpment Outliers (link) and more specifically, it forms part of Landscape Character Area 1F (Escarpment Outliers – Meon and Ebrington Hills). There will also, undoubtedly, be impressive views of Meon Hill and the Cotswolds National Landscape from within the Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the major development currently taking place in the local area (and outside of the Neighbourhood Area), land within the setting of the Cotswolds National Landscape can make an important contribution to maintaining its natural beauty. Where development within the setting of the National Landscape is poorly located or designed, it can do significant harm to this natural beauty. This is especially the case where long views from or to the designated landscape are identified as important, or where the landscape character of land within and adjoining the designated area is complementary. Development within the setting</p>	

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>of the National Landscape will therefore need sensitive handling that takes these potential impacts into account.</p> <p>For these reasons, I would recommend that the Neighbourhood Development Plan makes explicit reference to the Cotswolds National Landscape and the need to ensure that views from and to the National Landscape are not further adversely affected by development within the parish.</p> <p>The Board's Position Statement on 'Development in the Setting of the Cotswolds AONB' (link) may be useful in this regard.</p> <p>I trust this response is helpful, but if you wish to discuss further, please don't hesitate to contact me.</p>	
20	Consultee The Coal Authority	General	<p>Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above.</p> <p>Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it. Should you have any future enquiries please contact a member of Planning and Local Authority Liaison at The Coal Authority using the contact details above.</p>	Noted. No action required

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>It is noted however, that a number of the figures within the draft document (including Figure 35, illustrating the Plan Area Boundary), actually encroach upon part of the Long Marston Airfield development site and the Long Marston Garden Village site allocation.</p> <p>The encroachment can be seen to the south-western part of the Long Marston site allocation and includes part of the area known as the 'Greenway'. To avoid any conflicts or contradictions between the draft local and adopted Local Planning Policy documents, it is requested that the boundary of the draft Neighbourhood Plan boundary is amended to exclude all of the former Long Marston Airfield site, as per the approved red line boundary and Council's site allocation.</p> <p>This red line boundaries of the Long Marston Airfield development site and the Long Marston Garden Village allocations are illustrated by the plans below:</p>	<p>The "buffer zone" in figure 35 extends outside the plan area. This will be amended to follow the neighbourhood plan boundary</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses



Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			 <p>Long Marston Garden Village site allocation- Source: Stratford Upon Avon's adopted Long Marston Airfield Garden Village- SPD, 2018</p> <p>In addition to the matter above, it is noted that paragraph 3.1.4 of the draft plan identifies a number of local footpath networks in the area including the Stratford Greenway, the Monarch's Way and the Heart of England Way. Several of these, including the Greenway and the Monarch's Way actually fall within the former Long Marston Airfield site and the Garden Village allocation. It is recommended that clarification is provided within the draft Neighbourhood Plan that the specific policies relating to footpaths and street furniture etc, do not apply to the areas outside of the plan area. This will ensure that</p>	 <p>As can be seen from the above plan taken from the LMA Garden Village Master Plan, the Greenway does not fall within the LMA allocation. Monarchs' way follows the route of the Greenway. Heart of England way follows Wyre Lane and then public footpaths to the west and then northwards. None of the policies of the neighbourhood plan apply to anything outside the plan area.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>there is no conflict with approved and emerging plans relating to the wider Long Marston Garden Village allocation. I do trust that the above information is helpful. If you have any questions, in relation to any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact me. Yours sincerely,</p>	
22	Agent J Thompson	Figure 18, p. 27	<p>Figure 18 Build Up Area Boundary</p> <p>It is considered the the Built up Area Boundary (BUAB) to the rear of Pondacre and The Goodwins does not flow the adopted methodology set out by Stratford on Avon District Council for defining BUAB's (set out in Appendix 4 of the Site Allocations Plan). This states that areas to be included within BUAB's include; <i>"Dwellings and associated areas of lawful garden land which form the residential curtilage of a property (excluding areas of land that are clearly paddocks or orchards or land more appropriately defined as 'non-urban');</i></p> <p>It is submitted that the land to the rear of Pondacre and The Goodwins fits this definition and the boundary should be adjusted in line with the plan attached to these representations.</p>	<p>The Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) is drawn up in accordance with SDC guidelines. It defines the settlement area as it is now and includes any site(s) allocated for development.</p> <p>This land does not fit the description of lawful garden land. It is grade 3b agricultural land. It can be seen from aerial photographs (Google maps) that the area of land behind Pondacre is obviously a field or paddock and that the remaining area is separated from the Goodwins residence by a group of agricultural buildings/barns.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>Policy Dev 3 and Figure 35, p. 59</p> <p>Policy Dev 6</p>	<p>Objection 8.3. Policy Dev 3: Preserving the Separate Identity of Long Marston</p> <p>It is considered that the plan supporting this policy presents a misleading picture. In particular, it pays no heed to the approved masterplan for Long Marston Airfield in the adopted Long Marston Airfield SPD. This shows that the area of the allocation closest to the greenway will be free from development. Therefore coalescence between the two settlements is not a risk and the normal countryside policies for development outside the BUAB will suffice to protect the separate identity of the two settlements. In addition, the demarcation of the 'gap' in figure 35 is arbitrary and does not follow any natural features on the ground.</p> <p>Comment 8.6 Future Housing</p> <p>The policy of identifying a Reserve Site is supported. However, it is noted that the site is small and is intended to meet needs for the plan period only. In order to provide certainty for the community it is considered that a</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The purpose of a Built-up Area Boundary is to define and differentiate the built-up area of the village from the countryside that surrounds it. One way to help ensure future sprawl does not result in coalescence to highlight the gap between the two settlements.</p> <p>Figure 35 is to be amended so that the gap follows the line of the greenway.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan covers the period 2011 to 2031. Development beyond 2031 is not considered. However, the prosed site would not be considered suitable as it is contrary to policy 8.3 of the plan. The land</p>

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**


Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>direction of growth or potential location of future development. This would be for development needs beyond the plan period or if the South Warwickshire Plan indicates that more development should be directed toward Long Marston. It is considered that land adjoining the proposed reserve site would be the most appropriate site to meet this need. This land is highlighted on the attached plan.</p> 	<p>will be released if it can be demonstrated that there is an identified housing need. In addition, the Plan will be reviewed every 5 years. This will include reviewing local housing needs and future allocations (if necessary).</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses


Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
				
23	Consultee National Grid		<p>National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.</p> <p>About National Grid</p>	Noted. No action required

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses.</p> <p>National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.</p> <p>National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.</p> <p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: Following a review of the above document we have identified the following National Grid assets as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Gas Transmission</p> <p>Asset Description</p> <p>Gas Transmission Pipeline, route: CH</p> <p>Gas Transmission Pipeline, route: CH HONEYBOURNE</p> <p>Gas Transmission Pipeline, route: CH DUPLICATE</p> <p>Avison Young (UK) Limited registered in England and Wales number 6382509. Registered office, 3 Brindleyplace, Birmingham B1 2JB. Regulated by RICS</p> <p>A plan showing details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only.</p> <p>National Grid also provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shapefiles/ <p>Please see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure.</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Distribution Networks Information regarding the electricity distribution network is available at the website below: www.energynetworks.org.uk Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting: plantprotection@cadentgas.com Further Advice Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or sitespecific proposals that could affect our assets.</p>	
24	Consultee Natural England	General	<p>Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 14 Pre-submission</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 19 May 2022.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p>	Noted. No action required

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Sally Wintle Consultations Team</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities</p> <p>Natural environment information sources</p> <p>The Magic¹ website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones). Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available here².</p> <p>Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found here³. Most of these will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic</p>	

1 <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

2 <http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php>

3 <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>website or as Local Wildlife Sites. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found here⁴.</p> <p>There may also be a local landscape character assessment covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.</p> <p>If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape.</p>	

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making>
<http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>⁵

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.</p> <p>General mapped information on soil types and Agricultural Land Classification is available (under 'landscape') on the Magic⁵ website and also from the LandIS website⁵, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.</p> <p>Natural environment issues to consider</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework⁶ sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. Planning Practice Guidance⁷ sets out supporting guidance.</p> <p>Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.</p>	

5 <http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm>

6 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/807247/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

7 <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p><u>Landscape</u> Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.</p> <p><u>Wildlife habitats</u> Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed here⁹), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Ancient woodland¹⁰. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.</p> <p><u>Priority and protected species</u></p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed here¹¹) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice here¹² to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.</p> <p><u>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</u></p> <p>Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 171. For more information, see our publication Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land¹³.</p> <p>Improving your natural environment</p> <p>Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way. • Restoring a neglected hedgerow. • Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site. • Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape. • Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds. • Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings. • Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife. • Adding a green roof to new buildings. <p>⁹http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimpotence.aspx</p> <p>¹⁰ https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences</p> <p>¹¹http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiv</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>ersity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimp ortance.aspx ¹² https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-ortance.aspx and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals ¹³ http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35012</p> <p>You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community. • Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision. • Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see Planning Practice Guidance on this¹⁴). • Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency). • Planting additional street trees. • Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or 	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
25	Rectory Homes Developer	Policy Dev 6	<p>extending the network to create missing links.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore). <p>Rectory Homes welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan (LMNHP) and wishes to make representations to Policy Dev 6: Future Housing Sites.</p> <p>Established in the 1990s, Rectory is a small-medium sized housebuilder operating primarily in Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire, although also cover the wider Home Counties and the south midlands. Our focus is on small to medium sites in towns and villages and we specialise in high quality housing developments built to reflect the local vernacular using locally sourced natural and sustainable materials.</p> <p>We have an interest in the existing and emerging planning policies for Long Marston due to a legal interest in the site identified in the Stratford Upon Avon Site Allocation Plan as IMAR 09, Land at Park House Long Marston. Our representations are as follows:</p> <p>We commend the Neighbourhood plan steering committee for identifying areas suitable for housing to ensure development within the village reflects local needs and is delivered on preferred sites.</p>	<p>SDC revised preferred options SAP June 2022 Proposal SCB.6 lists this site as 0.8 hectares with a capacity for 10 dwellings. This is based on a net site area of 0.5 hectares @20 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The net developable area and density issues raised in the representation are straying into technical development management issues and are not particularly relevant to a strategic site allocation in the NDP.</p> <p>It is for any subsequent planning application to demonstrate an appropriate density having regard to the particular constraints of the site and the effect on the character and appearance of the area. Any suggested specific figure for the number of houses on the site will then need to be based on evidence of appropriate site capacity having regard to density and character and site constraints.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Park House is incorrectly identified in the LMNHP as having a developable site area of 0.3 Hectares. This figure is taken from the June 2020 Stratford District Council (SDC) Site Allocation Plan (SAP) which miscalculated the total site area and subsequently the developable area. RGL Surveys Ltd have completed a Topographical survey of the site which confirms the area highlighted in orange in Figure 32 is indeed 0.8 Hectares. This was acknowledged the SDC's July 2020 Strategic Housing Land availability assessment (SHLAA) which corrected the Gross Site area for LMAR.09 from 0.6 Hectares to 0.8 Hectares. This correction however was not carried forward into the SAP meaning the site proforma contains incorrect information which does not reflect the true site area shown in the inset map. The site information for Park House should be updated to reflect SDC's own evidence base in the SHLAA and the findings of an independent surveyor.</p> <p>Registered Office as below. Registered in England No 2S7S047</p> <p>When applying the correct gross site area for Park House of 0.8 Hectares, the Developable Area shown in Policy dev 6 of 0.3 Hectares equates to an inefficient 37.5% of the site being developable. Neither the SAP or LMNHP currently provides any evidence or criteria for how a net site area has been calculated. Given SDC's standard density is</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>applied to this figure to generate an overall unit allocation for each site it is appropriate to publish a methodology for how a net area arises. A standard ratio for net site area should be devised depending on size of site, the land required for infrastructure and services whilst also considering topography or significant areas of undevelopable land, Small sites require little or no additional infrastructure to gain access or substantial land set aside for service requirements such as attenuation ponds or substations. Small sites that do require such work are rendered unviable and therefore do not come forward for development. The larger the site the greater this requirement becomes meaning that the net developable site area for a large site should be a lower percentage to a small site. It is therefore logical to apply a progressive ratio for net site areas such as that used by Central Bedfordshire District Council when assessing sites for the Made Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2015-2035: Site Size Gross to net ratio standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 0.4 hectare - 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares - 80% • 2 hectares or above - 60% <p>The Net site Area should be increased to at least 0.64 Hectares to reflect the new Gross Site Area which would result in 80% of the site being developable. When applying a</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>SDC's selected density for rural areas of 25 dwellings per hectare this gives a figure of 16 units on the site which is considered both appropriate for the context and constraints of the site and reflects the government's aim of making efficient use of land as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>Should the LMNHP steering group wish to see no more than 8 dwellings permitted on Park House a site-specific mix policy should be applied to ensure the site is not underdeveloped and an appropriate density is achieved through amount of accommodation provided on site. A scheme of 8 larger 4 or 5 bed properties would reflect the loose knit character of the southern end of Long Marston whilst providing sufficient accommodation to make efficient use of land and would be commensurate with edge of village sites which typically consist of larger dwellings with generously proportioned plots. Allocating the site for 8 dwellings and applying SDC's mix policy from the Core Strategy would lead to a number of smaller 2 and 3 bed properties which are often delivered as terrace or semi-detached houses. This would not reflect the density or character and appearance of this end of the village.</p> <p>Rectory Homes have acknowledged the requirement for further assessment since reviewing the September 2020 SAP and commissioned Albion Archaeology to</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>complete a Desk Based Heritage Assessment of Park House. The assessment was undertaken in November 2020 in order to characterise the nature, date and likely survival of known and potential heritage assets within the proposed development area (PDA) and to assess their significance. It also assesses the likely impact of development on the known and potential archaeological and heritage assets identified in the assessment. The assessment has examined the PDA and a 1km-radius study area around it. Overall, Albion Archaeology concluded a scheme of 15 proposed dwellings in a linear development on the setting of all heritage assets in the study area would have no significant adverse impact and can be effectively mitigated through the design of the proposals.</p> <p>Further Site development considerations are given to vehicular access and pedestrian links to Long Marston Village. A testing layout has been completed by Rectory Homes' technical department which accommodates a singular vehicular access of Long Marston Road to serve all properties. The site abuts highway land meaning there is sufficient land to achieve the appropriate visibility splays and an access be" mouth can be constructed to the required standards. Our access proposal includes the construction of a footpath alongside the vehicle access which will extend northwards to a suitable crossing</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>point where a connection can be made to the existing footpath provision on the western side of Long Marston Road. This connection will include dropped kerbs and will provide a continuous pedestrian route to local amenities in Long Marston Village. Park House is therefore deliverable and can provide an acceptable pedestrian and vehicular.</p> <p>Rectory have considered the specific requirements for Park House to retain mature trees where possible. A comprehensive Arboricultural report will accompany a detailed planning application which will identify the most valuable trees for retention and recommend any trees for removal. A robust landscape strategy will seek to mitigate the loss of any trees with new planting of native species.</p> <p>Park House is the gateway to the village and currently comprises a section of uninhabited previously developed land. The uninhabited house is falling into disrepair and is impacting the visual approach to the village. Given the number of listed buildings and heritage assets in the vicinity of the site there is a chance to redevelop the land in order to enhance the entrance into Long Marston village.</p> <p>The site is suitable for development, is available and is achievable. In order to deliver the benefits of development of the site in a timely manner, it is considered the</p>	

