## Appendix 1 - Comments from Stratford-on-Avon District Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contents Page</strong></td>
<td>Contents list (p.1)</td>
<td>Under Section 2 (Evidence Gathering) sub-headings should be listed and numbered to be consistent with the rest of the document (i.e. 2.1 – Governing Principles; 2.2 – The Process). This principle also relates to Sections 3 and 4. Under Section 4 (Policies), all policies should be listed. In order to do this, each policy in the Plan will need to be given a title. See comments throughout this document for assistance in this regard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contents Page</strong></td>
<td>Glossary (p.1)</td>
<td>It is suggested that ‘LSV2’ refers to ‘Local Service Village Category 2’ and ‘SDC’ refers to ‘Stratford-on-Avon District Council’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Whole document</td>
<td>It would helpful if separate headings were added to the top of each of the individual sections to make it easier to read the plan. Paragraph numbering should also be added throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>NDP Vision (p.2)</td>
<td>First sentence of fourth paragraph to be amended to read “The character of the settlements and landscape within the designated neighbourhood area is of special quality…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1.2 The Neighbourhood Development Plan (p.4)</td>
<td>Amend second sentence of first paragraph to read “Approval to prepare the Plan was given by SDC in June 2014 through the approval of the application to designate the neighbourhood area which was based on the Parish boundary.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1.4 How the Community Influenced the Plan (p.5)</td>
<td>Replace “Spring” with “June” in the final line of the first paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 – Brailes Today</td>
<td>3.2 History (p.9)</td>
<td>Should the final word on the first line of the first paragraph on p.9 be “sinking” not “shrinking”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 – Brailes Today</td>
<td>3.3 Profile of the Parish (p.9)</td>
<td>The section refers to surveys but does not explain what surveys are being relied upon as evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 – Brailes Today</td>
<td>People (p.10)</td>
<td>The section refers to surveys but does not explain what surveys are being relied upon as evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 – Brailes Today</td>
<td>Hamlet of Winderton (p.17)</td>
<td>Replace “…is in…” on the first line of the first paragraph, with “…the majority of the settlement lies within…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Reference/NDP page</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 – Objectives and Policies</td>
<td>Objectives and Policies (p.18)</td>
<td>This section informs the reader that each policy will consist of: An objective; A policy statement; an explanation for the policy. However, the policy section is not actually written in this format. Currently, not every policy has an objective, in some instances a number of policies are ‘linked’ together (for example policies L1-L7) and not each policy has an associated explanation. This requires clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 – Objectives and Policies</td>
<td>4.1 A valued landscape and setting (p.18)</td>
<td>The two main themes would read better as “The Natural Environment” and “The Built Environment” at the bottom of p.18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 – Objectives and Policies</td>
<td>Environment – Natural (p.19)</td>
<td>The section entitled Environment highlights flooding as an area of concern for the Brailes community, and makes reference to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CS.2 in setting the context. However, it does not make any reference to the District Council’s Core Strategy Policy CS.4 ’Water Environment and Flood Risk’. It would be helpful reference to CS.4 was included to strengthen the context. The District Council is committed to protecting and enhancing the District’s environment and supportive of measures which help to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of Climate Change. Therefore, the District Council is supportive of a policy which seeks to reduce flood risk and mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change in local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 – Natural Environment</td>
<td>Objective for Policies L1-L7 (p.20)</td>
<td>Inclusion of the word ‘exceed’ in the third line would seem to be inappropriate. Whilst the objective looks to exceed guidelines, Policy L1 then states that ‘new developments must adopt best practice SUDS, which appears to be at odds with the objective to ‘exceed’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 – Natural Environment</td>
<td>Policy L1 (p.20)</td>
<td>Policy CS.4 of the Council’s adopted Core Strategy provides detailed policy principles for the protection of the district’s water environment and the reduction of flood risk. Policy CS.4 Part B relates specifically to surface water runoff and sustainable urban drainage systems. It requires that SUDS should be proportionally incorporated into all scales of development, supported by a groundwater risk assessment. Part B of the policy currently exceeds the non-statutory national SUDS standards by requiring that for brownfield development sites, developers are expected to deliver substantial reduction in the existing rate of surface water generated from the development, and where possible, limits the rate of surface water runoff to the equivalent Greenfield rate. It is recommended that the policy is reworded to reflect this. Policy L1 states that new developments must adopt best practice Sustainable Drainage Systems. The policy could be strengthened if it requires that the design of SUDS should support the findings and recommendations of Warwickshire Surface Water Management Plan, the Warwickshire Sustainable Urban Drainage Manual and the District Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, which also requires development to exceed best practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 – Natural Environment</td>
<td>Policy L2 (p.20)</td>
<td>Policy does not appear to directly relate to land-use planning matters and should be deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Reference/NDP page</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4 – Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td>Policy L3 (p.20)</td>
<td>Policy does not appear to directly relate to land-use planning matters and should be deleted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Section 4 – Natural Environment** | Policy L4 (p.20)  | Separate legislation requires water companies to carry out their statutory duty to ensure that water services infrastructure is provided in a timely manner. It is worth noting that Severn Trent will ensure provision once planning permission has been granted. At a strategic level, the Council Core Strategy has undertaken a number of Water Cycle Studies to evidence that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of planned growth in the district in the plan period.  
In addition, Policy CS.4 part D ‘Water Quality’ requires that, in accordance with the Water Framework Directive’s objectives, development must not affect the water bodies’ ability to reach good or potential status as set out in the Rivers Severn, Humber and Thames River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs).... Development will not be permitted where proposals have a negative impact on water quality, either directly through pollution of surface or ground water, or indirectly through overloading the wastewater treatment works. Prior to any potential development, consultation must be held with either Severn Trent or Thames Water as appropriate to ensure that the required wastewater infrastructure is in place in sufficient time. |
| **Section 4 – Natural Environment** | Policy L5 (p.20)  | It is unclear what is required to comply with the policy.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| **Section 4 – Natural Environment** | Policy L6 (p.20)  | It is unclear what is required to comply with the policy – what are the flood water management proposals to be assessed against?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **Section 4 – Natural Environment** | Policy L7 (p.20)  | Which flood alleviation works are to be taken into account and by whom?  
Suggest replacing “villages” with “land and properties” if retained, but see comment below on possible re-drafting of the policy.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **Section 4 – Natural Environment** | Policies L1-L7 (p.20) | It is suggested the remaining policies in this section (after the removal of L2, L3 and L4) could be integrated into one policy titled “Flood Risk”. A sample policy is set out below, which could be adapted and incorporated into a revised all-encompassing ‘flood risk’ policy:  
“Development should not increase flood risk. Planning applications for development within the Plan area must be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment in line with the requirements of national policy and advice, but may also be required on a site by site basis based on locally available evidence. All proposals must demonstrate that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere and that the proposed development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                          |                            | Information accompanying the application should demonstrate how any mitigation measures will be satisfactorily integrated into the design and layout of the development. The use of sustainable urban drainage systems and permeable surfaces will be encouraged where appropriate. Development within Flood Zones 1 and 2 must demonstrate that it will not reduce the capacity and capability of the functional flood plain. Water compatible uses within Flood Zone 3 may be acceptable in certain circumstances but other forms of development will be strictly resisted. All development proposals must incorporate suitable and sustainable means of drainage. Where site conditions are proven to be unsuitable, an alternative drainage solution will need to be agreed by the council and the relevant water authority. The re-use and recycling of water within developments will be encouraged. Proposals which do not satisfactorily demonstrate secure arrangements for the prevention of fluvial and pluvial flooding will not be supported."

| Section 4 – Natural Environment | Policy L1-L7: Explanation (p.20) | The explanation should be reworded to be more explicit about the impact of flooding on the Parish. It is recommended that the first paragraph is reworded as follows: “Flooding is a major concern for the Parish as it has a significant impact on the local communities. This is evidenced by the feedback from ....January 2016 which shows that it is a high priority consideration for future developments. Reference should also be made to the fact that Brailes is registered on the WCC Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) as a community at risk of flooding”. The explanation would be strengthened if this fact was included with a link to the SWMP. A full description of mitigation works should be included. It is recommended that details of flood alleviation works are provided .e.g. what, where (with a map) and duration. The final sentence of the explanation should be deleted as this does not relate to the explanation of the policy. |

<p>| Section 4 – Natural Environment | Policy L8 Objective (p.21) | Insert “Local” between “designated” and “green” and Insert capital ‘G’ for green and capital ‘S’ for spaces. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Section 4 – Natural Environment** | Policy L8 (p.21) | Re-number as ‘Policy L2’ and provide title “Local Green Space”.

The policy as written includes the word “permitted”. With regard to the issue of decision making the Framework states “the planning system is plan-led. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise”. The material considerations at the time of determination of a future planning application are unknown and therefore cannot be dismissed through a policy that states development “will only be permitted in the following circumstances”. Policies should use the term “supported” or “not be supported” in recognition that the basis of decision making is the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As such, “permitted” should be replaced by “supported”.

The second paragraph of the ‘Explanation’ text (including 2 no. bullet points) should be incorporated into the policy itself.

