

GREAT BOWDEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Submission Draft Version

**Questions to the Qualifying Body and Local Planning
Authority on
Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan
by Independent Examiner, Rosemary Kidd**

Rosemary Kidd, Dip TP, MRTPI
NPIERS Independent Examiner
10 January 2018

Great Bowden 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. **Policy H1** states that the parish has exceeded its housing requirement and that the target for Great Bowden is for no further residential development. Would the QB and LPA confirm the source of this statement and the number of dwellings that are commitments.
2. Would you confirm that the Limits to Development have been revised to include all sites with planning permission.
3. Would the QB explain how the term in **Policy H2** "they respect the shape and form of Great Bowden" is to be interpreted?
4. Has a Housing Needs Survey of the parish been undertaken? The report appears to rely solely on Census data.
5. The final part of **Policy H5** seeks to have developments as tenure blind. Is this covered by guidance in SPD?
6. What is the full title of the RSPB guidelines are referred to in **Policy H6** (f)?
7. Sites a), b), d) and e) under **Policy ENV2** are also proposed to be designated as important open space under Policy **ENV3**. The Local Green Space designation is more restrictive than identification as important open space. The NPPF states that LGS are to be considered in the same manner as sites in the Green Belt and only development in very special circumstances should be permitted. Open space policy usually permits limited development to enhance the use of the site for sport and recreation etc. It is noted that there are proposals for improved facilities at the recreation ground which a Local Green Space designation may not be appropriate for. Which policy do the QB consider the most appropriate for the four sites?
8. **Policy ENV3** refers to the sites being safeguarded by ensuring that "development does not compromise their integrity or value". Would the QB explain how this term is to be interpreted.
9. **Policy ENV3** Site B refers to some sites as Common Land and de-registered common land. Would the QB explain why it is proposed in the description of the sites listed under Policy ENV3 to include areas of unregistered common land which are described in the background evidence as land in private ownership and not accessible. The map headed Policy ENV3 appears to exclude the areas. Figure 6 does not appear to be consistent with the Map headed ENV3 Map Showing Common Land (CL70 – CL75).
10. Would the QB explain what action will be pursued through Community Action ENV2 as Policy ENV3 will designate the appropriate sites. Would it be more appropriate for the Parish Council to work with HDC and landowners to safeguard and enhance the areas?

11. Has any expert advice been sought on the significance of the sites identified under **Policy ENV4** and the ridge and furrow areas identified under Policy **ENV5**?
12. Is it intended that the properties identified under **Policy ENV6** should be designated as non-designated heritage assets through the neighbourhood plan or does the LPA have a process for designating such assets? Would the QB confirm whether all the landowners / tenants have been consulted individually on the proposed designation? If the properties are to be designated through the neighbourhood plan it will be necessary to show the curtilage of each property on the Policies Map.
13. **Policy ENV7** states that the views should be “respected”. It is considered that this term is vague and unclear. Would the QB expand on their intentions of how they consider that the policy should be interpreted by decision makers when dealing with any planning applications for development in the areas covered by the arcs of the viewpoints. The PPG is clear that policies should be clear and unambiguous so that they can be interpreted consistently by decision makers.
14. Apart from sites 1 and 2 in **Policy ENV8**, all other sites are non designated wildlife sites. Is it the intention of the policy to designate them as Local Wildlife Sites? If so have the sites been independently assessed and found to be of sufficient ecological interest to justify the designation? If not is this simply a list of sites which may have some ecological interest which would warrant further investigation should any development affect them? On what basis have sites 23 – 27 been identified as priority habitat? Does this definition link in with those priority habitats in the Biodiversity Action Plan? Is there any reason why the trees should not be protected by Tree Preservation Orders or the hedgerows under the Hedgerow Regulations (1997)? Have the landowners been individually consulted?
15. What is the route of the proposed wildlife corridor running east west to the south of the village with site 13 at its centre?
16. **Policies CAF1 and CAF2** refer to “existing community facilities and amenities”. Would the QB confirm which facilities and amenities this policy refers to. Those listed in the justification to the policy local businesses which whilst serving the community are not community facilities as such. Others such as footpaths and open spaces are safeguarded under other policies. How is the Red Lion public house to be considered, as it closed to business?

Rosemary Kidd
10 January 2018