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>allocation of "Park House" as a reserve site should be amended to a full allocation. This means the site could be delivered as a housing scheme with certainty and not subject to the requirements / delivery constraints already proposed in the SAP for a reserve allocation.</p> <p>We trust you will consider the above representations and look forward to receiving your formal acknowledgement.</p>	
26	Tyler Parkes Agent	Policy Dev 6	<p>Objection on behalf of Kendrick Homes Limited</p> <p>Regarding Land North of Barley Fields, Long Marston</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>1. Tyler Parkes Partnership acts on behalf of Kendrick Homes Limited, who are a Midlands based family run housing developer with a proud history dating back to 1880. They have a proven track record of building high quality family homes in both the urban and rural areas within the wider West Midlands region, and beyond. They have promoted and delivered new homes on a large number of sites, both large and small, within Warwickshire and in particular the Stratford-on-Avon District. Recent</p>	Noted. No action needed.

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>housing developments delivered by Kendricks Homes Limited in the District including sites at Newbold-on-Stour and Little Kineton.</p> <p>2. On behalf of our Client, Kendrick Homes Limited, who have an interest in the Land North of Barley Fields, Long Marston, (previously identified as Reserve Housing Site ref: LMAR.B (2020 SHLAA ref: LMAR.17) within the Stratford-on-Avon Site Allocations Plan Preferred Options Consultation (October 2020) we are instructed to submit representations to the current Regulation 14 Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2031 (Pre-submission version 2.0) consultation.</p> <p>3. We can confirm that these representations are submitted in the full knowledge of, and have been approved by, the Landowner's Agent.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>4. On behalf of our client we have previously made representations in respect of the Land North of Barley Fields, Long Marston, to Stratford-on-Avon District Council's Regulation 18 Site Allocations Plan (SAP) Consultation in December 2020, at which time the Land North of Barley Fields was identified as a Reserve Housing Site. We are instructed to make further representations regarding the site</p>	<p>Policy Dev 6 allocates a reserve housing site for the village. The land will be released if it can be demonstrated that there is an identified housing need. In addition, the Plan will be reviewed every 5 years. This will include reviewing local housing needs.</p> <p>The reserve housing site at Park House was chosen in preference to the land north of Barley Fields because it is a previously built site whose derelict building has become an eyesore.</p> <p>The Land north of Barley Fields is open countryside.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>to the District Council in respect of the current further Regulation 18 SAP Consultation which runs until 29 July 2022.</p> <p>5. Furthermore, we have also previously made representations with regard the site via the South Warwickshire Local Plan Call for Sites Consultation in June 2021 and in doing so promoted the site as a suitable Housing Site directly adjacent existing residential development where there is a strong demand for new homes, with the allocation of the site being a logical, but modest, extension to the built-up area of the village.</p> <p>Site Description</p> <p>6. The site will be familiar to the Parish Council, but for the record, is an irregular shaped piece of land located towards the northern end of the settlement of Long Marston, which is a Category 4 Local Service Village (as currently defined within the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy). The site is accessed via Barley Fields, an adopted public highway, which connects to Welford Road which is the main north/south arterial route through the Village. Barley Fields currently serves the relatively recent housing development which we believe was first approved</p>	<p>To add further new development in such close proximity to Barley Fields and Perry Orchard would concentrate a disproportionate amount of new housing at the north end of the village.</p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		Policy Dev 3	<p>under outline planning permission 14/01676/OUT.</p> <p>7. The site is bounded to the north by a farm track, and beyond open agricultural land. To the west lies agricultural land, with existing residential development located to the east and south boundaries.</p> <p>8. To clarify, the site at Land North of Barley Fields was identified as Reserve Housing Site ref: LMAR.B (2020 SHLAA ref: LMAR.17) within the Stratford-on-Avon Site Allocations Plan Preferred Options Consultation (October 2020). The site currently sits outside, but directly adjacent, the draft Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) for Long Marston.</p> <p><u>Specific Comments Regarding the Regulation 14 Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) for Long Marston and Policy Dev 3.</u></p> <p>9. Paragraph 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that: <i>“To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are</i></p>	<p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p>Long Marston is indeed a Category 4 LSV. AS such, under the Stratford on Avon Core Strategy policies CS 16 the indicative dwelling figure for the 2011-2031 plan period is 32 dwellings. To date there have been 80 new dwellings constructed in the village. This</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p><i>groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.”</i></p> <p>10. The Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy currently classifies Long Marston as Category 4 Service Village which is capable of supporting housing. This categorisation is based upon an assessment of the presence and comparative quality of three key services - general store, primary school and public transport - together with the existing size of the settlement. However, we contend that it is no longer appropriate to rely solely upon surveys of the physical infrastructure, such as access to transport, albeit that bus stops for the no.27 bus service are within easy walking distance of the site and the village is served by a Post Office and Village Shop.</p> <p>11. It is instead appropriate to also consider the social, economic and environmental benefits for sustainable development of the burgeoning trends in rolling out carbon efficient technologies into rural areas and trends in work and behavioural patterns. With an emphasis on quality of life, beauty and the environment and with increased home/remote working and an</p>	<p>represents an over-provision of 211%. The highest in the district. As of 31st march 2021 the Stratford on Avon District Council can demonstrate 8.42 years of housing land supply. Therefore, Long Marston has fulfilled its housing commitment requirements. However, the Plan plans positively for future development with the allocation of a reserve site in Policy Dev 6. Furthermore, due to the current over-provision the revised preferred options SAP June 2022 does not identify any reserve sites in Long Marston.</p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>expectation for more hybrid working patterns into the future, there is a notable increased shift in demand towards more rural living.</p> <p>12. Technological advances including electric cars, e-bikes and scooters, the emergence of commercial car sharing businesses, and faster broadband speeds all mean that rural living can be a sustainable development option. Clearly many, both in urban and rural areas, now rely on the Internet for accessing a broad spectrum of social, community, entertainment and other services, as well as for work. This trend has grown significantly during the Covid-19 pandemic but looks set to continue into the future now people are familiar with the opportunities and tangible benefits. According to Ofcom, Long Marston village currently benefits from access to Superfast Broadband.</p> <p>13. The current BUAB for Long Marston is shown at Figure 18 on Page 27 of the Neighbourhood Plan consultation document (i.e. Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2031 (Presubmission version 2.0)).</p> <p>14. Policy DEV 3: 'Preserving the Separate Identity of Long Marston' states, inter alia, that:</p>	<p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group’s responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p><i>“Development proposals beyond the Built-Up Area Boundary which reduce the gap between Long Marston and nearby developments at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield will be resisted unless they comply with Policy DEV 2 and specifically allow for the preservation of the separate identity of Long Marston and surrounding settlements.” (Author’s emphasis).</i></p> <p>15. Policy DEV 2: ‘Ensuring Appropriate High-Quality Development’, as referred to in Policy DEV3 (above) sets out design-based criteria against which new development proposals will be assessed. It is the case that Kendrick Homes Limited (our client) is a high-quality regional housing developer with a proven track record of delivering quality new homes. They are committed to the delivery of sustainable development and in doing so take their commitments towards environmental and biodiversity enhancements seriously.</p> <p>16. The supporting text to Policy DEV 3, at Paragraph 8.3.3 (page 58), clearly states that, with reference to Policy DEV 3: <i>“This policy does not prohibit the boundaries of the built-up area of Long Marston changing providing growth in</i></p>	<p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p>The purpose of a Built-up Area Boundary is to define and differentiate the settlement area from the countryside that surrounds it. One way to help ensure future sprawl does not result in coalescence to highlight the gap between the two settlements.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		Policy Dev 6	<p>17. <i>the built-up area does not lead to a merging with other settlements</i>” . As a matter of fact, the residential development of the site of Land North of Barley Fields would not result in any merging with other settlements, and most certainly no merging with development at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield.</p> <p>18. Furthermore, it is noteworthy in that in deciding upon the Planning Appeal made by Bloor Homes Western which related to the exact same site at Land North of Barley Fields, Long Marston (LPA Ref: 16/02206/FUL/PINs Ref: APP/J3720/W/17/3175407) whilst dismissing the Appeal on other grounds the Planning Inspector did observe that with reference to the physical confines of the settlement of Long Marston that in his view: “ ... the proposal (and thereby the site) would be seen as part of the wider (previously) permitted residential scheme and I agree with the appellants that the proposal would achieve a logical rounding off of the built-up area. In addition the Council raise no objection regarding the visual effect of the proposal on the surrounding area. On this basis I am satisfied that the proposal would be within the physical confines of the settlement.”</p>	<p>As noted previously, Long Marston has more than fulfilled its housing commitment requirements and does not need to allocate additional housing sites.</p> <p>The land on the east side of the main road as shown in figure 37 is an area already occupied by a derelict building. Provided that the development is contained within the existing site curtilage it will comply with policy Dev 3</p>