The exact individual boundaries for each of the proposed Local Green Spaces are difficult to pick out on the policies map. It would be appropriate to include separate individual ‘inset’ maps for each site at an appropriate scale, for clarity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Section 4 – Natural Environment** | Policy L9 (p.21) | Re-number as ‘Policy L3’ and provide title “Promoting High Quality Design”, or similar.  
The policy does not read particularly well as drafted. Some suggested wording for a re-drafted policy is set out below:  
“All development proposals must demonstrate how local character has been taken into account during the conception and evolution of a design. Proposals that do not positively contribute to local character will not be supported.  
All development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how the design has been influenced by the need to plan positively to reduce crime and the fear of crime and how this will be achieved.  
The density of development must enhance the character and quality of the local area whilst preserving the amenity of neighbouring residential homes, being commensurate with a viable scheme and infrastructure capacity”.  
The final sentence relating to the maintaining or enhancing of the ecological status of a development site is a separate policy issue and should be a distinct policy in its own right. It is suggested introducing a new policy L4 titled “Nature Conservation” or something similar. Some suggested wording for the policy is set out below:  
Development should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity wherever possible. Existing ecological networks should be retained and new ecological habitats and networks are particularly encouraged. Measures to improve landscape quality, scenic beauty and tranquillity are encouraged.” |
| **Section 4 – Natural Environment** | Policy L10 (p.22) | Re-number as ‘Policy L5’ and provide title “Renewable and Low Carbon Energy”, or similar.  
Some suggested wording for a re-drafted policy is set out below:  
“Development proposals relating to the production of renewable and low carbon energy will be supported providing they can be satisfactorily integrated into the character and appearance of the village and its environs. Proposals which have an adverse impact on the character of the area will not be supported.  
Where appropriate, other development should demonstrate how energy efficiency measures have been maximised through the provision of high energy efficient buildings” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Section 4 – Natural Environment | Policy L11 (p.22) | The policy as drafted does not directly relate to land-use planning matters since it refers specifically to street lighting. Street lighting is not a matter that can be influenced through planning applications since it is a statutory function of the County Council through other legislation. As drafted, the policy should therefore be deleted. However, the explanatory text indicates the policy is based on the requirement for the maintenance of a ‘dark sky’ environment in the neighbourhood area. An alternative stance on a ‘dark sky’ policy is set out below for consideration:  
“Development should aim to minimise light pollution by avoiding obtrusive external property and street lighting. In considering applications, parties will be encouraged to assess whether the proposed development could take place without external lighting.  
All applications for new development must demonstrate how the dark skies environment will be protected through the submission of appropriate supporting documentation, to demonstrate that they accord with current professional guidance to achieve an appropriate lighting environment for the area.”  
Re-number as ‘Policy L6’ and provide title “Dark Skies”, or similar. |
| Section 4 – Built Environment | Objective for Policy L12 (p.23) | It seems unnecessary to refer to “dwellings” in the first line; suggest it reads “Ensure all new buildings...” |
| Section 4 – Built Environment | Policy L12 (p.23) | Re-number as ‘Policy L7’ and provide title “Responding to Local Character”, or similar. |
| Section 4 – Built Environment | Policy L13 (p.23) | The following comments in respect of this policy should be read alongside comments in respect of the housing policies, particularly regarding the delivery of affordable housing. As this policy relates to housing, it may be more appropriate to give it a ‘H’ prefix.  
For the avoidance of doubt, it is suggested that the policy is reworded as follows with the heading of either “Windfall Development” or “Development within the Built-up Area”:  
“Developments on unallocated (windfall) sites within the built up area boundary will be supported where they do not exceed 6 dwellings”.  
The policy should also include additional text and framed in a more generalised manner and acknowledge that larger schemes may be appropriate depending on nature and location of site.  
The accompanying explanation should more accurately reflect the fact that the change to the... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Context for comments on Housing Policies</td>
<td>In order to understand the District Council’s concerns and objections, it is important to appreciate more fully the context within which the Plan is being prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Plan covers the whole of the parish of Brailes, which includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the village of Brailes (which has the status of a Category 2 Local Service Village (LSV) for the purposes of the Core Strategy); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the hamlet of Winderton (which has no defined status for the purposes of the Core Strategy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The period covered by the Plan is not clearly stated, although we assume its housing policies relate to the same period covered by the Core Strategy, i.e. 2011–2031.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both settlements are ‘washed over’ by the Cotswolds AONB. It is acknowledged that the ability of the Plan to allocate or reserve housing sites will therefore be constrained within the terms of Core Strategy Policy CS.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brailes village, by virtue of its status as a LSV, forms part of the strategic housing allocation of approximately 2,000 homes in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. For Category 2 LSVs, such as Brailes, an aggregate housing requirement of approximately 700 homes in total is identified, of which no more than around 12% (i.e. 84 homes) should be provided in any individual settlement. Part D of Core Strategy Policy CS.15 indicates that this development will take place:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• on sites identified in a Neighbourhood Plan; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• through small-scale schemes on unidentified but suitable sites within their Built-Up Area Boundaries (where defined) or otherwise within their physical confines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The District Council’s monitoring of housing supply (as at 31 March 2016) across all categories of LSV indicates that a total of 2,000 homes have already been built or ‘committed’ between 1 April 2011 and 31 March 2016. This actual supply figure may reasonably be expected to increase in the future. Of this supply, some 42 homes are in the village of Brailes. This monitoring further suggests that, although supply from Brailes is currently nowhere near approaching the figure of ‘around 84 homes’, there is, equally, no urgent imperative for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Reference/NDP page</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Key Drivers (p.24)</td>
<td>Plan to identify additional sites for release to contribute towards meeting the strategic housing allocation for LSVs contained in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. However, this situation will need to be regularly monitored, and for this reason it may still be prudent for the Plan to allocate sites to meet strategic requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Key Drivers (p.24) | **Plan to identify additional sites for release to contribute towards meeting the strategic housing allocation for LSVs contained in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. However, this situation will need to be regularly monitored, and for this reason it may still be prudent for the Plan to allocate sites to meet strategic requirements.** |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Site Allocation (p.25) | Other policies of the Core Strategy relevant to consideration of the Plan’s approach to housing supply include CS.18 (affordable housing) and CS.19 (housing mix and type). |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Site Allocation (p.25) | **Other policies of the Core Strategy relevant to consideration of the Plan’s approach to housing supply include CS.18 (affordable housing) and CS.19 (housing mix and type).** |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Site Allocation (p.25) | The concerns and objections in respect of NDP policies primarily relate to uncertainty about their purpose and whether the relevant policies would actually work. It is recommended that a clearer explanation of the strategic policy context be provided in the introductory paragraphs including clarity over where individual policies apply. |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Site Allocation (p.25) | **The concerns and objections in respect of NDP policies primarily relate to uncertainty about their purpose and whether the relevant policies would actually work. It is recommended that a clearer explanation of the strategic policy context be provided in the introductory paragraphs including clarity over where individual policies apply.** |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Site Allocation (p.25) | References under ‘Key Drivers’ should also include reference to satisfaction of the statutory ‘basic conditions’. |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Site Allocation (p.25) | **References under ‘Key Drivers’ should also include reference to satisfaction of the statutory ‘basic conditions’.** |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | With reference to the second sentence “The sites allocated will have 6 dwellings…”, should this read “have a maximum of 6 dwellings each”? What if the sites can't actually accommodate 6 dwellings? Additionally, the plot list is missing “1” after “Sutton Lane Plot”. |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | **With reference to the second sentence “The sites allocated will have 6 dwellings…”, should this read “have a maximum of 6 dwellings each”? What if the sites can't actually accommodate 6 dwellings? Additionally, the plot list is missing “1” after “Sutton Lane Plot”.” |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | It is suggested the sites identified in bullet points are referred to as ‘sites’ rather than ‘plots’. |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | **It is suggested the sites identified in bullet points are referred to as ‘sites’ rather than ‘plots’.** |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | It is unclear what is meant by ‘Site B – under discussion’. This needs to be clarified. |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | **It is unclear what is meant by ‘Site B – under discussion’. This needs to be clarified.** |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | By definition, allocated sites cannot also be windfall sites. The word ‘windfall’ should be deleted. |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | **By definition, allocated sites cannot also be windfall sites. The word ‘windfall’ should be deleted.** |

| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | Should “… affordable housing as required by the latest…” read “… affordable housing as identified by the latest Brailes …”? |

<p>| Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements | Objective for Policy H1 (p.27) | <strong>Should “… affordable housing as required by the latest…” read “… affordable housing as identified by the latest Brailes …”?</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements** | Policy H2 (p.27) | There is a lack of evidence to justify departure from national and local thresholds for the provision of affordable housing. Whilst the Policies all imply a requirement for on-site affordable housing provision, as per the Core Strategy, the Parish Council will be aware from previous informal advice that the maximum size thresholds proposed for schemes fall below those above which on site affordable housing provision is required by CS Policy CS.18 (briefly, on-site provision is only required on sites of 11 or more dwellings), with an off-site commuted sum for sites of between 6 and 10 dwellings. This approach is consistent with the national thresholds.

Evidence is therefore essential that due regard has been had to national guidance and Policy CS.18 and that specific local circumstances are such as to warrant the application of lower minimum size thresholds. This is closely linked to the issue of deliverability (see below). Without this evidence, there is a strong likelihood that the Policy could be adjudged to not meeting the ‘basic conditions’. If such evidence cannot be produced prior to submission stage, then we recommend the Plan revert to applying the existing thresholds in CS Policy CS.18.

