

BARFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014 - 2029

(Submission Version October 2014)

**Report of the Examination into the Barford Neighbourhood Development**

**Plan 2014 - 2029**

Timothy Jones, Barrister, FCI Arb,

Independent Examiner



No 5 Chambers,

Birmingham - London - Bristol - Leicester

5<sup>th</sup> November 2015.

<b><u>Contents</u></b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
- Neighbourhood planning	1
- Appointment and role	1
<b>2. Preliminary Matters</b>	<b>1 - 2</b>
- Public consultation	1
- Other statutory requirements	2
<b>3. The Extent and Limits of an Examiner's Role</b>	<b>2 - 3</b>
<b>4. Consideration of Objections</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5. Public Hearing</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6. The Basic Conditions and Human Rights</b>	<b>4 - 6</b>
- Regard to national policies and advice	4
- Contributing to the achievement of sustainable development	5
- General conformity with the development plan	5
- EU obligations	5 - 6
- European sites	6
- Human rights	6
<b>6. The Draft NDP</b>	<b>6 - 7</b>
<b>7. The first four chapters</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>8. Chapter 5 Policies and proposals</b>	<b>7 - 10</b>
- Policy B1	7 - 8
- Policy B3	8
- Policy B6	8 - 9
- Policy B9	9
- Policy B10	9 - 10
<b>9. Chapters 6 and 7 and Appendix A</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>10. The Referendum Area</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>11. Summary of Main Findings</b>	<b>10 - 11</b>
<b>Appendix A: Recommended Modifications</b>	<b>12 - 14</b>
<b>Appendix B: Abbreviations</b>	<b>15</b>

## **1. Introduction**

### *Neighbourhood planning*

1. The Localism Act 2011 Part 6 Chapter 3 introduced neighbourhood planning, including provision for neighbourhood development plans. A Neighbourhood Development Plan should reflect the needs and priorities of the community concerned and should set out a positive vision for the future, setting planning policies to determine decisions on planning applications. If approved by a referendum and made by the local planning authority, such plans form part of the Development Plan for the neighbourhood concerned. Applications for planning permission should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
2. This report concerns the Submission Version of the Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-2029 (“the Draft NDP”).

### *Appointment and Role*

3. Warwick District Council (“WDC”), with the agreement of Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council (“JPC”), has appointed me, to examine the Draft NDP. I am a member of the planning bar and am independent of WDC, JPC, and of those who have made representations in respect of the Draft NDP. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by it.
4. My examination has involved considering written submissions and two unaccompanied site visits.
5. My role may be summarised briefly as to consider whether certain statutory requirements have been met, to consider whether the Draft NDP meets the basic conditions, to consider human rights issues, to recommend which of the three options specified in paragraph 13 below applies and, if appropriate, to consider the referendum area.

## **2. Preliminary Matters**

### *Public Consultation*

6. The consultation met the requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. I am satisfied that JPC took public consultation seriously and that proper, genuine and sufficient consultation resulted from this approach. I also bear in mind that parish councillors are democratically accountable, subject to a code of conduct and likely to be in close contact with the community they represent.

*Other statutory requirements*

7. I am satisfied of the following matters:
- (1) The Draft NDP area is the parish of Barford. JPC is authorised to act in respect of this area (Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (“TCPA”) s61F(1) as read with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (“PCPA”) s38C(2)(a));
  - (2) The Draft NDP specifies the period for which it is to have effect, namely 2014 to 2029, does not include provision about development that is excluded development (as defined in TCPA s61K),<sup>1</sup> and does not relate to more than one neighbourhood area (PCPA s38B(1));
  - (3) No other neighbourhood development plan has been made for the neighbourhood area (PCPA s38B(2)); and
  - (4) There is no conflict with PCPA s38A and s38B (TCPA Sch 4B para 8(1)(b) and PCPA s38C(5)(b)).
8. To date all relevant statutory requirements have been met.

**3. The Extent and Limits of an Examiner’s Role**

9. I am required to consider whether the Draft NDP meets the basic conditions specified in TCPA Sch 4B para 8(2) as varied for neighbourhood development plans, namely:
- (a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the Plan;
  - (d) The making of the Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
  - (e) The making of the Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area);
  - (f) The making of the Plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations;<sup>2</sup> and
  - (g) Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the Plan
10. There one prescribed basic condition:<sup>3</sup> *“The making of the neighbourhood development plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site (as defined in*

---

<sup>1</sup> Excluded development includes: (a) development that consists of a county matter; (b) certain waste development; (c) development within Annex 1 to the EIA Directive and (d) a nationally significant infrastructure project.