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>19. In light of the above, our client contends that there is a very strong case for the inclusion of the Land North of Barley Fields, which has previously been considered suitable for Housing development (by way of a Reserve Housing Site) by the District Council, within the BUAB for Long Marston, which in turn would secure the principle of its residential development in line with adopted Core Strategy policies AS.10 and CS.16.</p> <p>Policy DEV 6: Future Housing and Paragraph 8.6.10</p> <p>20. Our client objects to Policy DEV 6 and the proposed allocation of the land on the East Side of Long Marston Road as a Reserve Housing Site, which like the Land North of Barley Fields, lies outside the BUAB, but unlike the Land North of Barley Fields it clearly extends closer to, and reduces the gap with, the Meon Vale site, which is clearly at odds the aspirations to preserve the separate identity of Long Marston, and thereby the fundamental aims of Policy DEV 3.</p> <p>21. Furthermore, the proposed site at land on the East Side of Long Marston Road appears, unlike our client's site, to have constraints which may ultimately prove to be an impediment to development</p>	<p>The land north of Barley Fields is open countryside whereas the land at Park House is a derelict, previously developed site.</p> <p>It is for any subsequent planning application to demonstrate an appropriate density having regard to the particular constraints of the site and the effect on the character, appearance of the area and any heritage impacts.</p> <p>The site is surrounded by Conifer hedging.</p> <p>See above response</p> <p>As noted previously, Long Marston has more than fulfilled its housing commitment requirements and does not need to allocate additional housing sites.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>including, but not limited to, heritage impacts and tree protection considerations, as is stated within the Policy (DEV 6) itself.</p> <p>22. Against this backdrop, it appears that the proposed allocation of the site on the East Side of Long Marston Road is not consistent with the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan and is flawed.</p> <p>23. Paragraph 8.6.10 (page 64) refers specifically to our client's site, Land North of Barley Fields, and indicates that whilst it had been considered it was not favoured for reasons which are not fully explained or justified. Whilst the paragraph does refer to the previous planning application and appeal, it fails to acknowledge or recognise the previously stated comments of the Appeal Inspector who, observed that: "<u>... the proposal (and thereby the site) would be seen as part of the wider (previously) permitted residential scheme and I agree with the appellants that the proposal would achieve a logical rounding off of the built-up area. In addition the Council raise no objection regarding the visual effect of the proposal on the surrounding area. On this basis I am satisfied that the proposal would be within the physical confines of the settlement.</u>" (Author's emphasis).</p>	

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>24. The comments of the Inspector (above) clearly challenge and address the 2nd and 3rd bullet points listed by the Parish Council under paragraph 8.6.10. The 1st bullet point acknowledges that matters of access could be satisfactorily addressed. Therefore, it is unclear and certainly not sufficiently justified as to why the Land North of Barley Fields has been dismissed as a suitable Housing (or Reserve Housing) site within the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>25. Our client advises that the site is available for development and could be delivered, subject to obtaining planning permission, well within 5 years. In this respect, the site is both 'deliverable' being "... available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years" and 'developable' being "... in a suitable location for housing development with reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged" (as per the NPPF, Glossary).</p> <p>26. The site offers a suitable location for development now and has a realistic prospect that housing could be delivered on the site relatively quickly, in line with</p>	<p>As noted previously, Long Marston has more than fulfilled its housing commitment requirements and does not need to allocate additional housing sites.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Paragraph 69 of the NPPF. In summary, our client's site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is within the confines of the Long Marston village; • has clear physical defensible boundaries which will clearly define the suggested revised BUAB; • is in a sustainable location; • the residential development of the site is financially viable; • all relevant site conditions have been assessed and topographical and ground contamination surveys are being undertaken by our client. An assessment of the site access from Barley Fields, has been undertaken and concludes that there are no impediments to its use and the development of the site utilising this access would be in line with Paragraphs 110 and 111 of the NPPF. • is in the ownership and control of a landowner keen to bring it forward for development at the earliest opportunity. In this regard, there are no impediments to the deliverability of new homes on the site. <p>27. For all of the above reasons, our client contends that there exists a strong argument for the redefining of the BUAB for Long Marston to fully include the site currently referred to</p>	<p>Disagree. For the reasons above, there is no argument for redefining the BUAB.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses


Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>as Land North of Barley Fields, Long Marston, thereby releasing the site for housing development.</p> <p>28. Even if the decision is taken not to redefine the BUAB for Long Marston, it is maintained that the reasons for dismissing the site as a Reserve Housing Site, beyond but adjacent the BUAB, are without foundation and that the site at Land North of Barley Fields is a preferable, more realistic, less constrained, site for new housing to serve Long Marston than the currently preferred site and is available, developable and deliverable.</p> <p>tylerparkes  RTPI Chartered Town Planners</p> <p>T: 0121744 5511 A: 66 Stratford Road, Shirley, Solihull, B90 3LP W: www.tyler-parkes.co.uk E: info@tyler-parkes.co.uk</p> <p>The Tyler-Parkes Partnership Ltd is a registered company in England and Wales: 04102717</p>	
27	Consultee Environment Agency	General	<p>I refer to your email of 18th May 2022 in relation to the Regulation 14 Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). We have reviewed the submitted document and offer the following comments for your consideration at this time.</p>	Noted. No action required

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Site Allocation: The NDP includes the submission of a reserved site for a possible 8 dwellings (Policy Dev 6: Future Housing). The site is entirely within Flood Zone 1, the low risk zone.</p> <p>We would not, in the absence of specific sites allocated within areas of fluvial flooding, offer a bespoke comment on flood risk at this time. You are advised to utilise the Environment Agency guidance (attached) which should assist you moving forward with your Plan. Environment Agency Sentinel House (9) Wellington Crescent, Fradley Park, Lichfield, WS13 8RR. Customer services line: 03708 506 506 www.gov.uk/environment-agency Cont/d..</p> <p>It should be noted that the Flood Map provides an indication of 'fluvial' flood risk only. You are advised to discuss matters relating to surface water (pluvial) flooding with the Councils drainage team as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). It is noted that pluvial flooding has been considered within the draft NDP although there is no reference to fluvial flood risk matters.</p> <p>We would not offer detailed bespoke advice on Policy but advise that you ensure conformity with the adopted Core Strategy and, in consideration of the emerging South</p>	<p>Noted. No action required</p> <p>Noted. No action required</p> <p>Noted. No action required</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			Warwickshire Local Plan, during Plan reviews.	
28	Consultee Warwickshire County Council	4.2.1 p18, L&E 1: 5.1, p20 P26	We support the protection of open spaces and river corridors – this could be developed to mention the benefits of open space as flood risk management to retain water. Above ground SuDS could be utilised in open spaces.	Agree, will include the following in policy L&E1 Where appropriate and beneficial to local wildlife and ecology, measures in open spaces that mitigate flood risk, such as above ground SuDS, will be supported.
		5.1 p20	You could add to your objective a specific point about new developments needing to consider their flood risk and sustainable drainage systems when building on Greenfield and brownfield sites. You could also include all new developments will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems.	Agree: Will include the following in Policy Inf 3: Where applicable, proposals for new development should demonstrate that flood risk and sustainable drainage systems have been taken into consideration. Agree: Will include the following in Policy Inf 2: Proposals for new development will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems.
		L&E 5: 5.5 p39	WCC would strongly support the recycling of grey water and captured rainwater on developments.	Agree. Will include the following in Inf 2: New development are encouraged to include water reuse, grey water recycling and rainwater capture measures, including the use of water butts.

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>You could add to your objective a specific point about new developments needing to consider their flood risk when building on Greenfield and brownfield sites.</p> <p>You could include an additional point that encourages new developments to open up any existing culverts on a site providing more open space/green infrastructure for greater amenity and biodiversity; and the creation of new culverts should be kept to a minimum. New culverts will need consent from the LLFA and should be kept to the minimum length.</p>	<p>Agree: Will include the following in Policy Inf 2: Where applicable, proposals for new development should demonstrate that flood risk and sustainable drainage systems have been taken into consideration.</p> <p>Agree: This is partially covered in Inf 3e. However, Will include the following in Policy Inf 3: Existing culverts on a development site should be opened up to provide more open space/green infrastructure for greater amenity and biodiversity.</p>
		<p>Com 1: 6.1 p41 Com 2: 6.2 p42</p>	<p>In this section it is mentioned that new community facilities will be encouraged providing they are compatible with existing neighbouring uses. If a site is over 1ha it is classed as a major planning application, therefore in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy must be submitted to the Lead Local Flood Authority for review.</p>	<p>Noted. No action required</p>
		<p>Inf 1: 7.1 p44</p>	<p>In this section it is mentioned that proposals for commercial development will be supported subject to meeting set criteria. If a site is over 1ha it is classed as a major planning application, therefore in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a site-</p>	<p>Noted. No action required</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>specific Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy must be submitted to the Lead Local Flood Authority for review.</p> <p>You could add to your objective a specific point about new developments needing to consider their flood risk and sustainable drainage systems when building on Greenfield and brownfield sites.</p> <p>You could also include all new developments will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems.</p>	<p>Agree: Will include the following in Inf 3: Where applicable, proposals for new development should demonstrate that flood risk and sustainable drainage systems have been taken into consideration.</p> <p>Agree: Will include the following in Inf 2: Proposals for new development will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems.</p>
		Inf 3: 7.3 p45	<p>In point B you mention that new developments should be designed to control run-off generated to the greenfield run-off rate (QBAR40). We suggest the removal of the 40 as discharge rates should be set to QBAR.</p> <p>In point E you mention proposal including culverts should minimize the length of such which is correct. Before this it would be good to include an additional point that encourages new developments to initially open up any existing culverts on a site providing more open space/green infrastructure for greater amenity and biodiversity;. It would also be worth mentioning that any culverting proposal</p>	<p>Point B, Agree. 40 to be deleted</p> <p>Point E, Agree Additional point to be added as advised.</p> <p>The last sentence and link will be added to the explanation.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>will require Land Drainage Consent from WCC. I have attached a link below.</p> <p>https://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/watercourse</p> <p>In this section is would be good to include the SuDS hierarchy. The hierarchy is a list of preferred drainageoptions that the LLFA refer to when reviewing planning applications. The preferred options are (in order of preference): infiltration (water into the ground), discharging into an existing water body and discharging into a surface water sewer. Connecting to a combined sewer system is not suitable and not favourable.</p> <p>You have included a policy regarding pluvial flood risk however there does not appear to be a section covering fluvial flood risk. Long Marston is shown to be in close proximity to an EA Main River (Noleham Brook) and is also close to a number of smaller Ordinary Watercourses so a section on fluvial flood risk would be welcomed.</p> <p>You could include a copy of the Flood Zone maps, showing the levels of risk from fluvial flooding to provide supporting evidence that flood risk is a problem in parts of Long Marston, and encourage development to reduce the impacts from flooding.</p>	<p>Appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) where necessary should be incorporated into all new developments following the SuDS hierarchy. This should maximise any opportunities to enhance biodiversity, create amenity and contribute towards green infrastructure. Connecting to a combined sewer system is not suitable and not favourable.</p> <p>All new development proposals must ensure that a minimum easement of 8 metres from the top of the bank of the Noleham Brook and other smaller Ordinary Watercourses is provided to allow access for maintenance and to ensure that the natural features and functions of the wider river corridor are retained or reinstated.</p> <p>Agree: These maps will be included</p> <p>Agree: The following wording will be included:</p>