There is also lack of evidence that the Policies will work in practical terms. Irrespective of the position concerning compliance with the ‘basic conditions’, the District Council is concerned that the Policies will not work, in the sense that they would fail to deliver the housing sought. This also has wider adverse reputational implications. This observation is not in any way intended as a criticism of the Plan’s underlying objectives – which are laudable and welcome – but are necessary to highlight the considered opinion of the District Council based on its recent experiences elsewhere that the policies in question will not work under current circumstances.

Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, if the submission version of the Plan were to include policies which are likely to be undeliverable in practical terms, then the District Council might be forced to conclude that the Plan itself is constructively not in general conformity with strategic policies for the purpose of assessing compliance with the ‘basic conditions’. In any case, there is no point in including policies that will not work.

The District Council recognises and welcomes the considerable background work that has been undertaken in preparing the Plan. In particular, it welcomes the fact that meetings have taken place with representatives of some of the Council’s partner housing associations to discuss the...
Plan’s proposed approach to delivery of affordable housing. However, their involvement only represents part of a longer supply chain and is conditional upon certain criteria being met. When considering the likelihood of successful delivery, it is necessary to consider all key links in the supply chain.

In the above respect, recent experience elsewhere within the District suggests it is highly unlikely that affordable housing (or consequently any housing) will be delivered because the individual sites proposed to be allocated are too small to be viable to develop for mixed tenure schemes.

The fact that all the proposed allocated sites are ‘sub threshold’ (as discussed above) is a strong indicator – a warning sign as it were – that it may be difficult or impossible to achieve the necessary economies of scale necessary to make the provision of affordable housing viable. At the very least, experience suggests that proceeds from the sale of market dwellings would be required to cross-subsidise the cost of developing the affordable homes. This may need to be reflected in reduced purchase prices for the plots of land in question.

Under current conditions, and based on the District Council’s ongoing dialogue with its partners, it is considered that housing associations are very unlikely to be able to develop very small-scale schemes (of just one or two affordable homes) such as proposed here, even though they remain willing to work with the local community to deliver affordable housing. It is, of course, possible that conditions could change during the Plan period, but it would be wrong to base policies on speculation about what might happen in the future.

Similarly, and again taking into account the ‘sub threshold’ nature of the proposed allocations/reserve sites, the District Council has not seen any evidence to suggest that private house-builders consider that such sites would be likely to be viable to develop for mixed tenure schemes. Developers are unlikely to want to take the risk of promoting and developing market-led schemes without a strong likelihood of housing association involvement.

There have been recent cases, including at Fenny Compton, Long Marston and Welford-on-Avon, where private house-builders on smaller ‘market-led’ housing sites that already had/have the benefit of planning permission have been unable to identify housing associations willing to partner the development of the required affordable housing. It should be noted that the sites concerned are significantly larger than the sites proposed to be allocated in the Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan’s proposed approach to delivery of affordable housing. However, their involvement only represents part of a longer supply chain and is conditional upon certain criteria being met. When considering the likelihood of successful delivery, it is necessary to consider all key links in the supply chain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the above respect, recent experience elsewhere within the District suggests it is highly unlikely that affordable housing (or consequently any housing) will be delivered because the individual sites proposed to be allocated are too small to be viable to develop for mixed tenure schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The fact that all the proposed allocated sites are ‘sub threshold’ (as discussed above) is a strong indicator – a warning sign as it were – that it may be difficult or impossible to achieve the necessary economies of scale necessary to make the provision of affordable housing viable. At the very least, experience suggests that proceeds from the sale of market dwellings would be required to cross-subsidise the cost of developing the affordable homes. This may need to be reflected in reduced purchase prices for the plots of land in question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under current conditions, and based on the District Council’s ongoing dialogue with its partners, it is considered that housing associations are very unlikely to be able to develop very small-scale schemes (of just one or two affordable homes) such as proposed here, even though they remain willing to work with the local community to deliver affordable housing. It is, of course, possible that conditions could change during the Plan period, but it would be wrong to base policies on speculation about what might happen in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similarly, and again taking into account the ‘sub threshold’ nature of the proposed allocations/reserve sites, the District Council has not seen any evidence to suggest that private house-builders consider that such sites would be likely to be viable to develop for mixed tenure schemes. Developers are unlikely to want to take the risk of promoting and developing market-led schemes without a strong likelihood of housing association involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There have been recent cases, including at Fenny Compton, Long Marston and Welford-on-Avon, where private house-builders on smaller ‘market-led’ housing sites that already had/have the benefit of planning permission have been unable to identify housing associations willing to partner the development of the required affordable housing. It should be noted that the sites concerned are significantly larger than the sites proposed to be allocated in the Plan:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each of the sites in question having typically been granted planning permission for up to 15 homes, of which 5 or thereabouts have been secured as affordable. It has only been possible to prevent delivery of those sites from stalling through the substitution of a Fixed Equity Sale tenure product. But the use of that tenure product in the case of Brailes may not necessarily be effective in meeting identified local need. There may be a more pressing need for housing for rent.

It is understood all the proposed allocations comprise sites in separate, private ownerships. In considering the overall likelihood of delivery, it is accordingly necessary to consider whether the owners of the sites in question would be willing to accept the likelihood of significantly reduced land values such as would be necessary to enable the development of each site to be economically viable.

A suggested alternative approach could be the allocation of certain sites for market housing and other sites purely for the provision of affordable housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</th>
<th>Policy H1 (p.27)</th>
<th>The Policy will require a suitably worded title. Unclear what a ‘gradual approach’ is and how this would work in practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</td>
<td>Policy H2 (p.27)</td>
<td>Unclear what is meant by ‘an appropriate time’ and how this would work in practice. The wording is different to a previous description in the Plan, plus “…of which at least 2 must be affordable housing” or is it “…of which two will be affordable…”? If retained, the policy will require a suitable title e.g. “Promoting Affordable Housing”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</td>
<td>Policy H3 (p.27)</td>
<td>The policy should refer to the ‘Policies Map’, not the Proposals Map. Second sentence “… of which 2 must be affordable housing.” or should this read “… of which at least 2 must be affordable housing.”? Policy H3 is not strictly a “safeguarding” policy but a ‘reserve sites’ policy. Part D of Core Strategy Policy CS.16 includes provision for a Site Allocations Plan (SAP) to identify Reserve Housing Sites for the purposes explained in that Policy. The SAP is to be prepared by the District Council. Although there is no requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan to identify reserve sites, there is no reason why it should not do so and the District Council considers NDPs to be an ideal opportunity to assist in that provision, although such reserve sites would come forward to meet District, as opposed to local needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Reference/NDP page</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Objective for Policy H4 (p.28)</td>
<td>Second sentence: “These sites are small sites used solely for affordable housing on land...”. Preferably this should read “These sites are small sites used solely for housing, as identified through a housing needs survey, on land...”. As this currently reads it appears that only housing association rent or shared ownership housing would be allowed on these sites though such proposals are often reliant on local market homes to cross-subsidise a “local needs scheme”. This could, in effect, be a way of preventing development. Policy H4 would also need a slight re-wording so it doesn’t read “… will be affordable houses only.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Policy H4 (p.28)</td>
<td>It is difficult to identify what “added value” this Policy creates, over and above existing Core Strategy policies in respect of ‘Local Need’ schemes. More importantly, for similar reasons discussed in respect of Policy H2, it is difficult to see sites of no more than about six dwellings being financially viable for development if exclusively for affordable homes. Whilst the Parish Council are entitled to restrict any housing provided to use exclusively as affordable housing, it should give careful consideration to the likelihood of delivery. As with other Policies, the underlying objective is laudable and welcomed. However it lacks clarity and further consideration should be given to delivery. For example, is it intended that the sites on which such properties would be developed will come forward under the auspices of Policies H2 and H3? The District Council therefore recommends: • That the continued inclusion of the stipulation, in Policy H4, that any sites released “will be of around six houses” be reviewed in the light of the considerations around delivery discussed above. Provide a suitable policy title, “Rural Exception Housing”, or similar. Unclear what is meant by ‘an appropriate time’ and how this would work in practice. Replace “will be provided by a correctly administered Housing Needs Survey” with “will be provided by a Housing Needs Survey endorsed by the Council”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Policy H4: Explanation (p.28)</td>
<td>In third line, refer to PC’s in full for clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Reference/NDP page</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Policy H5 (p.28)</td>
<td>The percentage requirement needs to be justified as it departs from the 40-50% ordinarily required for market dwellings by Part B of Core Strategy Policy CS.19. Should the policy read “2 and/or 3 dwellings” otherwise all 66% would either be all 2 or all 3 bed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Policy H6 (p.29)</td>
<td>The statement “Encourage the provision of dwellings for older residents ...” has a very wide description (bungalows? sheltered? larger property so family can move in to care for resident? smaller property?). This requires clarification. Subject to other possible modification based on comments set out elsewhere in this schedule, the policy could be made more positive by deleting the word “Encourage” and add “...will be supported” at the end of the sentence. Add clarity to explanation as to how this policy will be implemented e.g. through the use of planning obligations and/or planning conditions that restrict the occupation of such units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Policy H7 (p.29)</td>
<td>This Policy could of considerable significance to all potential housing delivery partners. However its application could prove highly problematic. There are significant practical issues around interpretation. In addition, it is difficult to see what “added value” this Policy creates over and above relevant national and Core Strategy policies on design quality (see, for example, Policy CS.9). The District Council therefore recommends: • That the continued inclusion of this Policy be reviewed in the light of the existence of other relevant policies. Should the policy be retained in any form, the policy will need to be given a suitable title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.2 – Meeting Housing Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Housing – General comment</td>
<td>It is noted there is no policy included in respect of the village boundary and its function in determining where housing development will be supported, in principle. Suggested revisions to Policy L13 may resolve this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Reference/NDP page</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies Map</td>
<td>Policies Map (p.30)</td>
<td>Site 5 – There is an area of ‘white land’ to the rear (east) of this site that is not an allocated site through the NDP but is included within the built-up-area boundary (BUAB). Is this an error, or is it part of the allocation? Since it is agricultural (greenfield) land, it is suggested the BUAB should run along the eastern boundary of site 5 if the ‘white land’ does not form part of the allocated site. Southwest part of proposed BUAB – There is an agricultural field to the eastern side of Henbrook Lane that has been included within the BUAB but has not been put forward as an allocated site in the NDP. Is this an error? It is considered that if this land is not an allocation, it should be removed from the proposed BUAB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.3 – A Strong Local Economy</td>
<td>Policy E1 (p.32)</td>
<td>In the first line of the policy, it is suggested that ‘should’ is replaced with ‘will’ and ‘must’ is replaced with ‘should’.”All” should be deleted, since it is far too onerous for every application to do what the policy is asking. A suitable alternative measurement of appropriateness in terms of scale of development will need to be considered and inserted into the policy. The policy will require a suitable title.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Section 4.3 – A Strong Local Economy | Policy E2 (p.32) | Whilst supported in principle, the policy is not as clear as it could be and does not appear to support new employment sites or take account of the potential loss of existing employment sites, which seems to be omissions, given that one of the three objectives of the NDP is to support a strong local economy. An alternative, all-inclusive policy could be considered, along the following lines:  