<sup>2</sup> The omission of (b) and (c) results from these clauses of paragraph 8(2) not applying to neighbourhood development plans (PCPA s38C(5)(d)).

<sup>3</sup> This is prescribed by Sch 2 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

*the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010) or a European offshore marine site (as defined in the Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 2007 (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects)''.*

11. The combined effect of TCPA Sch 4B para 8(6) and para 10(3)(b) and the Human Rights Act 1998 means that I must consider whether the Draft NDP is compatible with Convention rights. 'Convention rights' are defined in the Human Rights Act 1998 as (a) Articles 2 to 12 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights, (b) Articles 1 to 3 of its First Protocol, and (c) Article 1 of its Thirteenth Protocol, as read with Articles 16 to 18 of the Convention. The Convention rights that are most likely to be relevant to town and country planning are those under the Convention's Article 6(1), 8 and 14 and under its First Protocol Article 1.

12. In my examination of the substantial merits of the Draft NDP, I may not consider matters other than those specified in the last three paragraphs. In particular I may not consider whether any other test, such as the soundness test provided for in respect of examinations under PCPA s20, is met. Rather it is clear that Parliament has decided not to use the soundness test, but to use the, to some extent, less demanding tests in the basic conditions. It is not my role to write or to rewrite a neighbourhood development plan for Barford.

13. Having considered the basic conditions and human rights, I have three options, which I must exercise in the light of my findings. These are: (1) that the Draft NDP proceeds to a referendum as submitted; (2) that the Draft NDP is modified to meet basic conditions and then the modified version proceeds to a referendum; or (3) that the Draft NDP does not proceed to referendum. If I determine that either of the first two options is appropriate, I must also consider whether referendum area should be extended. I may recommend modifications:

- (a) that I consider need to be made to secure that the draft NDP meets the basic conditions mentioned in para 8(2) of Sch 4B as modified;
- (b) that I consider need to be made to secure that the draft NDP is compatible with the Convention rights;
- (c) that I consider need to be made to secure that the draft NDP complies with the provision made by or under s61E(2), s61J and s61L;
- (d) that specify a period under s61L(2)(b) or (5); and
- (e) for the purpose of correcting errors.

#### **4 Consideration of objections**

14. I have considered all objections. With some hesitation this has included Cerda's very late objection of 4th September 2015. In accordance with the statutory requirement<sup>4</sup> I have given reasons for my recommended modifications. As for those objections that I have not accepted, it is in most cases sufficient to say that they do not propose modifications that are necessary to ensure compliance with the basic conditions and with human rights. In respect of the site being advanced by Cerda in its late objection, I see no reason to add that to the preferred sites in the draft NDP. Rather, as a result of my site visits, I share WDC's concerns about access and about the relatively large size of this site in the context of Barford. It is not entirely clear from the map on page 28 of the draft NDP whether the site concerned is classified as grade 2 agricultural land, although it seems to be. If I had been minded to add it as a preferred site, I would have asked if further information was available on this point.

#### **5. Public Hearing**

15. The general rule is that the examination of the issues by the examiner is to take the form of the consideration of the written representations. However an examiner must cause a hearing to be held for the purpose of receiving oral representations about a particular issue in any case where the examiner considers that the consideration of oral representations is necessary to ensure (1) adequate examination of the issue or (2) a person has a fair chance to put a case. Neither applied in this case. I therefore did not hold a public hearing.

#### **6. The Basic Conditions and Human Rights**

*Regard to national policies and advice*

16. The first basic condition requires that I consider whether it is appropriate that the plan should be made "*having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State*". A requirement to have regard to policies and advice does not require that such policy and advice must necessarily be followed, but it is intended to have and does have a significant effect.

17. The principal document in which national planning policy is contained is the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) ("the Framework") and I have borne that in mind. I have also borne in mind Planning Practice Guidance, particularly its section on neighbourhood planning.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Sch 4B para 10(6).