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>In this section it would be good to mention that all above ground attenuation features should be designed to be multifunctional and consider the four pillars of SuDS which are water quality, water quantity, amenity and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Infiltration SuDS and above ground SuDS attenuation, such as swales, ponds and other water-based ecological systems, should be used wherever feasible. They should be designed to be multifunctional and consider the four pillars of SuDS which are water quality, water quantity, amenity and biodiversity.</p>
		<p>Dev 2: 8.2 p60</p>	<p>You could add to your objective a specific point about new developments needing to consider their flood risk and sustainable drainage systems when building on Greenfield and brownfield sites.</p> <p>You could also include all new developments will be expected to include sustainable drainage systems.</p>	<p>Agree: Will include wording in Inf 2 as noted above.</p> <p>Agree: Will include wording in Inf 2 as noted above.</p>
		<p>Dev 4: 8.4 p63 8.6.3 p67</p>	<p>In this section it is mentioned that a number of homes may be built. If a site is for 10 or more dwellings it is classed as a major planning application, therefore in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, a sitespecific Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy must be submitted to the Lead Local Flood Authority for review.</p>	<p>Noted. No action required</p>
		<p>Dev 5: 8.5 p64</p>	<p>The document suggests that new car parks might be developed at some stage. Depending on the size and type of drainage, there is an opportunity to introduce SuDS and adequate treatment for flows, to ensure that</p>	<p>Agree. Will include the following wording: New car parks should incorporate permeable materials or where possible and appropriate, introduce SuDS and adequate treatment for flows, to ensure that discharge/run off flows</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			discharge/run off flows leaving the car park site do not degrade the quality of accepting water bodies, providing greater amenity.	leaving the car park site do not degrade the quality of accepting water bodies, thereby providing greater amenity.
29	Consultee Stratford on Avon District Council	Para 2.8 1 st line, p8	Suggest replacing 'allocated' with 'provided' as the former word suggests specific sites being identified in the Plan.	Agreed. Text to be changed to 'provided'.
		3.1.28, p 15	It should be pointed out that the Parish population is going to be very different to the Neighbourhood Area population due to the Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield developments. The 2019 population forecast likely includes an element of the former because the increase since 2011 can't be entirely down to the recent small developments on the edge of the village identified in paragraphs 3.1.24-3.1.27.	Agreed but no reliable figures exist for the NDP area. Add the following text: The 2019 population forecasts are for the parish. The NDP area will be considerably less.
		4.1, p17	The Vision of the NDP should not refer to Long Marston Parish because the NDP does not cover the whole Parish.	Agreed. Change text to Long Marston Neighbourhood Area
		L&E 1, p19	Concern is raised that this policy does not distinguish between the different types of environmental designations e.g. SSSIs, Local Wildlife Sites, etc. and the proportionate level of protection afforded to these, as per Policy CS.6 of the Core Strategy. In addition, the criteria do not flow well from the introductory paragraph of the policy.	There are no SSSIs or local wildlife sites in the plan area

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Criterion a) cannot be controlled through planning policy and should be removed. Criterion b) would need to be mapped to make sense of the aim of the policy. Delete text from "...which connect with..." as it is not required. Criterion c) is in effect a duplication of criterion a) and should be removed. Criterion d) – it is assumed this is meant to only apply to external lighting. It should be noted that here are limited circumstances where external lighting would be controllable through the planning process. Street lighting would normally be controlled by the Local Highways Authority whilst domestic security lighting would normally be permitted development. Criterion f) suggest re-drafting second sentence to read "Proposals should look to preserve existing aquatic habitats and development that has an adverse impact on such habitats will not be supported". Remove reference to Fig. 14 as it is not necessary. Delete final sentence as the examples listed are not mapped and will not be the full list of such sites. Criterion g) Delete "Environmentally sustainability by" and add "through" between "demand" and "using"</p>	<p>Criterion a to be removed Criterion b to be deleted. Criterion c to be removed Criterion d change text to – minimise obtrusive external property lighting..... Criterion f, Change text as advised Criterion g, Change text as advised</p>
		5.1.2, p19	The contents of this paragraph are largely unrelated to the contents of Policy L&E1,	Agree. Move para to page 47. Heritage and archaeological Assets

**Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses**

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			which concerns the natural rather than built environment.	
		L&E 2, p25	This policy is more akin to a 'settlement gap' policy that a green infrastructure policy and should therefore be re-titled and re-drafted as such. Is there a reason why this approach has been chosen rather than identifying the land as a potential Local Green Space?	Agree. Policy to be retitled and redrafted as a Local Gap policy. This approach was chosen in preference to LGS because, in the opinion of the steering group, only one of the plots forming this strip of land conformed to the NPPF definition of Local Green Space.
		Fig 18, p27	This Figure should be amended to reflect the latest version in the 2022 SAP Preferred Options. This includes an amendment on the eastern edge of the village to take account of the correct built form of a recent development.	To be amended as advised.
		L&E 3, p28	The policy is conflating different issues/assessments (landscapes, vistas and skylines). It seems to relate more to protecting important views and it should be redrafted to explain how these views should be protected. The views seem to be mapped at Fig. 19, not Fig.21 as suggested in the policy.	Agree. Redraft policy as advised. Figure 19 to be amended to clarify the views. This policy has been used in a number of 'made' plans. However, the map will be amended to clearly mark the Valued Landscapes and the direction of views to and/or from them. The explanation will clearly explain why each landscape is Valued above and beyond common fields and open countryside.
		Fig 19, p29	Are the views from public vantage points? It isn't clear from the map. Assessments and local evidence is needed to justify why each of these views are particularly important to	Yes they are public vantage points. Add reference to NDP survey.

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		L&E 4, p32	<p>the local community and thus meriting specific protection.</p> <p>There seems to be a lot of repetition within the policy and it could be re-drafted in a more streamlined and focussed manner.</p> <p>Should criterion a) start with the second sentence and go on to say that in such an event, the PROW should be diverted?</p> <p>Criterion b) is unlikely to happen since this would relate to land outside the application site.</p>	<p>Agree. Policy to be streamlined as follows:</p> <p>Wherever possible or appropriate, proposals for new development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance or divert a public right of way (PRoW) to create equal or improved access, particularly for those leading to the countryside. Where the proposed development would cause harm to an existing PRoW, the PRoW should be diverted. • Provide or improve connections and accessibility for all users to the existing network of footpaths and cycle-ways unless it can be demonstrated that this is not possible. • Enhance the visual impact on existing routes through screening, landscaping and planting. • Ensure footpaths next to or adjacent to its boundaries are comprised predominantly of natural planting. Provision should be made to ensure these are maintained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage walking and cycling opportunities. Those that do not encourage walking and cycling opportunities will not be supported.

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		L&E 5, p36	<p>Criterion a) – it is unclear how this would work in practice.</p> <p>Criterion b) – “New homes will be expected to demonstrate improvements to water efficiency.” – improvement compared to what?</p> <p>The second sentence of criterion c) is a separate point</p> <p>Criterion d) would, in effect, support wind farms and solar farms as well as solar roof panels – is this the intention?</p> <p>Criterion f) – this criterion does not relate specifically to the climate emergency – it should be moved to a design policy.</p> <p>Criteria g), h), and i) are all in fact part of one criterion and should be combined accordingly. How would criterion i) work in practice? Where would these charging points be located? How would this be controlled?</p> <p>Criterion j) – remove this as you can't set out in a policy that the policy will be modified in different circumstances.</p>	<p>Agree: Reworded to say: New development proposals are encouraged to take into account the Government's net zero target of 2050.</p> <p>Criterion b, Change text to – demonstrate efficient use of water.</p> <p>Criterion c, split into two points.</p> <p>Criterion d, Add text after supported, provided that it does not adversely affect cause unacceptable harm to residential amenity or to the visual impact and tranquillity of the rural character of the village and the neighbourhood area, such as excessive noise or traffic.</p> <p>Criterion f, delete</p> <p>Criterion g,h to be merged.</p> <p>Criterion I and,j to be deleted.</p>
		Com 1, p38	<p>Criteria a) and d) cover the same topic. It would be useful if a Map could be provided to show the community facilities or assets covered by the Policy.</p>	<p>Criterion a, to be deleted.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Figure 27 shows two registered community assets but Paragraph 6.1.2 states that there are four community assets in the village.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.8 states that new development should improve recreational facilities, but this requirement does not form part of the Policy wording itself?</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.9 states that the Policy looks to add additional recreational areas, but this is not referenced anywhere in the Policy wording.</p>	<p>Agree: Community assets map Figure 27 to be amended</p> <p>Para 6.1.8, Agree. Though this is partially covered in criterion b (which supports proposals which enhance and improve the viability community building use and ancillary land), will insert 'recreational facilities' after 'viability of'.</p> <p>Para 6.1.9, Agree. Will insert 'recreational area and' before 'community facilities' in criterion c.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		Com 2, p38	This policy does not appear to add anything above criterion c) of Policy Com 1 and it is suggested it is deleted.	Agree. Will delete Com 2 and merge with criterion c) of Com 1 as follows: New recreational areas and community facilities will be encouraged and supported in principle providing they comply with other development policies within the plan and are compatible with existing neighbouring uses to ensure that residents have access to local facilities, open spaces and recreation to maintain a strong, active, healthy and vibrant community.
		Inf 1, p41	Criteria a) and b) seem to be saying the same thing. Criterion d) – why 'Where applicable'? Criteria e), f) and g) should be indented bullet points underneath criterion d). How would criterion f) be assessed? The wording isn't sufficiently precise. Criterion g) relates to construction of structures and use of land for storage, which are two separate issues.	Criterion b, to be deleted Criterion d, deleted where applicable. Criterion e,f,g to be bulleted under criterion d. Criterion f, Delete. Criterion g, Split at Open storage and add criterion h
		Inf 5, p45	Given the subject matter of the criteria, it is unclear why this is titled 'Community Safety'? It is unclear how criterion a) could be implemented as it is outside the application site and it is unlikely any development would be of the scale appropriate to warrant any such S106 Legal agreement to insist upon any such provision. Criteria b and c) – these are more akin to a 'dark skies' policy. Street lighting is generally	Agree, Delete Policy Inf 5.

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			controlled by the Local Highways Authority. Domestic lighting is normally permitted development.	
		HA 1, p47	Suggest re-wording criterion a) as follows: "As appropriate, proposals should demonstrate how development will impact upon designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings. Proposals must set out how the affected assets will be conserved, enhanced or mitigated".	Agree, Redraft criterion a as advised
		Fig 29, p48	The BUAB should be amended to accord with the SAP Preferred Options (June 2022)	Agree, new drawing to be inserted
		General Development Pages 55-63	The Government has introduced criteria for 'First Homes', a specific kind of discounted market sale housing that is also classed as affordable housing: First Homes - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Neighbourhood Plans need to reflect these new requirements, therefore you are advised to incorporate the First Homes requirement within an NDP policy.	Agree. To be inserted. First Homes criteria to be added to Policy Dev 4, Housing for local people will include
		Dev 1, p55	The Policy is a bit repetitive. Suggest rewording first paragraph to "All development should minimise, and where appropriate, mitigate its impact on the rural character of the village. In particular, development proposals should." Suggest deleting criterion a)	Amend text as advised Criterion a, reworded as follows: Demonstrate how the village's rural character has been respected, as appropriate.

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group’s responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			<p>Criterion d) delete “...such as dew ponds and ridge and furrow fields” – either list all features, or none at all.</p> <p>Unsure how criterion e) can be achieved. Do you mean ‘glimpsed’ views between buildings? If so, why is this so important?</p> <p>Criterion g) may well be impractical and will certainly not be appropriate in all cases.</p> <p>Criterion h) – street furniture and signage would be controlled by the County Council and therefore could not be influenced by the Neighbourhood Plan. This criterion should be deleted.</p>	<p>Criterion d, delete text as advised.</p> <p>Criterion e, delete</p> <p>Criterion g delete.</p> <p>Criterion h re-word: Where signage is fixed to a premises, be of a design and scale that reflects and respects the village’s local character. Fixed signage that causes unacceptable harm to the local character, heritage assets or its setting will not be supported.</p>
		Dev 2, p57	<p>Criterion a) delete “be of a high quality design and” as it is duplicating the first paragraph.</p> <p>Criterion c) re-draft to read “include a mixture of architectural styles”</p> <p>Replace criterion f) with “protect neighbour amenity”</p> <p>Criterion g) – Replace ‘older’ with ‘listed’</p>	<p>Criterion a, Agree, to be deleted</p> <p>Criterion c, Agree, text to be redrafted as advised.</p> <p>Criterion f, Agree, text to be redrafted as advised</p> <p>Criterion g, Agree, text to be amended</p>
		Dev 3, p58	<p>Criterion a) delete “be of a high quality design and” as it is duplicating the first paragraph.</p> <p>Criterion c) re-draft to read “include a mixture of architectural styles”</p>	<p>This is a duplicate of the previous comment</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		Dev 4, p60	<p>Replace criterion f) with "protect neighbour amenity" Criterion g) – Replace 'older' with 'listed'</p> <p>The combination of Policy Dev 5 and 6 into one consolidated Policy Dev 4: Housing for local people, is welcome. The purpose of the policy as is understood is to support local needs housing schemes. As such it would be useful to rename the policy 'Local Needs Schemes' in order to be consistent with Policy CS.15 of the Core Strategy. It is important to note that local needs schemes include local market housing where there is an identified need.</p>	<p>The three policies address different issues that may arise over the plan period and should remain separate. Policy Dev 4 supports local needs housing schemes which may or may not come forward in the Reserve Site outlined in Policy Dev 6. It also supports such developments beyond but adjacent to the BUAB. With this in mind, Policy Dev 5 should continue to be a separate car parking policy, as it would be relevant not only for the Reserve Site but also for self-builds and any other local needs housing development that may come forward over the plan period.</p>
			<p>Within the policy there are concerns about the reference to require a viability appraisal to include open market housing in order to achieve cross-subsidy, and indeed reference to open market housing in general. Core Strategy Policies CS.15 and AS.10 (and the Development Requirements SPD) do not allow open market housing on local needs schemes - any market housing has to have a restrictive covenant that states it will be for local people, and it has to meet an identified local housing need. Therefore it is recommended to delete this paragraph and just reference that local needs housing schemes can include local market housing where there is an identified housing need.</p>	<p>Agree: Delete paragraph as recommended.</p>