“In the interests of developing a sustainable community, proposals for expanding or improving existing employment sites or creating new employment sites which support the growth of local employment will be encouraged. Proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of land or premises identified for or currently in employment use will not be permitted unless:  

a) There is a sufficient supply of sites for a range of employment uses to meet both immediate and longer term requirements over the Plan period; or  
b) The applicant can demonstrate that the site/premises is no longer capable of meeting employment needs or where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment uses; or  
c) Development of the site for other appropriate uses will facilitate the relocation of an existing business to a more suitable site; or  
d) Unacceptable environmental problems are associated with the current use of the site and the proposal will remove them; or  
e) The site is located in the village centre and the proposed use will contribute to the vitality and viability of the centre or forms part of a regeneration project.” |
Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, planning applications for alternative uses will be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities."

The policy should be titled “Employment Sites” or something similar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Section 4.3 – A Strong Local Economy** | Policy E3 (p.32) | Does this policy intend to cover all redundant farm buildings, or ones of ‘traditional’ building materials (i.e. brick/stone barns) etc? The second sentence indicates “The AONB states...” which cannot be correct; it must be a quote from a publication referring to the AONB. Regardless, quotes should not be within the policy; however, they could be included in the Explanation. The policy does not provide guidance as to the situations when which a change of use could be appropriate. Set out below is an example of a similar policy that could be used/adapted, should it be deemed appropriate:

“The conversion of redundant agricultural buildings built of traditional materials and of architectural merit to housing, permanent business space or residential tourist accommodation will be accepted provided the development:

a) Does not have an unacceptable impact on the visual and landscape amenity of the area, particularly conservation areas and listed buildings;
b) Does not have an unacceptable impact on neighbours’ amenity;
c) Does not cause harm to nature conservation interests;
d) Benefits from a safe and convenient access to the site or a satisfactory access can be created;
e) The building is genuinely capable of being converted without significant modification, rebuilding (including foundations and walls) or extension; and
f) Ancillary and/or proposed outbuildings and boundary treatments are in keeping with the character and setting of the original building.

Such applications will be expected to demonstrate compliance with the above criteria through the submission of supporting documentation such as ecological surveys and structural engineer’s surveys.”

The policy should be titled “Re-use of Buildings” or something similar.

Consideration needs to be given to the consistency/conformity of this policy will national permitted development rights and Core Strategy Policy AS.10. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Section 4.3 – A Strong Local Economy** | Policy E4 (p.32) | It will need to be clarified as to whether last sentence of the policy applies to sites in open countryside. It would seem inappropriate so suggest wording which refers to sites within/edge of Built Up Area Boundary.  

The policy as written does not provide criteria by which a planning application could be assessed in terms of acceptability.  

There is no need to quote the NPPF in the policy itself. However, the NPPF definition excludes buildings in agricultural and forestry use. The policy should clarify that for the purposes of the NDP, the definition of brownfield land includes buildings in agricultural or forestry use or at the very least, that such buildings will be considered akin to brownfield land.  

If the policy is to support the use of land specifically for housing, should the policy be located in the Housing section of the Plan or the built environment section as opposed to the economy section?  

Set out below is an example of a similar policy that could be used/adapted, should it be deemed appropriate:  

"Any proposals for the redevelopment of brownfield land to create new homes will be supported subject to the following criteria:  

a) The new use would be compatible with the surrounding uses;  
b) Any remedial works to remove contaminants are satisfactorily dealt with; and  
c) The proposal would lead to an enhancement in the character and appearance of the site and would not result in the loss of any land of high environmental value.”  

The policy should be titled “Use of Brownfield Land” or something similar. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference/NDP page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Section 4.3 – A Strong Local Economy** | Policy E5 (p.33) | The Policy refers to the improvement of “...the current infrastructure” but does not explain what that relates to. The Explanation to the policy only talks about internet connectivity. Should the policy refer specifically to high-speed broadband? Set out below is an example of a policy that could be used/adapted, should it be deemed appropriate:  
“All new residential and commercial development within the Neighbourhood Area will be expected to include the necessary infrastructure to allow future connectivity to high speed broadband.”  
The policy should be given an appropriate title, depending upon its eventual scope. |
| **Section 4.3 – A Strong Local Economy** | Policy E6 (p.33) | Below is a re-worded policy for consideration:  
“All new dwellings are encouraged to provide space to support home-working, with flexible space adaptable to a home office, and where appropriate incorporate cabling to support broadband in accordance with Policy E5.”  
The policy should be titled “Homeworking” or something similar. |
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NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN GLOSSARY

AONB = Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BUAB = Built Up Area Boundary
LSV2 = Local Service Village 2
NDP = Neighbourhood Development Plan
NPPF = National Planning Policy Framework
SDC = Stratford District Council
STWA = Severn Trent Water Authority
VDS = Village Design Statement
WCC = Warwickshire County Council
WRCC = Warwickshire Rural Community Council
The wishes of the community might best be summarised by the following 'vision statement'. This also defines the guiding principle behind the Plan’s composition.

To see Brailes and Winderton develop whilst preserving our environment, character and community spirit

This statement was approved by 94% of the respondents to the 2015 Parish Survey.

The Plan does not seek to limit development but to embrace it as part of the evolution of the Parish. There is a need to provide dwellings, employment and continuing use of agricultural land in support of national and local food production.

The Plan focuses on three main themes to help us achieve this vision:

- A valued landscape and setting
- Meeting housing requirements
- A strong local economy

The character of our settlement and surrounding landscape is of special quality, as recognised by our status within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Special Landscape Area (designated in Policy CS.12 in the Stratford District Council [SDC] Core Strategy). The challenge ahead of us, which this Plan aims to resolve, is to accommodate planned growth whilst protecting the landscape and character of the Parish.

‘AONBs are designated by the Government for the purpose of ensuring that the special qualities of the finest landscapes in England and Wales are conserved and enhanced. In policy terms they have the same planning status as National Parks.’ (Cotswolds Conservation Board statement).
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brailes Parish

1.2 The Neighbourhood Development Plan

1.3 What a Plan can do and cannot do

1.4 How the Community influenced the Plan

1.1 Brailes Parish

The Parish of Brailes is a thriving community of around 1150 (2011 Census) people in South Warwickshire. Most of the Parish lies within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a Special Landscape Area in recognition of the specific qualities of our landscape and settlements. The Parish includes Brailes village and Winderton hamlet as well as numerous outlying farmsteads.

A detailed description of the Parish can be found in the Brailes Today section of the Plan.

This Plan contains policies which planners and developers will use to determine the way in which Brailes develops between now and 2031. The Plan document illustrates how the objectives and policies have been created and it includes references to all the guiding material which has been used to develop the Plan.
1.2 The Neighbourhood Development Plan

The Neighbourhood Development Plan ['the Plan'] is being produced for the Parish Council [PC] by a team of community volunteers. The Localism Act of April 2011 introduced this community dimension to development planning. Approval to prepare the Plan was given by SDC in September 2013. Evidence gathering for this Plan has methodically and openly followed a process with the emphasis on extensive community engagement and researching and assessing the facts.

The Plan conforms, as is required, to the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and to the District-wide policies and proposals in the SDC Core Strategy, the latter as adopted in July 2016. This Plan is about putting in place bottom-up local policies in place of a hitherto top-down approach.

The Plan will join the Core Strategy and related documents as a component of the SDC adopted Development Plan. This status will ensure that these local policies and proposals carry due weight when planning decisions are made. These local policies and proposals will also be the basis for local projects to improve community facilities and infrastructure. Funding prospects will be enhanced by having the Plan adopted.

It should be noted that the local projects within Section 5 of this document are not formally part of the Plan but that does not make them any less valid. Local projects are ways to deliver consequent changes the community has said it wants, in line with the policies and proposals in the Plan.

