

Quorn Neighbourhood Development Plan

Independent Examiner's Clarification Note

Context

This note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

Initial Comments

The Plan is very well-presented. It provides a clear and distinctive vision for the neighbourhood plan area in a challenging context in terms of the relationship between existing planning policy and the emerging Local Plan. Its focus on housing, the natural and built environments, community facilities and local green spaces is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area.

Points for Clarification

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now in a position to raise some initial issues for clarification. They are designed for the Parish Council. The comments that are made on these points will be used to assist in the preparation of my report. They will also inform any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

Policy S2

Plainly this policy relies heavily on the existing Village Design Statement (2008). Has the Parish Council assessed the continued applicability of the Statement to the neighbourhood area throughout the Plan period?

Policy H1

I looked at the site in detail as part of my visit.

How would vehicular access be achieved into the site?

To what extent has the site been assessed against the flood risk sequential test in national policy (NPPF 2012 paragraphs 100-102)?

Policy H2

I looked at the site in detail as part of my visit. I can see that the third criterion comments about where access should not be achieved. However how and where would vehicular access be achieved into the site?

Is the site available and developable?

Policy H4

On what basis was the cluster upper limit of six dwellings determined?

Policy ENV1

Is the designation of Areas of Separation necessary to achieve the desired effect? Would such designation have regard to national policy?

Are the proposed Areas of Separations underpinned by detailed landscape appraisals?

Policy ENV2

The Plan's analysis of the proposed Local Green Spaces is very thorough. Nevertheless, please can you let me know the size of Barrow Slabs.

Policy ENV8

I recognise that views take no account of administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, is this policy designed to safeguard views solely within the neighbourhood area?

Policy ENV9

I can see that the policy has three principal components. Would proposals for wind turbines (part 2) and solar energy schemes (part 3) also need to comply with the generality of the first part of the policy?

Policy CF1

The principle of the policy meets the basic conditions. For clarity I am proposing to recommend that the policy lists the facilities concerned (rather than loosely referring to 'listed above'). Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposal?

In addition, page 55 lists the 'particularly valued' facilities but also refers to the full range in Appendix J. That appendix does not appear in the further supporting information schedule on the CBC website. Assuming that you agree with my general proposal above which list should then be incorporated into the policy? If it is Appendix J please can I see that document?

Policy E2

The meaning within the first part of the policy is confused by the different applications of 'frontage'. Is it the case that the policy's approach is to support proposals for new retail uses in the defined area where the property is not currently in retail use?

In the second part of the policy has the Parish Council considered the scale of any 'cluster of non-retail uses' that would trigger the need for a planning application to be refused? How could the policy be applied consistently by CBC?

In the fourth part of the policy I understand what might be considered as 'inappropriate' design. What would be 'indifferent' design?

Policy E3

Should the policy/text acknowledge that many such proposals would be unlikely to need planning permission?

Policy E4

How would a 'well-designed new building' be defined in the context of the policy?

Community Actions

I can see that the various Actions have naturally arisen as part of the plan-making process. The Plan correctly includes such non-land uses in a separate section (in this case Section 9). However, in the case of Actions ENV1-3 the numbering is identical to the three relevant land use policies. This is potentially confusing.

Do the three Actions represent the way in which the community would implement the land use policies in a complementary fashion to their implementation through the planning process? If this is the case should they have different Community Action numbers?

Representations made to the Plan

Does the Parish Council wish to make observations on any of the representations made to the Plan?

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for comments by Friday 18 January 2019. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It reflects the factual basis of the questions raised.

In the event that certain responses are available before others I am happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled please can all responses be sent to me by the Borough Council and make direct reference to the policy/issue concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Quorn Neighbourhood Development Plan

3 January 2019