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
			Local needs schemes can include both affordable and local market, it all depends on the evidenced need.	
		Dev 5, p61	<p>This Policy states that EVC points are required for each open market dwelling but does not reference affordable housing dwellings. In addition, the EVC standards of this policy are different to those provided at Policy L&E5.</p> <p>The policy should comply with the adopted Development Requirements SPD and the SPD should be referred to in the explanatory text for the policy as evidence.</p>	<p>Change criterion c to read: All new dwellings, where parking is provided within the curtilage, shall be provided with at least one permanently wired electric car charging point per dwelling.</p> <p>Agreed: SPD Part R – Air Quality will be referenced in the explanatory text. https://www.stratford.gov.uk/doc/208509/nam e/PART%20R%20clean%20version%20Cabinet%20June%202019.pdf</p>
		Dev 6, p61	<p>This site is identified as a potential site for approximately 10 self-build/custom-build dwellings in the Site Allocations Plan Preferred Options (June 2022).</p> <p>This policy safeguards land on the east of Long Marston Road as a Reserve Housing site. Notwithstanding the latest Preferred Options version of the SAP which now identifies the site as a self-build/custom-build site, as the land is for 'up to 8 dwellings' this will not attract an on-site affordable housing contribution.</p>	<p>The District Councils comments are noted. The site has the capacity to deliver up to 10 dwellings so the NDP group is happy to amend the number accordingly</p>
SDC Minor comments				
		2.13, p8	Repeats paragraph 1.5	Agree, Para 2.13 to be deleted

Table 1. Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Respondent No:	From (resident, landowner/agent or consultee)	Policy ref, paragraph &/or page no.	Comment	Steering Group Response
		3.1.16, 2 nd line, p13	The numbers need deleting	Agree, numbers to be deleted
		Fig 13, p21	Heading should be amended to 'Dark Skies map of the local area'	Agree, to be retitled
		Inf policies, p41-47	Policy Inf 4 appears to be missing.	Policy was deleted after Plan health check resulting in a numbering error. Inf 5 to become Inf 4
		Fig 29, p48	The BUAB should be amended to accord with the SAP Preferred Options (June 2022)	Agree. To be amended
		Fig 30, p49	The map is too small a scale to read properly. Do the numbers represent Listed Buildings? If so, it would be better to have the buildings highlighted red rather than numbered. It says 'Conservation Area' but the village doesn't have one. Where is the Registered Park and Garden/ Scheduled Ancient Monument and what is the buffer zone referring to and why is it located where it is?	Agree. This map duplicates information shown on the Public footpaths and listed Buildings map (figure 34) and Community assets map (Figure 27). Fig 30 to be deleted
		Fig 33, p52	It is not clear what this adds to the Plan. The colours on the key don't match the colours on the map, it doesn't indicate what the numbers are and what their relevance is, the buffer zone is replicated from Fig.30 and Fig.31 and it is not clear what this represents.	Agree, map to be deleted
		Fig 35, p59	Suggest this Figure states what the pink area represents, as specified in Policy Dev.3	Agree, Figure 35 to be amended
		8.6.3, p64	The text forms part of paragraph 8.6.2, so the paragraph numbering should be adjusted	Agree, Numbering to be adjusted
		8.6.9 and 8.6.10, p64	The text forms part of paragraph 8.6.2, so the paragraph numbering should be adjusted	This is a typo, 8.6.9 and 8.6.10 are a subset of 8.6.8

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Appendix 0: Bletsoes Letter to Parish Clerk, 11 July 22

Bletsoes
EST. 1881

Agricultural & Development
Consultants, Chartered Surveyors,
Auctioneers & Estate Agents

Oakleigh House, Thrapston,
Northamptonshire NN14 4LJ

01832 732241
www.bletsoes.co.uk

Your Ref:
Our Ref: PEM/CM/5954/1

11 July 2022

Long Marston Development Plan Steering Group
c/o Debbie Woodliffe
Clerk to Marston Sicca Parish Council
Forge House
6 School Lane
Honeybourne
Worcestershire
WR11 7PA

By post and email: clerk@marstonsicca-pc.gov.uk

Dear Sir or Madam

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan- Land off Wyre Lane, Long Marston

We act for Mrs Brown who owns Land off Wyre Lane, Long Marston as shown edged blue on the **attached** plan. We are instructed by Mrs Brown to submit an Objection to the Regulation 40 Pre-submission Version of the Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan. We set out our Objection below and we also **enclose** a Regulation 40 Pre-submission Comments Form with this letter.

1. Objection

We object to *Policy L&E 2: Protection of Existing Green Infrastructure and Wildlife Corridors* and particularly the inclusion of the land in our client's ownership which lies to the north of Wyre Lane. The **attached** plan highlights the area within our client's ownership and we do not believe that the inclusion of this land within *Policy L&E 2: Protection of Existing Green Infrastructure and Wildlife Corridors* is either justified or based upon appropriate evidence. We therefore believe that the area shown on the plan attached should be removed from the Policy to make the Plan sound.

2. Planning Policy

As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework any Greenspace Designation should comply with Paragraph 102 which states:

"Local Greenspace Designation should only be used where the Greenspace is:

- a. *In reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;*
- b. *Demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife;*
- c. *Local in character and is not an extensive tract of land"*

We are not aware that the Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan Group has undertaken an objective assessment of the site against the criteria above.

Having undertaken our own assessment of the site we do not consider that the land in our client's ownership meets the requirements set out in Paragraph 102, principally in respect of **limb b**.

Partners: C.T. Bletsoe, FAAV A.Y. Brodie, BSc(Hons), FRICS, FAAV D.H. Bletsoe, MA, DipArb, MRICS, FAAV, MCI(Arb)
Mrs N.J. Clayton-Bailey, BSc(Hons), MRICS, FAAV P.E.L. Moore, MSc, MRICS, FAAV C.J. Templar, BSc(Hons), MRICS, FAAV

Salaried Partner: A.C. Middleditch, BSc(Hons), MRICS



Bletsoes is the trading name of Henry H Bletsoe & Son LLP, a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England & Wales under Partnership Number OC371369. Regulated by RICS. Registered office: Oakleigh House, Thrapston, Northamptonshire NN14 4LJ. We use the term 'partner' to refer to a member of the LLP or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications.

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

3. Functionality of the Site

The site as shown on the plan enclosed lies off Wyre Lane and is bounded on all sides by mature hedgerows. The site is currently unmanaged and is largely covered by invasive weed species such as nettles and brambles.

Due to the dense hedgerow boundaries there are no views into the site or through the site from Wyre Lane or from footpath SD40 (please see **attached** photographs) and due to the unkempt nature of the site, there is little to no wildlife value from the current use.

There is no public access to the site and whilst footpath SD40 lies approximately 30 metres from the northern boundary of the site, the footpath runs through an open area of amenity land which is visually separate and different in character from our client's site.

Accordingly, we do not believe that the site displays any of the characteristics identified in limb B of paragraph 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework (i.e. none of the following characteristics apply: *natural beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife*).

4. Evidence Base

We have reviewed the supporting documentation for the Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission version 2 on the Neighbourhood Plan website and we are unable to find specific evidence relating to the proposed designation of our client's site. Within the Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-submission Version 2, an extract from an Appeal Decision is included regarding the subject site (APP/J3720/W/176/3153788) which we assume is part of the justification for the site in Policy L&E 2. The extract reads

"the open and undeveloped nature of the site also contributes to the quality, character and setting of the lane and this part of the village generally"

The Inspector's comments are in response to an appeal for the refusal of planning permission for the redevelopment of the site for 5 new houses, and from reading the Appeal Decision in full it is our opinion that the Inspector raises a general concern about the overdevelopment and urbanisation of the site/frontage to Wyre Lane rather than the loss of an important area of open space which conforms the criteria set out in Paragraph 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

It should also be noted that the Planning Application, the subject of the Appeal (Ref: 14/02985/FUL), was recommended for approval by Stratford on Avon District Council but subsequently refused by the Planning Committee. In the Report from the Planning Committee the Case Officer comments as follows:

"The proposed development seeks to substantially retain the existing landscape with only a new access point being formed in an area where the trees in the boundary are dead or is a section of hawthorn hedge only. All remaining trees to the front boundary of the site are to be retained and I am satisfied that the development would respect the rural leafy character of Wyre Lane with the dwellings located behind the existing boundary. Other than the removal of three small trees within the site all existing landscape features are retained and we consider that this is acceptable and recommend that the condition be imposed to provide appropriate root protection for all retained trees and hedges on the site"

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

The Neighbourhood Plan Group have undertaken extensive questionnaires to assist in the formulation of the Neighbourhood Plan but there is no specific question relating to the Local Community's desire to see our client's site off Wyre Lane designated as Green Infrastructure and Wildlife Corridor. In addition, the site performs relatively well through the responses to the questionnaires as a site with potential for residential development with 9% of respondents identifying the site as the most suitable site for development (only 9 of 21 sites received a higher response). Only 15% of respondents identified the site as the least suitable site for development with 7 of 21 sites receiving a higher number of responses.

We therefore consider that there is no evidence that the site is *Demonstrably Special* to the Local Community.

5. Conclusion

As outlined above, our client Objects to the inclusion of their site within the *Policy L&E 2: Protection of Existing Green Infrastructure and Wildlife Corridors* and our clients site should be removed from the designation to make sure that the Plan is sound. Our client's site lies outside the Built Up Area Boundary and so the site is afforded an appropriate level of protection through existing Open Countryside policies.

We would welcome further discussions with the Neighbourhood Plan Group and trust that the site will be removed from the proposed Designation in the next iteration of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours faithfully



Peter Moore


Email: peter.moore@bletsoes.co.uk

Enc Form
Plan
Photos

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses

Photographs relating to Land off Wyre Lane, Long Marston.

Photographs taken – 21 June 2022



Photograph 1 – Photograph taken looking west along Wyre Lane showing existing development on the north side of Wyre Lane.

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses



Photograph 2 – Photograph taken looking north-west from Wyre Lane showing very strong boundary to Land off Wyre Lane. This photograph highlights that there are no views into or across the site from Wyre Lane.



Photograph 3 – Photograph taken from footpath SD40 looking east – This area is to the north of the Land off Wyre Lane and has strong amenity value. However it is visually and functionally separate from our client's site and the two parcels of land should be considered separately.

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses




Photograph 4 – Photograph taken looking south from footpath SD40 showing a very strong natural boundary obscuring views into Land off Wyre Lane and marking a clear distinction in terms of functionality and visual separation. As shown the two parcels of land are entirely separate with no views either into or across each other.



Photograph 5 - Photograph taken from the boundary of Land off Wyre Lane looking north west showing extensive invasive weeds across the site which limits the value of the site for wildlife habitat. The photograph also shows the enclosed nature of the site.

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses



The purple line is: SSSI Impact Risk Zones - to assess planning applications for likely impacts on SSSIs/SACs/SPAs & Ramsar sites (England)

The purple dot is: Great Crested Newts survey

Appendix 1: Open day consultation flyer

CAN YOU HELP WITH THE LONG MARSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN?

We have an opportunity to decide how we would like our village to develop between now and 2031, and to produce a Neighbourhood Plan to help achieve that vision

Why do we need one?

Further development in the village is inevitable. With a neighbourhood plan in place we can influence the type and location of these new dwellings giving due regard to the social and environmental impact of the proposals.