1.3 What a Plan can and cannot do

Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to influence where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built, have their say on what those new buildings should look like and what infrastructure should be provided.

Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to ensure that they can influence the right type of development for their community, where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area.

Neighbourhood planning cannot be used to override, or try to add to, current statutory obligations of local authorities and utility companies in the provision of housing and services.
1.4 How the community influenced the Plan

The Parish Council appointed a steering group sub-committee in June 2013 to be responsible for the completion of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. The group included parishioners and 3 Parish Councillors. SDC gave its approval for the Plan to proceed after accepting the Plan boundary map in spring 2014. [See page 1]

The Plan is based on feedback from the community where they have indicated their wishes for the Parish. Residents and businesses have spoken through surveys, consultation days and meetings. The Plan document illustrates how their wishes have been translated into Plan policies. It is a requirement to submit a “consultation statement with the Plan to demonstrate the quantity and quality of engagement”.

See “Listening and Learning – How we communicated with the Parish” at Appendix 1. It is worth noting the very high level of participation, 83%, through the 2015 survey returns.
2. EVIDENCE GATHERING AND INTERPRETATION

Governing Principles

The Brailes Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group is governed by Terms of Reference agreed with Brailes Parish Council [see appendix 2], these set six governing principles:

- A committee which is open and transparent
- An inclusive consultation and plan making process
- Active participation by members
- Robust evidence gathering
- Actions based on evidence gathering
- The Neighbourhood Development Plan must have regard for the NPPF and the strategic policies of the adopted SDC Core Strategy

This section of the Plan seeks to establish that the group has abided by these governing principles.

Details of the work done and the methodology followed can be found in the following documents:

- Consultation Document – “Listening and Learning” [see Appendix 1]
- Evidence Base – Environment [see Appendix 21]
- Evidence Base – Housing [see Appendix 22]
- Evidence Base – Business [see Appendix 23]

The Process

The process followed was:

- The team was structured to have a Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary. Each individual in the team has different strengths, the group used people’s expertise and enthusiasm to allocate task amongst the group. Every member of the group has acted in an open and honest way.

- The group has been meeting regularly once a week for both working meetings and formal “full meetings” where decisions taken have been ratified.
- Feedback from the group to the Parish Council took place on a monthly basis; the report was a standing item on the Parish Council Agenda.

- The group gathered ideas from open days, anecdotal evidence and previous Parish reports

- This evidence base was used to design a Parish Survey; this gathered feedback on households, individual views and specific feedback from businesses. This survey, carried out in June 2015, attracted an 83% return rate.

- The feedback from this Survey was used to mould the objectives and policies.

- Consultation was carried out via open days to get feedback from the Parish on these ideas.

- In March 2016 the group employed the services of a planning consultant, Mr. Stephen Miles of Tadpole Planning. His role was to help the group focus our ideas and develop policies that met the requirements of the NPPF and Core Strategy, whilst reflecting the views of the parishioners.

- Objectives and policies were then revisited and revised.

- A detailed review was carried out and ideas were formalised into a matrix. This helped identify where some ideas “crossed over” between objectives. It also helped identify what were the objectives and what were potential projects that could help deliver the Plan.

- Further consultation was carried out via open days to get feedback from the Parish, repeating the iterative process to refine our ideas.

- The key area on the provision of housing is detailed in the Housing Evidence [Appendix 22]

- The draft Plan was presented to the Parish Council, and their feedback was incorporated into the draft Plan. The Plan is now being presented for its first public consultation period.
3. BRAILES TODAY

This section describes the Parish today. This helps define what is valued in Brailes and what the community wish to preserve or enhance.

3.1 The Parish

3.2 History

3.3 Profile of the Parish based on the 2015 survey

3.4 Character

3.1 The Parish

The Neighbourhood Development Plan [NDP] encompasses the whole of the Civil Parish of Brailes.

The Civil Parish comprises three distinct areas:

- The village of Brailes which encompasses the separate settlements of Lower Brailes, Upper Brailes and Grove End
- The hamlet of Winderton
- The surrounding countryside and farmsteads

3.2 History

Brailes was a significant ‘town’ before the Norman Conquest, perhaps twice the size of today’s village. In 1086 Domesday Book suggested it rivalled or even surpassed Warwick in population and wealth.

The grant of market and fairs in 1248, accession to borough status around 1315, its name “Chipping Brailes” and St Georges Church, the “Cathedral of the Feldon”, all stand testament to a community still thriving into the fifteenth century. There could be many reasons for Brailes’ subsequent decline, from the continuing effects of the Black Death to changing markets and routes.
By the 1500’s much of the old town, as well as its fields, was shrinking below new sheep pastures. And there it stays, the old town and the fields that supported it, fossilised in the grass fields that surround us. The settlements that made up the larger medieval Parish were traditionally separated by open fields, still in evidence today.

Little archaeology has been done to explore old Brailes but finds by metal detectorst and occasional geophysical surveys reveal human activity from the Bronze Age to the 15th century.

Today's main road was the principle route around which Upper and Lower Brailes grew. The siting of a motte and bailey fortification on Castle Hill suggests the early road was an important route before the Conquest.

The Parish boundary is defined by two, possibly earlier routes; Ditchedge Lane marking our eastern limit, and to the north an old salt road, known as Saltway.

### 3.3 Profile of the Parish based on 2015 Surveys

The data used in this report was based on a survey carried out in June 2015.

The survey consisted of three sections, household, individual and businesses (see Appendix 3). The surveys were delivered to every household in the Parish giving every resident over the age of 18 the opportunity to express their views on the future of the Parish.

The survey achieved an 83% response rate.

### Location

The Parish of Brailes and Winderton is made up of four areas:

- **Upper Brailes**: 31% of Dwellings
- **Lower Brailes**: 60% of Dwellings
- **Winderton**: 5% of Dwellings
- **Outlying Area**: 4% of Dwellings
People

The population is split into age groups as follows:

- 0-10 (10%)
- 11-20 (12%)
- 21-59 (40%)
- 60-74 (25%)
- OVER 75 (13%)

In comparison with the surveys carried out in 2005 and 2012 there has been a steady increase in the numbers of babies and young children in the Parish. The majority of the population is of working age. It is also noticeable that over that time period the number of people over sixty has increased. The key reason for people having moved into the Parish is that they like the area (35%). It is noticeable that 3% moved to the Parish because of the availability of affordable housing.

Having moved here, people tend to stay. Over 50% of the residents of the Parish have lived here between 11 and 40 years, with 14% having lived here for over 40 years.

Young People

Youth Survey carried out in September 2015 [see Appendix 4].

Our 2015 Parish Survey recorded 60 eleven to seventeen year olds; this is 85% of the youth population. The Youth Survey carried out in September 2015 had a response of just under 50% of 11-17 year olds in Brailes, most of whom attended Shipston High School.

Generally our Youth said that they are happy living in Brailes...
Here are some of the things the survey group said would make them happier to live in Brailes:

- More facilities e.g. cafe or gym
- More frequent buses
- More after school clubs to attend

Not everyone feels Brailes is a very safe place to live. One issue is the number of cars that travel through the village over the speed limit.

Few of those aged 15-17 (11 out of 15) could see themselves living in Brailes in 5 years time. Of our sample 2 respondents expressed a desire for a 1-2 bed starter home within the next 5 years.

Housing

The housing is split into types as follows:

There are 490 dwellings in the Parish, this shows you what % of each type.

![Diagram showing percentages of different types of housing]

In terms of the number of bedrooms per house, the split is as follows:

**Numbers of Bedrooms**

- **1 Bedroom**: 27%
- **2 Bedrooms**: 35%
- **3 Bedrooms**: 24%
- **4 Bedrooms**: 12%
- **5 Bedrooms (or more)**: 2%
The majority (74%) of houses are owner occupied, of the remainder 20% are rented and 6% Housing Association shared ownership. In terms of occupancy 32% of the houses are occupied by one person only.

Employment

Just over 25% of the working population of the Parish works in the Parish, either in full time or part time work. Nearly 40% work outside the Parish, whilst over a third of the Parish are retirees.

The business profile is:

**There are in the region of 115 businesses in the Parish**

These businesses cover a wide range of activities. Whilst agriculture is the major use of land in the Parish, it accounts for only 20% of the total business community.

Transport

Vehicle ownership in the Parish is as follows:

**The majority of households in the Parish have motor vehicles: around 80% have up to two vehicles.**
The use of public transport is driven mainly by either the needs of those attending schools or colleges in nearby towns or essential daily activities such as shopping, medical services etc.

Very few people commute to work by public transport, the car being the favoured option. For those who do commute to work, just under a half travel between 5-20 miles.

**Sustainability – current activities/services that make Brailes and Winderton sustainable**

The Parish is well served with amenities/services and activities; these are all centred on the village of Brailes. These include five shops, a hairdresser, a garage, a forge, two pubs, eleven working farms and an industrial estate. In terms of usage well over half the Parish use these facilities on a frequent or occasional basis.

There are two Churches which attract over half the Parish on an occasional basis. There is a local primary school.

In terms of recreational facilities there is a village playing field; a village hall, pavilion and a children’s play area. All are well supported.

There are a large number of societies and groups active in the village, supported by over a third of the Parish. There are also many key annual events, the two most significant being the Three Hills Walk and the Brailes Show. These two events draw many outsiders to the village and raise thousands of pounds to support local causes.
3.4 Character

The character of the Parish is defined by its variety - for both traditional and new build design and construction.

