

WRAY WITH BOTTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Submission Draft Version

Wray with Botton Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions

by Independent Examiner, Rosemary Kidd

Rosemary Kidd, Dip TP, MRTPI

NPIERS Independent Examiner

28 September 2018

Wray with Botton Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions

Following my initial assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan and representations, I would appreciate clarification and further evidence on the following matters from the Qualifying Body and/or the Local Planning Authority. In order to ensure openness and transparency of the examination process, these questions and the responses should be published on the Council's website.

1. Would LCC provide a copy of the correspondence from the Council's solicitor referred to in paragraph 4.9 of their representation concerning the S106 agreement. Would the QB provide the documents referred to in Annex 3 of Appendix 3 of the Site Assessment report and their legal opinion on the matter referred to in their note "Specific comments on the LCC response".
2. Policy OS2 criterion (III) refers to views into and out of the AONB. Within the context of the NP, policies can only refer to locations within the Plan area. Is it intended that these views are those shown on the Proposals Map 2?
3. How is it intended that Policy OS2 criterion (IV) is to be applied by developers and decision makers?
4. The LPA comments that Policy BE1 is confusing and repetitive. Would the LPA and QB consider and agree how the policy wording could be improved. The policy should focus on providing local guidance relevant to the parish rather than generic statements. It should avoid repeating points in other policies in the Local Plan and in other NP policies.
5. The Housing Needs Survey revealed a need for affordable homes by 2020 (para 4.3.6).
 - Will any of the sites with planning permission deliver any affordable homes in this timescale?
 - How is it intended that the demonstrated need for affordable housing is to be delivered through the NP?
 - Has the Plan considered whether any of the site options could have been delivered as a rural exceptions site?
6. Policies H1 and H2 refers to the maximum possible affordable number of affordable homes and Policy H2 sets a target of 50% affordable. Would the QB supply me with the evidence to demonstrate that the 50% figure is deliverable particularly on the Hoskins Fam site. Unless this can be demonstrated, the Local Plan policy would have to be recommended.
7. Local Plan Policy SC3 states that an allowance of 10% of new homes is made to accommodate development to meet local needs in villages. It is acknowledged that this is an allowance for the overall proportion of new housing that is to be developed in the rural areas. However in the absence of any other strategic guidance about the appropriate level of growth in the NP area, would the LPA agree that it would be appropriate for the NP to provide this level of growth as a minimum?
8. The Site Assessment Report includes Key Development Considerations that set out factors to be taken into account in the design and layout of the housing sites. I am

mind to recommend that they be incorporated into Policy H1 against the site allocations as suggested by Historic England. Would the QB and LPA review the Key Development Considerations and confirm that this is appropriate.

9. Paragraph 4.5.6 and the table following identify 3 sites as having “potential for housing”; however it is noted that the landowners are not intending to bring them forward for development. As these sites are not deliverable and it is not proposed to allocate them in the Plan, I shall be recommending that they be deleted.
10. Policy H2 seeks to restrict occupancy to sole/main residence. What is the evidence to support this restriction?
11. Policies H1 and RE1 seek to prevent development on international, national and locally designated sites. They make no distinction between the various types of sites or explain what the designations are. The policy therefore does not have regard to national policy guidance. Safeguarding of environmental and heritage sites is adequately addressed in other Local Plan policies and does not need to be repeated in NP development policies. In the circumstances I am minded to delete this criterion.
12. Policy RE1 (VI) refers to “micro-growth points”. Would the QB explain what is meant by this term.
13. The second paragraph of Policy RE1 is imprecise. Would the QB explain what type of buildings it is proposed that this paragraph should cover. Is this all types of rural buildings or only specific types? Would the QB consider whether this could be combined with criterion (II).
14. Policy RE1 Criterion (I) refers to “allocated mineral extraction or waste management”. I shall be recommending that this should be deleted as these are excluded forms of development. They will in any case be allocated in other plans and there is no need to repeat it in the NP.
15. Policy RE1 Criterion (IV) refers to “house extensions or extensions to outbuildings”. Would the QB confirm that under this policy, it is intended that they are to provide space for employment purposes. Would the QB consider how this could be worded more clearly.
16. The final paragraph of Policy RE1 does not reflect the national planning guidance on safeguarding agricultural land. There is insufficient evidence to justify this as an exception and I shall have to recommend that it be deleted.
17. There is a degree of overlap between Policy NE1 with Policy OS2 on landscape matters and Policy NE3 on the historic environment the topics should be clearly distinguished in the policies. Policy NE1 adds no locally specific policy matters on biodiversity to the Local Plan Policies in which case I shall be recommending that the policy should be deleted.
18. The environmental constraints map shows the location of the SPA, the Biological Heritage Site and the SSSI. Would the LPA/QB provide a brief description of these environmental areas for inclusion in descriptive text on the natural environment.
19. Lancaster City Council and Historic England have made a number of comments on Policy NE3. Would the QB and LCC consider the points made and agree revisions to the Policy. These should contain locally specific matters only as there is no need to address matters that are included in policies in Local Plans. The policy should avoid the use of the phrase “will not be permitted” as other policies in the development plan

and other material considerations will have to be taken into account in determining planning applications.

20. The Proposals Map shows three non designated heritage assets. Are these included on the LCC Local List?

Rosemary Kidd
Independent Examiner

28 September 2018