

Annex B

Proposed modification no. (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Examiner’s proposed Modification	Officer Recommendation
PM1	Throughout the document	Refer to the December 2023 version of the NPPF and update paragraph references where they have changed (see paragraph 4.5 of my report for an indication in this regard).	Agree. Simple modification that enhances clarity, brings the document up to date and does not change meaning or intention.
PM2	Policy SSNP7	Delete Policy SSNP7, paragraphs 5.25 – 5.34, Plan D and Appendices C, E and F.	<p>Agree. This is a significant modification, deleting the site allocation, which alters the strategy of the Plan. However, it accords with the case put forward in the Council’s own representation.</p> <p>This policy also elicited a large response from the neighbourhood area and neighbouring parishes.</p>
PM3	Policy SSNP1	Delete Policy SSNP1 and paragraphs 5.6 and 5.7.	Agree. The policy as drafted extended the Development Boundary to encompass the site allocated in SSNP7 above. Without the allocation, the Policy duplicates the Local Plan, and thus does not meet the requirements of the NPPF para 16.
PM4	Policy SSNP2	<p>Clause A. Delete: “... that is suited only to ...” and insert: “... which may be suited to no more than ...”.</p> <p>Clause B. Delete: “... not suited to ...” and insert: “... likely to be unsuitable for ...”.</p>	Agree. CDC made the case in its representation that the unmodified wording was not in general conformity.

		<p>Clause C. Delete: "... Rural Area ..." in the first sentence and insert: "... open countryside ...".</p> <p>Delete the second sentence.</p>	<p>Agree. CDC made the case in its representation that this clause did not have regard to the NPPF.</p>
PM5	Policy SSNP3	<p>Clause A. Delete: "... to the Neighbourhood Area and its immediate surroundings ..." and insert: "... as defined by the Homeseeker Plus Common allocations policy document ...".</p> <p>Clause B. Delete the clause and insert: "Within the Stow on the Wold Development Boundary proposals for residential schemes of 6 or more dwellings will be required to demonstrate that the mix of dwelling types and sizes is appropriate to meets the needs of current and future households."</p>	<p>Agree. Modification in line position articulated by CDC in its representation and response to clarifications questions. This ensures consistency with local policy and housing allocation practice.</p> <p>Agree. The revised wording gives weight to the evidence presented by Stow, but ensures appropriate flexibility to negotiate the housing mix to meet local needs and more up to date evidence in the future.</p>
PM6	Policy SSNP4	<p>Delete the policy.</p>	<p>Agree. This modification accords with CDC's representation, which identified challenges with the effective implementation of this policy, in the context of a changed approach to short term lets and second homes in national policy and guidance.</p>
PM7	Policy SSNP5	<p>Insert the following additional text in the first bullet point: "... households with a local connection as defined by the Homeseeker Plus Common allocations policy;"</p>	<p>Agree. As with Policy 3 above, this ensures a good reading across from this policy into the CDC approach to housing allocations.</p>

		Delete the second bullet pointed phrase.	The second phrase was insufficiently justified by evidence, so would have proven difficult to justify.
PM8	Policy SSNP6	Delete: " ... NPPF paragraph 177 ..." and insert: " ... NPPF paragraph 183 and footnote 64, ... ".	Agree. This updates the policy to reflect the latest version of the NPPF, and also, helpfully directs to supporting information in the footnote.
PM9	Policy SSNP8	Delete Clause G.	Agree. This amendment reflects the deletion of the site allocation, and the additional car parking capacity that the allocation was expected to supply.
PM10	Policy SSNP13	Clause A. Delete: "Development proposals..." and insert: " All new buildings... ".	Agree. This simple change ensures the workability of the project - it would have been difficult to insist on the policy requirements for all forms of development.
Consequential Amendments	Throughout	'A consequence of the acceptance of the recommended modifications would be that amendments will have to be made to the explanation within the Plan in order to make it logical and suitable for the referendum. The amendments would include the vision. Further amendments might also include incorporating factual updates such as references, correcting minor inaccuracies, any text improvements suggested helpfully by CDC in their Regulation 16 consultation and any paragraph renumbering. None of these alterations would affect the ability of the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions and could be undertaken as minor, non-material changes.'	As recommended by the Examiner, the above modifications have been made throughout the supporting text. Alterations have been kept to the minimum, to retain in so far as is possible, the wording presented by Stow Town Council. These changes have been shared with STC, who have also been invited to share proposed alterations to the introduction and vision, as these should reflect the ambitions of the town council, and set the tone for the document, as modified.