Stone was quarried locally and the walls of buildings reflect this with their colour, varying from one part of the Parish to another. The colour variation is a characteristic of Brailes buildings. The colour palate reflects the changing geology within each area; dark brown Marlstone in the east, and lighter brown and cream from Brailes Hill in the north. Between the stone hills lies clay which became the source for a local brickmaking industry, possibly from the late 1700s. Several brick works survived into the twentieth century and their warm red ‘Brailes bricks’ contribute greatly to the character and further compliment the colour palate of Brailes buildings.

Upper Brailes

The approach to the village on the B4035 from Shipston on Stour climbs steeply to the natural gap between Brailes Hill and Castle Hill. The road winds its way through this gap and descends through Upper Brailes, a linear settlement of mainly brick and stone cottages and houses fronting the road.

Upper Brailes has 16 Listed Buildings [see Listed Buildings List Appendix 6]. There is one pub, the Gate Inn but no other local amenities.
This part of the village is characterised by open views to the north looking up to Brailes Hill, which at 761 feet (232m) high is the second highest point in Warwickshire, and to the south looking over to Castle Hil, a scheduled ancient monument.

The road winds down, to a Village Green on the south of the road and Grove End, towards Lower Brailes. Once separated by fields, the playing fields to the north mark the remaining separation between Upper and Lower Brailes.

Approaching the village from the north, down Castle Hill Lane, the remains of a medieval motte and bailey castle are visible on the right. The site is located 200m west of Castle Hill Lane, Upper Brailes. [see Historic Environment Map Appendix 5]

Lower Brailes

On the approach from the south on Sutton Lane, the left is flanked by new housing [in the last 5 years]. There is a site for a new housing development (14 mixed affordable homes for rent or shared ownership and 4 local market houses). On the right is a housing development built between 1957 and 1964, known as Jeffs Close.

Approaching Lower Brailes from the east the road descends steeply down Holloway Hill. Most of Lower Brailes is in the Conservation Area and there are 18 Listed Buildings [see Appendix 6 and Brailes Conservation Area Map Appendix 7]. The area around St.George’s Church, elements of which date from the late 1200’s is one of the oldest parts of the village.
Old Rectory Farm is 15th century and its attached malting barn is of similar age. The Chapel of St Peter and St Paul is within the barn, established in 1726. It is amongst the earliest post-reformation Catholic chapels in the country. The George Inn is recorded in 1537.

These along with the earliest surviving small terraces, cottages and farm buildings are of stone construction. Other buildings indicative of the past thriving economy include an old bakery and brewery.

There is much 19th century infilling including larger detached houses, mainly of red brick with slate roofing. A number of businesses currently are located here, including a general store, hairdresser, interior design shop, garage and forge.

In the 20th /21st century the addition of modern mainly brick terraced, semi-detached and bungalow housing has doubled the size of the village. Heading north from Lower Brailes to Winderton is The Park leading to Saltway Lane. Property in The Park is mixed 18th century to modern with a row of 1960s semi-detached ex-Council Houses opposite 1970’s Council bungalows for the elderly. At the edge of the settlement on Saltway Lane is a small industrial estate.
Hamlet of Winderton

Winderton lies on high ground half a mile north of Lower Brailes and is in a Conservation Area [See Winderton Conservation Area Map Appendix 8]. There are fine views across the open countryside.

This hamlet has two working farms, farm houses and cottages including listed buildings [see Appendix 6]. The architecturally interesting memorial church of St Peter and St Paul is now administered by a trust. There are no amenities.

Surrounding countryside and farmsteads

One of the great assets of the Parish of Brailes is the 25 miles of footpaths, which provide access to recognised views in the Cotswolds AONB. These are used and enjoyed by many village residents and visitors throughout the year. The footpaths provide various levels of walking to enable a large number of people to enjoy the wonderful views, many of which are recognised in publications.

Brailes has an active footpath group that manages and maintains the extensive network of footpaths. There are currently eleven farmsteads in the Parish, an amalgamation of 1950’s and 1960’s agricultural smallholdings. The fields surrounding Brailes and Winderton are a mix of arable and grassland, grazed by sheep and cattle.

The ridge and furrow still prominent in many of the Parish fields are a relic of the open field agriculture dating prior to the 18th century. Whilst not a unique survival within the broader AONB, the quantity and quality is special. Its pattern is now criss-crossed by modern field boundaries, drawn up under the Parliamentary Enclosure Acts in 1784 around Brailes and 1854 around Winderton. The earlier pattern, together with many other earthworks, mark out not just the old unhedged arable fields but also the medieval routes along which each settlement had been established. In the 1950’s many hedges were removed as part of the government programme to grow more food.
4. OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES FOR BRAILES TOMORROW

This section of the Plan sets out the Policies that will influence the way in which the Parish develops over the period of the Plan.

Each policy will consist of:

- An objective
- A policy statement
- An explanation which will contain the evidence base on which the policy has been developed; Policies without evidence are not valid.

There is also a “Policies Map” (see Map Page 30) which identifies some of the key aspects of the Plan and will be referenced in the relevant sections.

As a result of consultations with parishioners there are three main themes that will shape the future development of the Parish:

4.1 A valued landscape and setting
4.2 Meeting housing requirements
4.3 A strong local economy

4.1 A valued landscape and setting

Parish surveys over several decades show that parishioners value the natural, rural environment of Brailes. Protecting this is paramount in local opinion and any development now or in the future must aim to enhance the ability of the community to enjoy that rural environment in an AONB

“It does not mean preserving in aspic, but managing evolutionary changes to maintain local identity and character” Village Design Statement 1998 [see Appendix 9]

“Future developments in the Parish should preserve and be consistent with the established character of the village” Village Appraisal 1992/93 [see Appendix 10]

“The Parish is allowed to remain as a vibrant, picturesque and friendly village” Parish Council Action Plan 2012 [see Appendix 11]

The objectives and policies in this section reflect the current views from the Parish, covering two main themes:

- Environment-Natural
- Environment – Built
Environment – Natural

The SDC Core Strategy document [adopted in July 2016] lays out two strategic objectives for Landscape (Section 3.4). This highlights the importance of “protecting” the area from “inappropriate developments”. A vital part of the strategy is to maintain the rural character and local distinctiveness of the Parish of Brailes, which is almost entirely within the Cotswolds AONB.

In addition the NPPF states that planning authorities “should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk”. Brailes is on the WCC flood risk list.

The SDC Core Strategy also lays out a strategic objective under Policy CS.2 that states “Development should ensure that biodiversity and natural habitats are resilient to the predicted effects of climate change by safeguarding and enhancing existing habitats”.

This section of the Plan will spell out objectives and policies that will deliver these strategies.

To meet this challenge the following areas have been identified:

- Management of the Water Environment
- Development constraint
- Development by way of good design
- Consideration for new energy resources
- Moderating light pollution
**Objective:** Managing the water environment by ensuring that development does not add to flood risk or harm ecology and that the current efforts to reduce the risk of flood exceed best practice guidelines and are sustained.

**Policy:**

L1. New developments must adopt best practice Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

L2. Work in progress to alleviate flood risk to Parish properties with the WCC Flood Team, National Flood Forum and Brailes Flood Group should continue sustainably into the future.

L3. Ensure that Severn Trent Water Authority (STWA) fulfill their statutory duty in maintaining the current infrastructure to provide adequate sewerage and storm water capacity for the Parish.

L4. STWA must ensure that the capacity of the sewerage infrastructure accommodating all new developments over the Plan period is sustainable and does not exceed the capacity of the Water Treatment Works for Brailes and Cherington.

L5. It must be demonstrated that new development sites are not subject to risk from potential sources of flooding evidenced by publicly available fluvial and surface water maps from WCC, the Environment Agency and local knowledge.

L6. The ecological impacts of any flood water management proposals must be fully assessed.

L7. Flood alleviation works for Brailes must take into account additional risk to flooding villages downstream.

**Explanation:** It is worth highlighting that flooding, which can have a significant impact on the Parish is a major concern. Feedback from the Open Days in January 2016 indicated this has a high priority in relation to future developments.

Flooding in the Parish can also have a knock on effect in the surrounding catchment area with villages downstream, Stourton, Cherington and as far as Shipston on Stour. In conjunction with local authorities and flood groups, work is currently being done to attempt to slow the flow of water courses upstream of the Parish and to take measures to deal with exceptional surface storm water to mitigate against flood damage to Parish properties.

There is much evidence of recent flooding [See Appendix 12] The mitigation work is described as an ongoing project [See Section 5, Project 6] Sewerage disposal on new site development is the responsibility of STWA. Any problems arising with overflow of sewage are reported direct to STWA by the current Brailes Flood Group.
**Objective:** To constrain development on designated green spaces, as encouraged by the NPPF 2012, paras 76, 77 and 78.

**Policy:**

L8. The following locations are designated as Local Green Spaces, as shown on the Policies Map (see Map Page 30). The village playing field (Lower Brailes), the 3 large village greens (The Lower Green, the War Memorial Green and the Upper Green, known as “Salcracks”). Proposals for development in Local Green Spaces will not be permitted except in very special circumstances.