<sup>5</sup> [planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/](http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/)

### *Contributing to the achievement of sustainable development*

18. The second basic condition means that I must consider whether the making of the Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Unless the Draft NDP, or the Draft NDP as modified, contributes to sustainable development, it cannot proceed to a referendum. This condition relates to the making of the Plan as a whole. It does not require that each policy in it contribute to sustainable development.

19. The bulk of the Framework constitutes guidance on sustainable development. As its para 6 says, “*The policies in paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government’s view of what sustainable development... means in practice for the planning system.*”

### *General conformity with the development plan’s strategic policies*

20. The third basic condition means that I must consider whether the draft NDP is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority. The development plan means the adopted development plan, not any emerging plan. Whether it is, as Cerda said, in its letter of 4<sup>th</sup> September 2015 “*good practice*” to consider the emerging Local Plan, is not a matter for me when considering compliance with basic conditions. The adjective ‘*general*’ allows a degree of (but not unlimited) flexibility and requires the exercise of planning judgement. This condition only applies to strategic policies. In assessing whether a policy is strategic I have borne in mind the advice in National Planning Practice Guidance para 074:<sup>6</sup> I am satisfied that the draft NDP is in general conformity with the development plan’s strategic policies.

### *EU obligations*

21. The fourth basic condition requires me to consider whether the draft NDP breaches or is otherwise incompatible with, EU obligations. I have in particular considered the following Directives and am satisfied that there is no breach of them or of any other EU law: the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2001/42/EC); the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (2011/92/EU); the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC); the Wild Birds Directive (2009/147/EC); the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC); the Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC); and the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC). I am also satisfied that no issue arises in respect of equality under general principles of EU law or any EU equality Directive. I am satisfied that nothing in the Draft NDP breaches or is otherwise incompatible with EU law. I have been particularly impressed both in respect of this basic

---

<sup>6</sup> Neighbourhood Planning para 074, Reference ID: 41-074-20140306 .

condition and in respect of human rights by the care that has been taken in respect of people who are disadvantaged as a result of disability or age.

#### *European site and European offshore marine site*

22. There is no objection from Natural England, or any other nature conservation body. Indeed I note the positive response from Natural England in its letter of 17<sup>th</sup> April 2015. I am satisfied that the NDP is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site.

#### *Human Rights*

23. It is also necessary to consider whether the draft NDP would cause any Convention right to be breached. English Planning law in general complies with the Convention. This matter can be dealt with briefly in advance of detailed consideration of the contents of the draft NDP. I have considered whether anything in the Draft NDP would cause a breach of any Convention right. In particular I have considered the Convention's Articles 6(1), 8 and 14 and its First Protocol Article 1. Nothing in my examination of the Draft NDP indicates any breach of a Convention right.

24. It will be apparent from the above that, having been satisfied in respect of the two EU basic conditions and human rights and satisfied that the draft NDP is in general conformity with the development plan's strategic policies, I have needed to concentrate on the first two basic conditions. My recommended modifications are those that I consider need to be made to secure that the draft NDP meets these two basic conditions and to correct errors.

### **6. The Draft NDP**

25. The draft NDP has a clear structure, being divided into seven chapters. Of these chapter 5, which details policies, has six sections relating respectively to: housing; economy; built environment and heritage; natural environment, landscape character and open spaces; transport, traffic and communications; and local and community facilities.

26. I commend the Draft NDP for being well written, logical, clear, appropriately concise and intelligible to a reasonably intelligent lay reader with no expertise in town and country planning.

27. The following sections of the report consider whether modifications are needed to make the Draft NDP comply with the first two basic conditions. I have concluded that some modification is necessary, but that with this modification, the Draft NDP can proceed to a referendum. My recommended modifications are in bold. Proposed new wording is underlined and deletions appear in this report as struck-through text: the underlining and striking-through text should not, of course, appear in the version subject to the referendum. I have not in this report given detailed written consideration to all policies and supporting text.



I, before writing it, have considered each policy, the whole of the draft NDP and all representations.

## **7. The first four chapters**

28. I have no concerns of substance with the first four chapters, there being only the following minor matters:

- (1) Since the draft NDP does not specify housing numbers or any other figures for meeting need, its start date may, if considered appropriate, be altered to 2015 or 2016. The end date should remain 2029.
- (2) Paragraphs 2.9 and 2.10 will need updating. This minor matter that does not require a specific wording from me.