What is a neighbourhood plan?

A Neighbourhood Plan uses local knowledge and analysis to indicate where best new housing could and should be located; what this should look like; and how it fits in with the village.

Long Marston Parish Council need to appoint a committee to operate as an independent steering group, on behalf of Long Marston residents. Its objectives are to:

Consult with the local community to identify their needs and expectations, in the realm of Planning and Development.

Produce a Neighbourhood Plan to complement:

- 1) Our community's, specific local needs.
- 2) The Core strategy (Stratford District Council's Local Plan).
- 3) The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 4) Ensure all foreseeable developments, in the next 13 years, are addressed by the plan.

We need people from all sections of our community to form the steering group, not just parish councillors.

Interested, Curious?

Come along to our **wine and nibbles** evening in the village hall to find out more
25th November 2017



THE MORE DIVERSE OUR
COMMITTEE IS THE MORE
DYNAMIC AND CREDIBLE
OUR PLAN WILL BE

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan:
Pre-Submission Comments and the NDP Steering Group's responses
Appendix 2: Results of Open day consultation
Long Marston Neighbourhood Open Day, 25th November 2017

Purpose of open day: To introduce the residents of the village to the Neighbourhood planning process and to recruit volunteers to form the steering committee.

The open event was very busy, with 21 visitors attending during the 3 hour event, showing a great deal of interest in the plan and its scope. Nine information packs were given out and eight membership forms were filled in on the day. Several others were taken away to be returned at the next parish council meeting. Of the 8 filled in so far, 4 are possible active members of the steering group, 2 offering help with admin / leaflet drops, 1 offering help with footpaths only and the other 1 unclear as to the level of commitment offered.

Invitations to this event were hand delivered to all addresses in the Neighbourhood Plan Area. A preliminary questionnaire was included with the invitations. The purpose of which was to gather opinions on the proposed new village hall and open space. Only 15 out of a total of 214 were returned. Of these, the majority were opposed to building a new hall. Only 4 respondents were in favour. Opinions were almost equally divided on the provision of a Sports Pavillion or Dual-purpose building. Of those who said that the village didn't need a sports field, the majority opted for an informal green space or park.

This subject will have to be revisited in some detail as such a poor response cannot be representative of the whole village.

Results:

Does the village need a new village hall?	YES	4	NO	11
Would you prefer a Sports Pavillion? Or A Dual-Purpose Building?	YES	7	NO	8
Does the village need a sports field	YES	6	NO	8

NP Volunteers to date:-

Parish Councillors

Noel Davis
Bill Tempest – All issues relating to planning
Malcolm Englishby
Graham Wilcox

Non Councillors

Debbie Woodliffe – whole process, particularly website and document design.
Rachel Woodliffe
Melodie Bruce – Any help she can
Jo Cooper

Prospective new members:-

Cassie Neville 721076 – All aspects of the plan
Margaret Andrews 720948 – Management of the plan and leaflet drops
Sandra Asford – management and process of plan
John Bredavs 720905– management of the plan ticked with a question mark
Angela Barnard 07855478007 – Admin, website, documents, leaflet drops
Susan Wright 720959 – leaflet drops.
Colin Drummins 720574 – Left question mark next to management of the plan and seems to have volunteered his wife Nina for leaflet drops.
Diana Rippin 720536 – Offered help with footpaths only

Next step will be to get the remaining membership forms returned.

Appendix 3: Introduction to Neighbourhood Planning Presentation

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

OVERVIEW

- Neighbourhood Planning is a right for communities introduced through the localism Act 2011.
- Communities can shape development in their areas through the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan. It is a locally prepared document that sets out planning policies for a local area
- Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity for communities to influence how development or changes may affect their local area

Financial Benefits

- ▶ Aside from influencing development, there are also financial benefits in having a NP from increased funding from the CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy).
- ▶ Without a plan, there is no acknowledged framework for development which a potential developer must take into account


LONG TERM GOAL

- ▶ The NP must have a long term view.
- ▶ It would influence the development of our village by working in conjunction with the core strategy (strategically managing any development issues via workable/sustainable planning).
- ▶ It would include appraisal of preserving and managing our rural environment
- ▶ Prepare a plan for future development up to 2031 that considers all factors within the NP



Marston Sicca

Marston Sicca Official Boundary Map



Marston Sicca Neighbourhood Plan Boundary

PRESENT STATUS

- ▶ SDC have registered the fact that we are preparing a NP.
- ▶ Registering secures assistance & funding but holds limited weight when considering planning applications
- ▶ NPPF and Core Strategy guidelines & directives have meant the Parish Plan of 2007 has little value in terms of planning considerations but provides historical evidence and a framework for the current NP
- ▶ The core strategy defines the amount of development expected in service villages. As a category 4, we already have more than recommended numbers. However, what was once considered as cap is now being regarded as a minimum.
- ▶ A robust NP is essential to achieve a legitimate and recognised (approved) base from which to tackle planning.

NEXT STEPS

- ▶ Assess the skills and interests of our volunteers
- ▶ Form a steering group who will manage the process and write the plan (ideally 4-6 people)
- ▶ Identify key tasks that need to be done and form an action plan.
- ▶ If necessary the steering committee can form sub-groups to tackle specific projects
- ▶ Design professional/comprehensive questionnaire to engage all residents (processed via SDC)

FRAMEWORK OF KEY TASKS WORKING GROUP

- ▶ **Planning and Housing needs**
- ▶ **Infrastructure - Transport, health, education**
- ▶ **Village demographics, historic buildings, businesses & employment**
- ▶ **Utilities and essential services**
- ▶ **Environment - wildlife & habitat, green spaces, landscape and countryside**
- ▶ **Recreation, community groups**
- ▶ **Budget and project planning**

CONSULTATION

- ▶ The plan must be based on consultation with the village as a whole. A robust questionnaire will be the initial driver. This will be professionally drafted and assessed by SDC to allow confidential data to be processed.
- ▶ This will be issued to all residents, businesses and land owners.
- ▶ The NP must reflect key stages in its development - consultation, referencing to core strategy and supporting evidence to our points and recommendations.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE (A)

- ▶ Review plans from other similar communities. Examine study & structure.
- ▶ Review/update 2007 Parish Plan which includes the village design statement 2001.
- ▶ Update village demographic to reflect increase in population due to recent development. Map of the village prior to new build/after view. Number of new builds, statistic comment on how many new vs. the original number of village dwellings.
- ▶ Public Transport - mode, frequency, traffic, parking, roads and pathways, greenway, signage
- ▶ Conservation, historic / listed buildings, age, location, rural aspect, green spaces, areas of outstanding natural beauty.
- ▶ Village Assets - significance.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE (B)

- ▶ Flood team reports and flood maps
- ▶ Environment - wildlife, official records & data, ponds, natural habitat
- ▶ Community communications - newsletters, website, notice boards
- ▶ Open Space, significance, location, use, relevance to the community
- ▶ Recreation - Open space, village clubs/organisations, fete,
- ▶ Footpaths - location, condition, routes, historical significance,
- ▶ Businesses in the village and in close proximity
- ▶ REFERENCING SPECIFIC SUPPORTING DATA IN THE CORE STRATEGY

OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS

- ▶ Form steering committee
- ▶ Determine tasks
- ▶ Include supporting evidence
- ▶ Draft policies based on any consultation results, referenced to the NPPF and core strategy
- ▶ Submit it for Local Planning Authority for independent examination
- ▶ SDC organise a referendum
 - ▶ After a YES vote, the plan can be officially recognised/enforced.

Appendix 4: Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

– Fete Survey

Saturday 23rd June 2018

Main themes from – ‘What do you like about the village’

- 1) Community spirit / friendly people
- 2) The Poppin shop
- 3) The pub
- 4) Rural location
- 5) It's a quiet village
- 6) The Greenway
- 7) Also, comments regarding: public footpaths, the church, historic buildings, Post Office, events, linear village, ridge and furrow fields.

Main themes from – ‘What don't you like about the village’

- 1) Over development of the village (actual or risk of)
- 2) Lack of an open space / social space other than the pub
- 3) Lack of opportunities for teenagers
- 4) Speeding traffic
- 5) Volume of traffic
- 6) Also, comments regarding: crowded new houses, parking on verges, not enough affordable housing, dog mess, same people running events, shop too small, not enough people involved in events at the pub, current style/décor of the pub, slow internet, and pot holes.

Main themes for – ‘What would you change?’


- 1) Create an open space for use by all ages (benches, garden etc)
- 2) Introduce traffic calming measures
- 3) Improve transport links – Evesham and Chipping Campden mentioned.
- 4) Introduce highspeed broadband
- 5) Also, comments regarding: separate LM from Meon Vale, Create footpath around Station Rd to join with the Greenway, produce a footpath map, style of houses to vary when building, make a business hub, a new village hall that is larger with room to hire, improve the hedges, change village signs, road improvements and safety, café/tea room, a link from the northern end of the village to the Greenway to make a circular walk.

Appendix 5: Post NDP Survey Meeting 13th October 2019

**Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan
Post Survey Public Engagement Meeting October 13th 2019**

The meeting was held between 11 am and 1 pm on Sunday 13th October.

Copies of the topline results of the neighbourhood plan survey questionnaire were available for perusal with key sections displayed on notice boards. All of the NP steering group members were available to discuss the results with 25 attendees.



Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023



Also, on display (on behalf of the Parish Council and Warwickshire County Council) was the proposed traffic calming scheme, which was enthusiastically welcomed.

Appendix 6; Minutes of Parish Council Meeting September 2019

Marston Sicca Parish Council

DRAFT MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16TH 2019 PARISH MEETING

The meeting was held on Monday September 16th at 7.30pm in Long Marston Village Hall. Copies of minutes and reports will be posted on the parish website.

Present: Cllr. Johnsey (Chairman) Cllr. Tempest Cllr. Clarke
Parish Clerk – DM Woodliffe

In attendance: Cllr Barnes plus 10 members of the public

Meeting opened at 7.30pm

1. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Cllr. Davis, Cllr. Hillier and Cllr. Hodges advised the Clerk they would not be able to attend the meeting. The Council accepted their reasons.

1.2 Cllr. Brain apologised for not being able to attend.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 Cllr. Johnsey declared a non-pecuniary interest in Lagan Homes/Perry Orchard Development.

3. PUBLIC OPEN SESSION FOR AGENDA

3.1 A member of the public queried the play area within the Barley Fields development and what plans were in place to empty the bin in situ. Council confirmed the transfer of open space from Bloor Homes to the Parish Council is imminent and once concluded all issues relating to the site would be tackled.

3.2 Resident raised the clash in timing for the Village Clean up Day which coincided with the village flower and produce show. The council acknowledged the unfortunate overlap and would check for any date conflicts in the coming year.

3.3 A resident from Meon Vale introduced the council to Andrew Goy, Community Minister for Meon Vale and Marston Mead. The council welcomed him.

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

3.3. Resident from Meon Vale confirmed Cllr. Seccombe had assisted in the implementation of a crossing from Meon Vale to help children in MV access Lower Quinton school and vice versa. Work on the crossing is expected to start October 2019.

3.4. A member of the public welcomed Cllr. Clarke to the Parish Council.

4. COUNCILLOR BARNES

4.1 . Cllr. Barnes raised the topic of reserve sites with additional comments on the frustration of seeing continual development without the appropriate infrastructure being in place. Cllr. Tempest acknowledged the problem of reserve sites confirming that whilst these are reserve sites only (theoretically only being considered if SDC cannot demonstrate a 5-year land supply), the need to respond to the suggested sites were nonetheless necessary.

4.2 Cllr Barnes confirmed charges for parking at Milcote Lane (access to the Greenway) have been scrapped. This may ease the increasing problem of cars parking on Milcote Lane, Station Road and more recently in Wyre Lane.

5. COUNCILLOR BRAIN.

5.1,Cllr. Brain provided a short report on the status of road repairs in the village. Following complaints from residents of Perry Orchard, Cllr. Brain advised that the delays were frustrating, but the work should be completed in October and that he would liaise with WCC in this respect.

6. APPROVE MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS PARISH COUNCIL MEETING.

6.1 Minutes from August 19th were considered to be a true and accurate account of the meeting and were approved.

7. CLERKS REPORT / OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

7.1. The clerk reported further on the ecological funds relating to the Lagan Home site and that the monies had been reduced by £20k (leaving £26,774 available for ecological projects in the vicinity of the site). The clerk had again contacted David Cole from WCC who confirmed they were now pressing to receive the funds from Lagan Homes and would be willing to meet with the Parish Council to share ideas once the funds had been received.