**Explanation:** There is a rationale and criteria for selecting the number of sites to be designated as Local Green Spaces, to ensure that they remain free from development [see Appendix 13]

Development in Local Green Spaces will not be permitted unless:

- The proposal is of a limited nature and it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required to enhance the role and function of an identified Local Green Space
- The proposal would result in the development of local community infrastructure

This rationale very much reflects the views of the local community as expressed in the feedback from our Open Days in January 2016. A need to supplement the Village Design Statement has been identified. [See Section 5 Project 1]

**Objective:** To ensure that appropriate new edge of settlement development in the village conforms to good design practice and is in keeping with the surrounding area.

**Policy:**

L9. To ensure that good design practices, set out in the VDS [see appendix 9] are adhered to for developments that border the edge of the settlement. [E.g. Brailes village]. They should blend in with existing developments and surrounding areas and be in harmony with the landscape when viewed from looking out of and in to the village. Ecological status should be maintained or enhanced.

**Explanation:** 90% of respondents to the 2015 survey agreed that it is important to protect the views out of and in to the village
Objective: To support the use of low carbon energy resources into a sustainable future.

Policy:

L10. New development should incorporate energy resource efficiency in its design. Renewable energy projects should be encouraged having due regard to the requirements of the AONB and SDC renewable energy policies.

Explaination: Community-led initiatives for renewable or low carbon energy will be considered. In the 2015 Survey (Q.6) 50% of respondents said that they would consider renewable energy development such as solar farms, bio-mass generating plants and anaerobic digesters.

Objective: To strongly moderate light pollution and retain “dark skies” in the Parish by the sensitive provision of appropriate street lighting as required.

Policy:

L11. Replacement of current street lighting and street lights in new developments should use energy efficient light bulbs and be programmed to switch on/off at times to minimise light pollution. Lighting design should maximise area to be lit while avoiding sending unnecessary light into the sky.

Explaination: A “dark sky” policy was said to be important in our 2015 Individual Survey (Q7), 79% said ‘dark sky’ was important to residents. In addition, tourism is an important financial contributor in the maintenance of the Village Hall and Playing Field.

The Village Hall Committee have reported that a number of caravan clubs use these facilities specifically so as to enjoy the current limited level of light pollution.

A project has been proposed to encourage this [see Section 5 Project7]
Environment – Built

In order to protect this environment it is vital that all new developments [or alterations to existing buildings] in the Parish are in keeping with their surroundings. This covers the sites of the development, the look of the development and the size of the development.

**Objective:** Ensure new buildings (dwellings) and extensions to existing buildings fit in with the VDS (see Appendix 9) and are in keeping with the scale and character of the surrounding buildings.

**Policy:**

*L12.* All Planning Applications should follow the guidelines of the VDS and take account of the character, scale and building materials of the immediate surrounding buildings. In addition sufficient trees, shrubs and green spaces need to be included to ensure the development “blends” in with the surrounding countryside.

**Explanation:** Our 2015 Individual Survey [Q 5j] asked “New housing and changes to existing dwellings to be sympathetic in construction with the immediate locality “and 89% agreed with this statement. The VDS, developed by the village, sets out our design principles. There will be an ongoing Project to enhance current VDS guidelines.

**Objective:** To ensure that all windfall developments are of a small scale, to protect our landscape and our environment.

**Policy:**

*L13.* All new windfall housing developments must be limited to six dwellings or less.

**Explanation:** “You and Your Ideas” Survey June 2015 Question [5c] asked “Future developments being of no more than 5 dwellings.” 64% agreed with this statement.

SDC then changed the rules regarding the size of developments that would contribute funds to the provision of affordable house to 6 dwellings. At our Open Day on the 16th January 2016 the question was asked “Should we change the size limit of developments from 5 to 6”. Of the 149 parishioners who attended 45 agreed with this. Subsequent changes may alter this number again but this policy remains in line with the need to meet parishioner’s desire for “small scale developments”. Provision of affordable housing is covered in the “Meeting Housing Requirements” section.
4.2 Meeting Housing Requirements

The Parish has a number of different areas to consider when looking at the issue of “meeting housing needs”.

- The village of Brailes is currently designated a LSV2 in the SDC Core Strategy. The village is set within the Cotswolds AONB; Lower Brailes has a Conservation Area.

- The hamlet of Winderton is in the AONB and has a Conservation Area.

- A section of the rural area in the north of the Parish has been designated as a “Special Landscape Area”

What this means for our policy making?

- All policies relating to developments apply across the Parish

- The specific policy relating to site allocation and housing numbers for the provision of affordable housing applies to the village of Brailes only; see Appendix 15 for the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB).

Key Drivers

From the 2015 Survey the group identified three key drivers that people told us they wanted:

- Provision of affordable housing for people with local connections

- The desire for “gradual additions “ of dwellings

- Future developments being no more than 6 dwellings

These have driven the design of our policies.

Housing Numbers

The village of Brailes is currently classified as an LSV2 village in the SDC Core Strategy. It is stated in the Strategy [p 95] that the “LSV list is dynamic”. This Plan accepts that villages can change status during the life of the Strategy.

The Core Strategy states that LSV’s should contribute 2,000 homes in the District between 2011 and 2031. This number of homes, across all LSV’s, has already been granted planning permission.
The Core Strategy also states [p91] that “no more than around 12% that should be provided in an individual settlement”. Whilst the District wide allocation of LSV2 house numbers has been met and exceeded, this does not mean that Brailes should provide none in the future. However, any future housing needs for the parish will be defined by the Housing Needs Survey, which will periodically be updated.

The following policies support the growth of the village in line with affordable housing needs, identified in the future by regular Housing Needs Surveys.

**Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB)**

SDC have recommended that the NDP should show a BUAB for villages within the Plan. The proposed BUAB can be seen on the Policies Map [see page 30]. The rules for determining the boundary can be found in Appendix 15.

**Site Allocation**

The details behind the process that the group used to arrive at these decisions can be found “Evidence Base – Housing” Appendix 22. The sites allocated will have 6 dwellings of which at least 2 must be affordable housing:

- Sutton Lane Plot
- Castle Hill Plot 2
- Off Sutton Lane Plot 3
- Upper Brailes Plot 4
- High Street Upper Brailes Plot 5

This provides the village with 18 windfall houses and 9 affordable houses. The group has also identified two further sites for “safeguarding” [see Policy H3]

- Site A
- Site B – under discussion

The group also recognises there may be a potential need for houses nearer the end of the Plan period.
This is allowed for within the “rural exception” sites that could be developed [see Policy H4] should the need for further affordable houses be identified by a Housing Needs Survey.

Evidence to support that we have landowners and a housing association prepared to support these policies can be found in Appendix 22. Further support for this approach can be found by reference to the following policies in the SDC Core Strategy.

4.2. Cotswolds Area of Outstanding National Beauty, states “will have been protected from inappropriate development”

Policy CS.11 states “Large scale development will not be allowed unless exceptional circumstances and public interest are demonstrated”, it goes on to state “Small-scale developments and activities are appropriate”

6.12 Countryside and Villages “will have been protected from inappropriate development”

Policy AS.10 states “minimise the impact on the character of the local landscape, communities and environmental features” also “Small scale schemes for housing, employment or community facilities to meet a local need identified by a local community in a Parish Plan, Neighbourhood Plan”

Total Housing Numbers

2011 - 2016 Built or have been approved in the planning process - 41
2016 - 2031 18 open market and 9 affordable – 27

There are two safeguarded sites that could potential provide another 8 open market house and 4 affordable houses.

A number of objectives relating to housing can be found in the “Conserving, enhancing and getting value from our natural environment” Section 3A of the plan:

- Policy L12 relates to type and style of development.
- Policy L13 relates to the scale of windfall developments.

These objectives are to ensure that developments are managed so as not to be at odds with conserving the intrinsic nature of the Parish.

In addition there are the following objectives;
**Objective:** To manage the development of the housing stock such that it meets the requirements of the SDC Core Strategy and provides affordable housing as required by the latest Brailes Housing Needs Survey.

**Policy:**

**H1.** Development must follow a gradual approach in conjunction with regular Housing Needs Surveys, so that development must satisfy current identified local need.

**Explanation:** Adhering to the Core Strategy and getting regular feedback via surveys as to the current “needs” in the Parish.

**Objective:** To use the 5 allocated sites to meet the local need for affordable housing.

**Policy:**

**H2.** At the appropriate time the Parish Council must investigate, with the landowners, the use of the allocated sites to provide affordable housing in the Parish. Four sites will have six dwellings of which two will be affordable housing; one site will have three dwellings of which 1 will be affordable.

**Explanation:** To respond to the outcome of the most up to date Housing Needs Survey. Whilst the 2015 Survey showed that 64% of respondents wanted small developments, 86% said they wanted the provision of affordable housing for people with local connections. The allocation of affordable housing to local people will be governed by the process established by SDC. (see Appendix 17 on criteria for allocating affordable housing)

**Objective:** The allocation of 2 safeguarded sites which can be used in the later stages of the Plan to meet potential housing needs, as identified by the then current Housing Needs Survey.

**Policy:**

**H3.** The land will be released during the Plan period if it can demonstrated, through a need identified by a Housing Needs Survey, that additional affordable housing is required. These sites [see Proposals Map] will have 6 dwellings per site of which 2 must be affordable housing.

**Explanation:** To respond to the outcome of the future Housing Needs Survey, it is felt prudent to allow for further development outside the BUAB in designated areas.
**Objective:** To support the development of affordable housing on rural exception sites. These sites are small sites used solely for affordable housing on land within or adjoining existing small rural communities which would not otherwise be released for general market housing because it is subject to policies of restraint.