## **8. Chapter 5 Policies and proposals**

### *Policy B1*

29. With its five criteria, each of which would have to be met, this policy is particularly restrictive, not least for a growth village, and could well lead to fewer houses than are needed. I share Cerda's concern about it being too prescriptive. Rather than contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and appropriately reflecting government policy, it could well prevent the provision of needed homes. (It would also be likely to render the NDP out of date when the new Local Plan is adopted.) In order to support sustainable development, it requires to be modified so that neither the three preferred sites, nor numbers in the new Local Plan when adopted, is necessarily the maximum. I recommend the following modification

### Recommended modification

#### **Policy B1 – Future housing development**

**Over the plan period, within the defined settlement boundary for Barford (see plan) new housing development proposals will be permitted where ~~it meets all the following criteria:~~**

**Either (1)** it is located on the preferred sites shown on map 5.7; **or**

**(2)** ~~the number of dwellings for which planning permission has been granted since the publication of the first new draft Local Plan in 2011, does not exceed the number of new dwellings in Barford provided for in the new emerging Local Plan currently due to run until 2029.~~ **It does not conflict with the policies of this Neighbourhood Plan and in particular:**

- it would not lead to the loss of open space preserved under policy B10, the views described at paragraph 5.39, shops or other local facilities;
- it has appropriate access; and
- parking is in accordance with policy B13.

Development outside the settlement boundary will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the policy H3 of the new ~~Warwick~~ Local Plan (2011-2029) that deals with such development. On other occasions, where new housing is allowed either for replacement dwellings, or for rural workers, then the re-use of redundant or disused buildings should be considered. In this policy the “new Local Plan” means the emerging Local Plan in the form it is in at the date of the decision on any application for planning permission and thereafter the adopted Local Plan that results from it (if this occurs).

30. I also recommend that a footnote be added stating that at present this policy is H3.

#### *Policy B3*

31. This policy is in principle commendable, contributes towards the social dimension of sustainable development and reflects the JPC’s compliance with its duty under the Equality Act 2010 s149. However its text (unlike its heading) wrongly assumes that all the elderly are infirm or disabled. This is an error that needs correcting. I recommend that it be modified as follows:

#### Recommended modification

**Policy B3 – Ensuring the provision of accommodation and/or facilities to enable the elderly, infirm or disabled population to remain within the Parish of Barford.**

**The Neighbourhood Development Plan will support, promote, enable and implement the provision of accommodation and/or facilities to encourage the elderly, ~~(or otherwise~~ infirm or disabled) population to remain within our parish community for the whole of their lives where that is their wish, in particular avoiding late-stage distress relocation due to deteriorating mobility and health, simultaneously facilitating downsizing and release of larger properties.**

#### *Policy B6*

32. While in general this policy supports sustainable development, I share the concern of English Heritage (now Historic England) that the first sentence of policy B6 goes too far beyond statutory requirements and, agreeing with its representation on this point, recommend that this sentence be modified as follows:

#### Recommended modification

## **Policy B6 – Heritage Assets**

**All new development within the Conservation Area and/or within the setting of a listed building will be expected to preserve and wherever possible enhance the positive attributes of the heritage asset.**

**Development will not be permitted where it has a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area, the setting of a Listed Building or the identified (in the Plans and Policies under B10 below) open spaces and views within the Conservation Area.**

### *Policy B9*

33. Policy B9 would prevent all irreversible development and hence all housing development on open agricultural land that is classified as grades 1, 2 and 3a. Almost all the agricultural land is grades 2 or 3 and the majority of the agricultural land is grade 3a. When the maps on pages 27 and 28 are compared, it can be seen that much of the grade 4 land is in flood zone 3. There is no grade 5 land. While I respect the desire to protect the best and most versatile agricultural, as worded, the policy could turn out to be too restrictive of needed future development and therefore contrary to the presumption in favour of sustainable development and government policy to meet the need for new homes. I therefore recommend that it should be modified:

#### Recommended modification

### **Policy B9 – Agricultural Land.**

**The irreversible development of open agricultural land should not be permitted where it would result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land except where it is development necessary for the purposes of agriculture or to meet a need for development stated in the adopted Local Plan current at the material time that cannot be met on more appropriate land.**

### *Policy B10*

34. Site A1 includes the walled garden site (site H20 in WDC's Submission Draft Local Plan). The NDP may remove this from preferred sites and I have therefore not recommended modifying paragraph 5.7. However that does not mean that it is appropriate to go further and prevent development on it should the need arise. I note that in his submission, Mr Toby Jones, among other things, pointed to the absence of evidence as to why this land was worthy of protection as local green space. I have seen no evidence to the contrary. I am also concerned that if development of this site were to be categorically excluded, there would be greater pressure for development outside the settlement boundary, perhaps on best and most versatile agricultural land. Should development on this land be proposed, consideration would, as a matter of law, have to be given to Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation

Areas) Act 1990 s66 and s72 and to the judgment of the Court of Appeal in East Northamptonshire District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.<sup>7</sup> The draft NDP's paragraph 5.39 (4), which I consider should remain, would also require consideration

35. The Local Green Space designation was introduced by the Framework whose paragraph 77, among other things, advises that it should not be used where the green area concerned is an extensive tract of land. Site A6/B5/C2 is an extensive tract of land and should therefore not be protected under a Local Green Space policy, although it can be protected (subject to my recommended modification and other than for excluded development<sup>8</sup>) under Policy B7. To the extent that this is described as a site of nature conservation value, there appears to be no evidence that this agricultural land has a nature conservation value sufficient to justify designation, nor does it appear from my site visits to be the sort of land where such value could be assumed.

36. I recommend that policy B10 be modified as follows

(1) by the deletion of the word "south" in respect of A1 and by the corresponding removal from the map on page 31 of site H20 in WDC's Submission Draft Local Plan;

(2) by the deletion of the entries in respect of A6, B5 and C2 and the corresponding entries on the map on page 31 and by consequential renumbering; and

(3) by specifying the map to which it refers

37. The full text of my recommended modified policy appears in my Appendix A

## **9. Chapters 6 and 7 and Appendix A**

38. I have no concerns of substance in respect of chapters 6 and 7. Paragraphs 7.4 and 7.5 will need updating. This minor matter does not require a specific wording from me.

## **10. The Referendum Area**

39. I see no reason for the referendum area to be extended beyond the designated plan area. I therefore recommend that the referendum area be limited to that area.

## **11. Summary of Main Findings**

40. I commend the Draft NDP for being well written, logical, clear, appropriately concise and intelligible to a reasonably intelligent lay reader with no expertise in town and country planning.

---

<sup>7</sup> [2014] EWCA Civ 137

<sup>8</sup> As to which see paragraph 7 and footnote 1 above.

41. I recommend that the draft NDP be modified in the terms specified in Appendix A to this report in order to meet basic conditions. I am satisfied with all parts of the draft NDP to which I am not recommending modifications.

42. With those modifications the draft NDP will meet all the basic conditions. Specifically

- Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the NDP;
- The making of the NDP contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- The making of the NDP is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the JPC (or any part of that area);
- The making of the NDP does not breach, and be otherwise incompatible with, EU obligations;
- The making of the NDP is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects).

43. The modified draft NDP is in all respects fully compatible with Convention rights contained in the Human Rights Act 1998.

44. I recommend that the modified NDP proceed to a referendum, the referendum area being the parish of Barford.

Timothy Jones, Barrister, FCI Arb,

Independent Examiner,

No 5 Chambers

5<sup>th</sup> November 2015.

## Appendix A: Recommended Modifications

1. Paragraphs 2.9 and 2.10 will need updating.
2. Policy B1 be modified as follows.

### **Policy B1 – Future housing development**

Over the plan period, within the defined settlement boundary for Barford (see plan) new housing development proposals will be permitted where ~~it meets all the following~~ **criteria:**

Either (1) it is located on the preferred sites shown on map 5.7; or

~~(2) · the number of dwellings for which planning permission has been granted since the publication of the first new draft Local Plan in 2011, does not exceed the number of new dwellings in Barford provided for in the new emerging Local Plan currently due to run until 2029.~~ It does not conflict with the policies of this Neighbourhood Plan and in particular:

- it would not lead to the loss of open space preserved under policy B10, the views described at paragraph 5.39, shops or other local facilities;
- it has appropriate access; and
- parking is in accordance with policy B13.