7.2 Clerk confirmed progress had been made with regards to providing the allotments for use by Meon Vale residents with more detail given later in the meeting.

8. STATUS REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN LONG MARSTON:

8.1 Lagan Homes – Council confirmed SDC had been contacted for a full update on status following the recent site visit with the enforcement officer. Clerk had prompted Lagan to give response to the various points raised at the time and will chase before next meeting to ensure all agreed items requiring action by Lagan Homes have been actioned.

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

8.2 Bloor Homes – The council discussed remaining stages in getting final issues concluded; invoice for commuted sums had been raised and transfer forms signed and ready for exchange pending monies received and searches concluded.

9. MEON VALE

9.1 The council discussed a site visit that was made to the allotment site with a contractor who would be able to get the site fit for purpose. Using a rotavator, the contractor estimated the work to cost no more than £500. The council considered the payment of the work may be supported by way of a Parish Council grant. Clerk to get a formal quotation.

10. DEFIBRILLATOR

10.1 Following residents request, the council agreed to reinstate details of defibrillator location back within the newsletter and discussed training. The question of training was also discussed, and it was resolved to organise a training session in the village hall that would combine the defibrillator and general first aid. *Clerk to investigate training programme with suggested dates.*

11.COMMUNITY BUILDING / OPEN SPACE COMMITTEE.

11.1 Following the appointment of Cllr Clarke who would be concentrating on community projects and related tasks, the council confirmed an outline of a specific committee should be drawn up with related objectives. It was agreed to prepare specific details ready for the next Parish Council meeting

12. FINANCE

12.1 The RFO/Clerk provided full monthly accounts which again gave full bank reconciliation along with an income/expense summary. Approved accounts page has been introduced to ensure accounts are signed as true and accurate.

12.2 The RFO confirmed meeting with HSBC has been arranged for October 9th and further meetings are being organised with Barclays and Lloyds with regards to spreading PC funds. It was also confirmed Unity Trust had been contacted but their interest options on community accounts were less favourable.

12.3 ITEMS APPROVED FOR PAYMENT:

DATE	PAYEE	CHEQUE NO	AMOUNT	DETAILS
16/09/2019	WALC	101662	£6.00	Training
16/09/2019	T JOHNSON	101663	£385.00	Newsletter
16/09/2019	THOS. FOX	101664	£653.74	Maintenance
16/09/2019	Clerk	101665	£38.97	HP instant Ink
16/09/2019	Village Hall	101666	£89.00	Hall Hire

12.4 PAYMENTS MADE

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

30/08/2019	Stratford DC	101661	£100.00	Election fee
------------	--------------	--------	---------	--------------

13. RESERVE SITES

13.1 Cllr Tempest gave more details relating to the Reserve Sites and due to the short time available to respond (18th), the matter was not able to be deferred to full council.

13.2 Because we have don't have a Neighbourhood Plan SDC have taken it upon themselves to propose four sites in the village which they deem as likely to be deliverable for development should they not be able to demonstrate a 5-year land supply for housing. Three of the sites have developer involvement which the council felt was the criteria used in selection of sites which are as follows: LMAR.A – 18, LMAR.B – 30, LMAR.C – 9, LMAR.D – 15 giving a total of 72 houses

13.3 LMAR.A(LMAR.02) East of Rumer close and north of Perry Orchard Only the west of this site is proposed for the erection of 18 dwellings, access being from Perry Orchard. Lagan Homes have been attempting to involve the PC in discussions which we feel is inappropriate at this time. **It was resolved to object for the following reasons:** - Long Marston is a category 4 LSV which should have a maximum of 32 homes when, in fact, we have 80, so any additional development would result in a clear conflict with policies CS.15 and CS.16.This would result in an unsustainable form of development in excess of the number of dwellings that LM can sustain in the plan period. It does not have the infrastructure, shops, services or public transport to accommodate this number of dwellings. Site sits outside the village BUAB so does not accord with policy AS.10. LMAR.D to the west of Welford Road was refused planning permission for the same reasons on appeal reference

APP/J3720/W/17/3175407 so this site should not be considered as a reserve site.

13.4 LMAR.B (LMAR.08) Glebe Field east of Welford Road, 30 houses. **It was resolved to object for the following reasons:** Long Marston is a category 4 LSV which should have a maximum of 32 homes when, in fact, we have 80, so any additional development would result in a clear conflict with policies CS.15 and CS.16.This would result in an unsustainable form of development in excess of the number of dwellings that LM can sustain in the plan period. It does not have the infrastructure, shops, services or public transport to accommodate this number of dwellings. Site sits outside the village BUAB so does not accord with policy AS.10. The proposed development would result in 'less than substantial' harm to a number of listed buildings which are situated in the vicinity of the site as well as to

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

the rural backdrop and medieval ridge and furrow. This is a highly sensitive location which makes a functional contribution to the character openness of the setting and visual amenity. These were the findings of SDC planning department when refusing application 17/00575/OUT for 12 houses so the proposed 30 would be even more unacceptable. All the reasons for refusal are still valid for this site.

13.5 LMAR.C(LMAR.09) Park House and Paddock on Welford Road for 9 houses

Although this site sits outside the village BUAB it does have a house on it which, in this case, would question the validity of the BUAB. This site has no recent planning history. It is a moribund site with the house falling into dis-repair. Any sympathetic development can only improve the street scene through the village. The council expressed doubt that 9 houses would be possible on this site but more realistically 5 or 6 may be possible. **It was resolved to support this site for the following reasons:** This is a moribund site with a house on it in a state of dis-repair. A sympathetic small- scale development would enhance the house and street scene in accordance with policy CS.9. It is also in keeping with the village linear settlement pattern so should be considered as suitable for a reserve site.

13.6 LMAR.D (LMAR.17) Bloor Homes Phase 3 for 15 bungalows. **It was resolved to object for the following reasons:** Long Marston is a category 4 LSV which should have a maximum of 32 homes when, in fact, we have 80, so any additional development would result in a clear conflict with policies CS.15 and CS.16. This would result in an unsustainable form of development in excess of the number of dwellings that LM can sustain in the plan period. It does not have the infrastructure, shops, services or public transport to accommodate this number of dwellings. Site sits outside the village BUAB so does not accord with policy AS.10. Previous application 16/02206/OUT and Appeal Ref. APP/J3720/W/17/3175407 both refused and reasons given are still valid so this should not be considered as a reserve site.

14. PLANNING MATTERS

19/01685/FUL – 2 College Close, Rear single storey extension. *Permission Granted* 19/01291/REM, Meon Vale, Extension to approved road for Phase 4. *Pending consideration.*

18/01892/OUT, LMA 3100 Additional information requested by SDC will not be available from Cala around October of this year. *Pending consideration*

18/001883/FUL, South Western Relief Road (SWRR). Additional information on impact to the Strategic Road Network requested by Highways England with special reference to the impact on the M40/A46 Junction 15. *Pending consideration* 19/02351/FUL, The Old Rectory, Single storey extension to the

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

kitchen at the rear of the house. It was resolved the council would confirm no objection

19/02177/LBC (Listed Building Consent), The Old Rectory, single storey extension to the kitchen at the rear of the house as well as internal and external alterations. Conservation Team must adhere to legal constraints when assessing alterations/extensions to listed buildings. Council felt the decision should be left to the Conservation team. It was resolved to issue No representation.

15. COUNCILLOR REPORTS

15.1 Cllr. Johnsey noted an issue with debris falling from skip hire vehicles transiting the village, it was agreed to note the problem in the newsletter and to write to local skip hire companies to ensure loads are correctly secured. Clerk to action.

15.2 Cllr. Johnsey also discussed maintenance through the village with particular reference to footpaths and the need for landowners to take responsibility for footpaths and stiles that crosses their land. It was agreed the Clerk would write to respective landowners reminding each of their responsibilities and giving a 3-month time frame for any required work to be done.

15.3 Cllr. Hillier submitted an interim report confirming speed calming measures was still work in progress with some debate taking place with Highways regarding street lighting supposedly being required close to any potential build outs.

15.4 Cllr. Hillier confirmed village benches had been ordered.

15.5 It was also confirmed any remedial work to Wyre Lane was awaiting from funds from Severn Trent.

15.6 Cllr. Davis gave a report confirming the results to the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire would be available for review. The NP committee have organised an open meeting at the village hall on October 13th between 11am and 1pm. The council felt this might be a good time to also include any plans available re traffic calming measures

15.7 Cllr Clarke gave her introductory report on community projects and initiatives. The newsletter was discussed in terms of adding something specific for children (quiz for younger children had been created) along with a regular article on topical subjects.

16. ANY URGENT ITEMS OF BUSINESS

None discussed

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement,
January 2023

17. DATE OF NEXT MEETING
Monday October 21st @ 7.30pm

Meeting closed – 9.02pm


Parish Clerk

Signed.....
Chairman

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

Appendix 7: SEA Screening

Switchboard: 01789 260321
e-mail : louisa.slator@stratford-dc.gov.uk
My ref : Long Marston NDP
Your ref :
Date : 17 May 2022



Long Marston Parish Council
c/o Noel Davis
Long Marston Neighbourhood
Development Plan Steering Group
(e-mail only)

Dear Mr Davis,

LONG MARSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCREENING FOR STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (SEA)

In accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SEA Regulations), Lepus Consulting has prepared a SEA Screening Document on behalf of Stratford-on-Avon District Council to determine whether the Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan (LNDP) should be subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

The Screening Document explored the potential effects of the proposed LNDP and concluded that on the basis of the SEA Screening Assessment, the LNDP would not result in significant environmental effects in relation to criteria set out in the SEA Regulations or the Habitats and Species Regulations.

This screening document was subsequently submitted to the statutory environmental bodies of Historic England, Environment Agency and Natural England for comment, in accordance with the SEA Regulations. The three consultees concurred with the conclusions of the Screening Document that the preparation of a SEA was not required.

Having read the Submitted Draft NDP, SEA Screening Document and responses from the three statutory consultees, I concur with the view that a SEA is not required for the LNDP.

I hope this is sufficient for your needs. However, should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact Louisa Slator, Policy Planner, whose details are at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'JCP Careford'.

John Careford
Head of Development

Elizabeth House
Church Street
Stratford-upon-Avon
CV37 6HX

telephone 01789 267575

minicom 01789 260747

website www.stratford.gov.uk

DX700737 STRATFORD-ON-AVON 2

Appendix 8 Stratford on Avon Herald Regulation 14 Consultation notice

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Regulation 14 - Pre-Submission Consultation and Publicity

Notice is hereby given that Marston Sicca Parish Council has prepared a neighbourhood plan for their Parish Neighbourhood Area and is publishing its Pre-Submission Draft Plan for public consultation, in accordance with Regulation 14 of Part 5 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

A copy of the Draft Plan and supporting documentation are available at <http://www.longmarstonnp.co.uk>. A hard copy of the plan will be available to view at Long Marston Village Hall on 6th June from 7pm – 9pm and 11th June from 10am – 12:30pm.

The consultation starts on **Monday, 30th May**. Comments to be received by **5pm on Monday, 11th July**. You are encouraged to submit your representations electronically at www.longmarstonnp.co.uk or by obtaining a comment form from the Clerk

Debbie Woodliffe • Parish Clerk.

email: clerk@marstonsicca-pc.gov.uk

Appendix 9 Template of letter sent to Land Owners affected by the Local Gap Policy

Debbie Woodliffe
Parish Clerk/RFO
Marston Sicca Parish Council
Forge House,
6 School Lane
Honeybourne / WR11 7PJ

clerk@marstonsicca-pc.gov.uk

Name
Address

Dear

18/05/2022

RE: Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan

As you may be aware, Marston Sicca Parish Council is currently preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan for the Parish of Marston Sicca which will cover the period up to 2031. The steering group leading the preparation of the plan on behalf of the Parish Council has identified spaces within or close to the village that it regards as valuable Green Infrastructure and Wildlife Corridors.

What is it and what does it mean for a landowner?