**Policy:**

**H4.** At the appropriate time the Parish Council may support the development of affordable housing on land outside the BUAB. These sites will be of around six houses, will be affordable houses only. Evidence for their need will be provided by a correctly administered Housing Needs Survey. The design and construction of the dwellings will be subject to all the policies in the Plan.

**Explanation:** At the time of the production of the Plan, it is impossible to determine the total future housing needs for the Parish. The provision of affordable housing is a key driver of the Plan. This policy gives future PC's the flexibility to react to future situations. These policies, in line with the SDC Core Strategy Policy CS.16, referred to in section 5.2.12, allow for this type of development to meet local housing needs.

**Objective:** To manage the development of the windfall sites such that they meet local requirements.

**Policy:**

**H5.** All new windfall developments with more than 3 dwellings on the site should provide 66% 2 or 3 bedroom dwellings. The Parish Council will review this in the light of current housing requirements.

**Explanation:** The 2015 survey identified current and potential housing requirements over the next five years. The results summarised in the June 2015 Housing Status Report [see Appendix 18] show a demand for “owner occupier” 2 and 3 bedroom houses.

Of the 13 households looking for “owner occupied” homes 10 were for 2 and 3 bedroom houses. In addition the Warwickshire Rural Community Council (WRCC) 2016 Housing Needs Survey also showed a need for 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings [see Appendix 19].
Objective: To provide housing for Older or Disabled Residents.

Policy: H6. Encourage the provision of dwellings for older residents or enabled dwellings for disabled residents, whose own properties will be released into the market or transferred to a family member.

Explanation: The 2015 survey identified that 38% of the population of the Parish are over 60 years of age. The “How Old Are We” chart (see Appendix 20) shows that this age group is staying at a consistently high proportion in the Parish. The survey also identified [see Housing Status Report Appendix 18] some twenty two households in four bedroom houses who were looking to downsize.

Objective: To manage the density of new developments so they are compatible with existing housing, and preserve the edge of village requirements in Policy L9.

Policy: H7. Density is defined as the number of dwellings per hectare. Any new development should not exceed the density of existing neighbouring developments. Where it is essential to exceed this density, a buffer zone must be provided to ensure the smooth transition from high to low housing density, so existing developments are not overpowered, and the character is maintained.

Explanation: The NPPF, under Para 47 sub point 5 states “set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances”.

Para 59 of the NPPF states: “Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally”
4.3 A Strong Local Economy

The Parish of Brailes has a vibrant economy. The survey undertaken in June 2015 identified 114 businesses operating in the Parish. This shows 69 self employed one person businesses, the remainder employing between 1 – 20 people on a full/part time basis.

There is a small industrial estate in Saltway Lane with around 6 businesses situated here. Making a contribution to the local economy are annual events in the Village such as the Brailes Three Hills Walk and Brailes Show. These two events between them have generated profits of around £10,000 per annum. The proceeds contribute to support the Village Hall, the school and a number of local groups.

Village Hall Committee accounts shows income from visiting caravans and motor homes that use the village playing field. Revenues for 2014/2015 were £5,224.50 and for 2015/16 they were £9,643.00.
Feldon Valley Golf Club and the two public houses attract a good number of visitors to the area and there is provision for overnight accommodation at the public houses, B&B’s and holiday lets in the Parish. The Golf Club has held public open days in June to show their proposals for expanding the club to include a small hotel and lodges in the grounds. Feldon Valley Golf Club currently employs 15 people full and part time. Expansion of their business should increase this figure.

The eleven farmsteads in the area, whilst not dominating local employment, contribute considerably to the local economy in terms of our environment.

**Objective:** To ensure that developments do not harm the economy. They should support a sustainable and competitive economy in line with NPPF Para 18 and Para 28.

**Policy:**

**E1.** Economic development should be encouraged. All development proposals must include a statement demonstrating how the development will enhance and improve the local economy and not harm the Parish in any way.

**Explanation:** Income in the Parish has been shown to derive in some part from visitors and tourism and development should be encouraged.

**Objective:** Ensure that the existing economy in the Parish is maintained or expanded to offer increased opportunities for employment. NPPF Paras 18 to 2

**Policy:**

**E2.** Any appropriate plans that enhance local businesses should be supported.

**E3.** Where it can be demonstrated there is little or no likelihood of a redundant farm building continuing to be used for its intended purpose, alternative uses which will be of long-term benefit to the community and the environment will be encouraged. The AONB states ‘conversions need to be carefully appraised so that the building’s distinctive character and setting are retained and adverse impacts on important nature conservation interests are avoided.’ Any decision should meet the requirements of NPPF Para 22.

**E4.** The effective re-use of Previously Developed Land, brownfield land, is encouraged. The NPPF fully defines brownfield land as “land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure”. The NPPF definition of Previously Developed Land will apply. The Parish Council should encourage the re-use of this land to provide affordable housing, should there be a proven need for it.
**Explanation:** Consultation events in 2015 highlighted a desire for the economy in the village to be maintained. The change of use of farm buildings was considered a good idea especially where these could be offered as commercial units so maintaining or growing employment in the Parish. In addition particular care should be taken with the change of use of other types of buildings and premises, such as assets of the Parish and used by residents e.g. public houses, shops and garages, from commercial to residential due to the potential loss of employment and economic impact in the community.

**Objective:** The communications infrastructure should support the needs of the local economy. NPPF Para 42 to 46

**Policy:**

**E5.** Every effort should be made to improve the current infrastructure. Any plans to do so must ensure that impact on the AONB is taken into consideration. All new developments should be provided with the highest possible quality communications structure to ensure that sustainable economic growth can be maintained.

**Explanation:** The 2015 Business Survey showed that one area “to help businesses develop in the future” was internet speed and cell phone connectivity. This is also important in supporting the great number of self employed people working from home.

**Objective:** To acknowledge and support the growing trend of people working from home and ensure that new development is not detrimental to them.

**Policy**

**E6.** The design of new residential development, incorporating home offices, studios and similar facilities is encouraged.

**Explanation:** A significant proportion of the business response to the 2015 survey indicated people work from home, often alone. The Financial Times (FT) [4th June 2014] reports there are now a record 4.2 m people or 13.9% of the workforce working from home offices. The FT goes on to say that people living in rural areas are making lifestyle changes rather than working out of home through necessity.

More people are working from home in a wide variety of jobs and professions and the evidence shows Brailes, with over 70% of businesses being run from home, is no exception.
5. PROJECTS TO HELP DELIVER THE PLAN

PROJECT 1
Supplement and apply the Village Design Statement

Description:
To supplement the 1998 VDS to reflect changes in the village and to support and complement the NDP

Outcome:
To ensure the views, green spaces, design issues and building materials deemed important by village residents are highlighted for developers and SDC planning officers.

PROJECT 2
Possible project to enhance the appearance, quality and range of industrial estate accommodation

Description:
An evaluation of current facilities at the small industrial estate in Brailes, including appearance and attractiveness of buildings and amenities.

Outcome:
To develop an action plan that would require the support of local businesses located on the industrial estate to improve appearance and amenities

PROJECT 3
Identify opportunities to promote and expand tourism activity

Description:
Identify and define current tourist facilities and infrastructure

Outcome:
Formulate a plan to develop additional facilities and infrastructure that could increase visitor numbers and spend to boost the local economy

PROJECT 5
Improve off-street parking capacity where opportunities arise

Description:
Identify if there are any locations in the village that could be used to increase parking capacity

Outcome:
Provide extra parking capacity
PROJECT 6

*Water Management*

**Description:**
A Brailes Flood group was formed in July 2016 at the request of the WCC FLOOD FORUM and in conjunction with ongoing volunteer work.

**Outcome:**
To encourage, support and help sustain the ongoing Brailes Flood Group’s work in flood alleviation.

PROJECT 7

*Dark Skies*

**Description:**
To encourage development of Brailes Parish as a potential Dark Sky area.

**Outcome:**
To raise awareness of this subject in Brailes and utilise it to encourage tourism.

PROJECT 8

*Ecology*

**Description:**
To increase village awareness of the rich habitats and variety of species in the Parish.

**Outcome:**
To set up an Ecology Group. This group will identify exceptional sites and suggest measures to protect and enhance these and other sites.
6. APPENDICES

Please use this link to access the appendices:
http://www.brailesparishcouncil.co.uk/npwp/appendices/

1. Listening and Learning - How we communicated with the Parish
2. Terms of Reference
3. The 2015 Survey
4. The Youth Survey September 2015
5. Historic Environment Assessment Designated Heritage Assets Map
6. Listed Buildings in Parish
7. Brailes Conservation Area Map
8. Winderton Conservation Area Map
10. Village Appraisal 1992/3
12. Flooding Evidence
13. Rationale for Designation of Local Green Spaces
14. Assessment Tool
15. Built Up Area Boundary Definition
16. Call for Sites
17. Criteria for Allocating Social Housing
19. WRCC Housing Needs Survey 2016
20. ‘How Old Are We’ Chart
21. Evidence Base - Environment
22. Evidence Base - Housing
23. Evidence Base - Business
24. Analysis Matrix
25. Warwickshire County Council Upper and Lower Brailes Landscape Study March 2016
26. Warwickshire County Council Upper and Lower Brailes Landscape Study July 2016
27. Warwickshire County Council Upper and Lower Brailes Landscape Study September 2016
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