Development outside the settlement boundary will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the policy ~~H3~~ of the new ~~Warwick~~ Local Plan ~~(2011-2029)~~ that deals with such development. On other occasions, where new housing is allowed either for replacement dwellings, or for rural workers, then the re-use of redundant or disused buildings should be considered. In this policy the “new Local Plan” means the emerging Local Plan in the form it is in at the date of the decision on any application for planning permission and thereafter the adopted Local Plan that results from it (if this occurs).

3. A footnote be added to the final paragraph of B1, stating that at present this policy is H3.
4. Policy B3 be modified as follows.

**Policy B3 – Ensuring the provision of accommodation and/or facilities to enable the elderly, infirm or disabled population to remain within the Parish of Barford.**

The Neighbourhood Development Plan will support, promote, enable and implement the provision of accommodation and/or facilities to encourage the elderly, ~~(or otherwise~~

infirm or disabled) population to remain within our parish community for the whole of their lives where that is their wish, in particular avoiding late-stage distress relocation due to deteriorating mobility and health, simultaneously facilitating downsizing and release of larger properties.

4. Policy B6 be modified as follows.

**Policy B6 – Heritage Assets**

All new development within the Conservation Area and/or within the setting of a listed building will be expected to preserve and wherever possible enhance the positive attributes of the heritage asset.

Development will not be permitted where it has a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area, the setting of a Listed Building or the identified (in the Plans and Policies under B10 below) open spaces and views within the Conservation Area.

5. Policy B9 be modified as follows.

**Policy B9 – Agricultural Land.**

The irreversible development of open agricultural land should not be permitted where it would result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land except where it is development necessary for the purposes of agriculture or to meet a need for development stated in the adopted Local Plan current at the material time that cannot be met on more appropriate land.

6. Policy B10 be modified as follows

**Policy B10 – Protection and enhancement of Local Green Spaces.**

The following green spaces as shown on the map on page ...<sup>9</sup> are protected from development

**SITES OF OPEN SPACE VALUE**

- A1 Garden and parkland to the north, ~~south~~ and east of Barford House
- A2 School playing field
- A3 Small field between the school playing field and recreation ground
- A4 Vicarage garden
- A5 King George V playing field, apart from any enhancements to the facilities agreed by the Joint Parish Council

---

<sup>9</sup> This will of course require completion.

~~A6 — Agricultural land enclosed by the loop of the river to the west of the bypass. This land is Grade 2 agricultural land, a Minerals Safeguarding Area and a Sand & Gravel Resource Area.~~

#### **SITES OF SPORTS, RECREATION AND AMENITY VALUE**

**B1 School playing field**

**B2 King George V playing field**

**B3 Village green**

**B4 Allotment gardens**

~~**B5 — Agricultural land enclosed by the loop of the river to the west of the bypass**~~

**B65 Oldhams Bank River walk and Community Orchard**

#### **SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION VALUE**

**C1 Tree belts around the parkland (A1)**

~~**C2 — Agricultural land enclosed by the loop of the river to the west of the bypass**~~

**C4.2 Alderham Farm - woods, marshes and osier bed**

**C53 Debden Hollow**

**C64 Several woodland, coppices and spinneys:**

**C64.1 On the river island**

**C64.2 Church Lane footpath**

**C64.3 Hareway lane**

**C64.4 Rear of Watchbury Farm**

**C64.5 Middle Watchbury Farm**

**C64.6 Debden Farm**

**C64.7 Watchbury Hill**

**C64.8 Gooseberry Hall**

**C64.9 Plestowes**

**C64.10 Wasperton Lane**

**C75 Banks of the river**

7. Corresponding changes should be made to on the map on page 31.

8. Paragraphs 7.4 and 7.5 will need updating.



## **Appendix B: Abbreviations**

The following abbreviations are used in this report

JPC	Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council
Convention	European Convention on Human Rights
Draft NDP	draft Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-2029 (Submission Version )
EU	European Union
Framework	National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG, March 2012)
para	paragraph
PCPA	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)
s	section
Sch	Schedule
TCPA	Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
WDC	Warwick District Council