Although protection of this and similar areas is not formally covered by current national policy support, acceptance of this Neighbourhood Plan would mean that for any planning applications that come forward, this policy would likely be a material planning consideration with regard to that land.

Designation does not in itself confer any rights of public access over what exists at present and only covers the Plan period (up to 2031). Any additional access would be a matter for separate negotiation with land owners, whose legal rights must be respected.

Valued Green Infrastructure designation is also justified due to the special qualities and important contribution they play within the physical and natural environment of the village and the social role they provide for local residents.

Designation of your land will run concurrently with the Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period 2011 – 2031. It is anticipated that the Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed every five years thereby enabling a review of the current green spaces to take place.

The plan below indicates the land that has been identified as potential Valued Green Infrastructure. It is understood that the land outlined in red is owned by you.

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement,
January 2023



It is anticipated that the Pre-Submission Draft v2.1 Neighbourhood Plan will be published for a formal 6-week public consultation between 30th May until midnight on 11th July 2022.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group welcomes the opportunity to discuss this proposal with you prior to the formal consultation. Alternatively, you may wish to submit your views via the formal consultation process. You may submit comments on our Reg 14 pre-submission comments form, which can be submitted or downloaded on our website <http://www.longmarstonnp.co.uk/reg14.html>

If you have any queries, please let me know within 21 days of the date of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Debbie Woodliffe


Clerk, Marston Sicca Parish Council

Mob: 07485 437702 or email: clerk@marstonsicca-pc.gov.uk

Appendix 10: Regulation 14 Consultation Flyer.



LONG MARSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION Monday, 30th May until 5pm Monday, 11th July 2022



YOUR OPINION COUNTS

Don't miss this opportunity to share your comments and help shape the future of Long Marston.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan has now been published for consultation. It will be available for a 6-week consultation period to seek the views of Long Marston residents on the vision, policies and aspirations contained within it. The

plan is based on the responses to the 2019 neighbourhood plan area survey, extensive research, independent assessments as well as face-to-face consultations with you.

Due to the close proximity of SDC strategic sites at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield, the neighbourhood plan area does not include the whole of the parish. Anyone can comment on the plan but only those living within the Plan Area are eligible to vote.

WHAT ARE THE MAIN POLICIES IN THE CURRENT PLAN?

Protected green spaces, valued landscapes, flooding, housing and site allocation for approximately 8 homes, protection for wildlife and biodiversity, footpaths and architectural heritage and much more.

WHERE CAN I VIEW THE PLAN AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS?

Follow the link on the Parish Council website homepage:

<http://www.longmarstonnp.co.uk>

- Printed copies are available to read at the following locations:
 - The Poppin Village Shop

HOW DO I RESPOND TO THE CONSULTATION?

- **PUBLIC MEETINGS:** Long Marston Village Hall. Monday June 6th 7 – 9pm.
Saturday June 11th 10am – 12:30pm

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

- **ON-LINE FORMS:** You can download a printable form or fill in the on-line version at this website <http://www.longmarstonnp.co.uk/reg14.html>
- **BY POST:** You can post your comments to Long Marston Parish Clerk, Marston Sicca Parish Council, Forge House, 6 School Lane, Honeybourne, WR11 7PJ or email: clerk@marstonsicca-pc.gov.uk
- **PARISH COUNCIL SUGGESTION BOX:** Comment forms are available by the Parish Council Suggestion Box in the Poppin village shop. Completed forms can be put in the box.

WHAT HAPPENS TO MY RESPONSES?

Every response will be considered and potentially used to modify the plan before it is formally submitted to the Stratford upon Avon District Council. A summary of all responses will be made public and published via the Marston Sicca Parish Council website.

WHAT IS THE DEADLINE FOR MY RESPONSES?

All responses must be received by the Parish Clerk no later than 5pm on Monday 11th July 2022.

ANY QUESTIONS? Contact Marston Sicca Parish Clerk by... Email:

clerk@marstonsicca-pc.gov.uk,

or by **Post:** Debbie Woodliffe • Marston Sicca Parish Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer

Appendix 11: Regulation 14 consultation poster

Long Marston **Neighbourhood Plan**

REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

Together we've written a plan that
shapes the future for Long Marston.
This is your time to feedback on the plan
before it starts the next steps in
becoming a legal document.

Public Consultation

30th May 2022 until 11th July 2022

Open Days

Long Marston Village Hall

Monday June 6th 7-9pm

Saturday June 11th 10am - 12:30

Digital Feedback

longmarstonnp.co.uk



More info at: longmarstonnp.co.uk

Appendix 12: Regulation 14 Consultation Comments Form.



REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

This is a formal consultation on the Pre-Submission Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) in accordance with Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The consultation runs from 30th May until midnight on 11th July 2022. The Parish Council is very keen to receive your views on the pre-submission NDP before it proceeds to the next stage of being submitted to Stratford upon Avon District Council for independent examination and community referendum.

All responses to this consultation must be received in writing prior to the end of the consultation period. Comments and the name of the person who submitted the comment will be published exactly as written when the plan is submitted to Stratford upon Avon District Council under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Anonymous responses will not be accepted, nor will any responses that are considered to contain inappropriate language, defamation or are deemed to be offensive. If your comment is not accepted, we will notify you, as long as contact details have been provided and your consent has been given.

Please note that fields marked with a * are required. Failure to provide required information may, regretfully, result in your response not being considered.

About you:

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement,
January 2023

First name*

Last name*

Company name and position (if relevant)

Address *

Postcode*

Email

Please tick all of the following that apply to you: -

- I live in the Neighbourhood Plan Area
- I am a statutory consultee
- I work in the parish
- I am an agent
- None of the above

Consent:

We need to store your personal information in order to receive your comments. Please confirm whether you agree to the following by ticking the box. Please note that we will be unable to consider your response if you do not consent to the * section below. Any comments submitted are not anonymous, and your name will be published along with the comment.

- I consent to Long Marston Parish Council and Steering Group storing my personal data*

The tick boxes below are optional and relate to us being able to contact you in future regarding the Neighbourhood Plan. Please confirm whether you consent to the following:

- I consent to be contacted regarding my response by Long Marston Parish Council or its Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
- I consent to being kept up to date on the status of the Long Marston Neighbourhood Plan by Long Marston Parish Council or its Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

A summary of all comments made will be publicly available. Please note that any other personal information provided will be confidential and processed in line with the Data Protection Act 1998 and General Data Protection Regulations. The Parish Council will process your details in relation to the preparation of this document only. As part of the Consultation and in line with the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) please confirm that you are happy for the Parish Council to pass your contact details (name, address/email address) on to Stratford upon Avon District Council (SDC) so that they can contact you at Regulation 16 consultation. Stratford upon Avon District Council will contact you in a manner that is compatible with the GDPR* (required)

- I consent to the Parish Council passing my contact details (Name, address, email address) to SDC so that I can be contacted by them regarding Regulation 16 consultation*

Comments:

What is your overall opinion of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan – would you support or oppose it at referendum?

- Yes, support without modifications
- Yes, support but with modifications
- No, would not support

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement,
January 2023

Would you like to share any comments on the plan? If you wish to comment on a specific point, please ensure you include the relevant page number, paragraph number and policy reference.

Your answer:

Document	Page	Policy Ref	Comment

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

Continue on separate sheet if needed – please staple or fix all sheets of your response form together if possible

Post completed form to:

Debbie Woodliffe

Clerk to Marston Sicca Parish
Council Forge House, 6 School Lane
Honeybourne.
Worcestershire. WR11 7PJ

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

Appendix 13: List of Regulation 14 Consultees

Akins Ltd

Ancient monuments society

Arqiva

Birmingham International Airport

CABE

Canal and River Trust

Capital and Property Projects

Coal Authority

Council for British Archaeology

Council for British Archaeology

Cotswold Conservation Board

Coventry Diocese DAC Secretary

Civil Aviation Authority

Coventry Airport

CTC - National Cycling Charity

CTC - National Cycling Charity

Historic England

English Heritage Parks and Gardens

Environment Agency

Environment Agency

Force Crime Prevention Design Advisor

Forestry Commission

Forestry Commission

Garden History Society

Georgian Group

Gloucester Diocese

Homes England

Highways Agency (Midlands)

Inland Waterways Association

Joint Radio company

Kernon Countryside Consultants

London Oxford Airport

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

MBNL(Acting for Everything Everywhere)

Ministry of Defence

Accessible Stratford

Mr Butler (CPRE)

CPRE

National Air Traffic Services

National Grid Gas Distribution

National Grid UK Transmission

National Planning Casework Service

National Trust

Natural England

Natural England

Network Rail

Ofcom

Off Route Airspace

SDC Conservation

WCC Principle Highway Control Officer

Ramblers Association

SDC Planning and Environment

Royal Agricultural Society of England

RSPB

Severn Trent Water

Severn Trent Water

Sport England West Midlands

Sport England West Midlands

Stratford-on-Avon Gliding Club

Stratford-on-Avon Gliding Club

Sustrans

Thames Water Utilities

Thames Water Utilities

Theatres Trust

Upper Avon Navigation Trust Ltd

Victorian Society

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

Warwickshire Badger Group
Warwickshire Bat Group
Warwickshire Police
Warwickshire Police
Warks Primary Care Trust
NHS Property Services Ltd
Warwickshire Rural Housing Association
Warks Wildlife Trust
WCC - planning
WCC Archaeology
WCC Extra Care Housing
WCC NDP Liaison Officer
WCC Flood Risk
WCC Flood Risk
WCC Ecology
WCC Forestry
WCC Fire & Rescue Service
WCC Gypsy & Traveller Officer
WCC Health & Communities
WCC Highways
WCC Land Registry
WCC Libraries
WCC Rights of Way
Wellesbourne Airfield
Wellesbourne Airfield
Western Power Distribution
Woodland Trust
Warwickshire Rural Community Council
Warwickshire Amphibian and Reptile Team
Stansgate Planning
Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership NHS Trust
South Warwickshire Clinical Commissioning Group
Community Forum - Stratford area

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

Stratford Business Forum
Strutt and Parker
Bromford Housing Group
Stonewater Housing Association
Fortis Living Housing Association
Warwickshire Rural Housing Association
Orbit Group
Platform Housing Group
Shakespeares England
SSA Planning, Nottingham
SDC Planning Policy
Lichfields
Delta Planning (Stefan Stojsavljevic)
Julie Warwick (JMW Planning Solutions Ltd)
Tetlow King Planning
Iceni Projects Ltd
Holt Property
Holt Property
Quod - Planning and Development Consultants
National Grid
Mather Jamie - Commercial Land Agents
Barton Willmore
Avison Young
Barton Willmore
Barratt Developments
Barrat Homes
WSP
Persimmon Homes
Michael O'Driscoll
Lichfields
Richborough Estates
WSP
Seven Homes

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement, January 2023

Barton Willmore

Dorsington Parish Council

Welford-on-Avon Parish Council

Weston-on-Avon Parish Meeting

Clifford Chambers & Milcote PC

Quinton Parish Council

County Councillor

Wychavon District Council

Manuela Perteghella

Daren Pemberton

Mark Cargill

Gill Cleeve

David Curtis

Ian Fradgley

Penny-Anne O'Donnell

Edward Fitter

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Statement,
January 2023

**Appendix 14: Consultation letter sent to all Statutory
Consultees**



16/05/2022

Dear Sir/Madam

Long Marston Neighbourhood Development Plan

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

**Neighbourhood Planning (General) Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended) Regulation
14 – Pre-submission consultation and publicity**

I am pleased to inform you that the Pre-Submission Draft of **Long Marston** Neighbourhood Plan has been published for public consultation. The plan sets out a vision for the future of the Parish neighbourhood area and the planning policies which will be used to determine planning applications within the neighbourhood areas.

The draft plan is subject to a six-week period of consultation from **30th May to 11th July** and can be viewed at <http://www.longmarstonnp.co.uk/reg14.html>. A representation form is available in electronic or printable format at the same website.

Please complete and submit your on-line copies or return your representation forms by post to me at the address shown on the form, to be received no later than 5pm on 11th July 2022.

Yours sincerely,

Debbie Woodliffe

Clerk to Marston Sicca Parish Council

Debbie Woodliffe • Marston Sicca Parish Clerk and Responsible
Financial Officer Mob: 07485 437702 or email: [clerk@marstonsicca-
pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@marstonsicca-pc.gov.uk)