

# **LUSTON GROUP NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

## **Submission Draft Version**

### **Examiner's Questions**

**Rosemary Kidd, Dip TP, MRTPI**

**NPIERS Independent Examiner**

**30 May 2017**

### **Luston Group Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions**

1. How is it intended that Policy LG1 (b) is to be interpreted when considering a new development proposal? It is not a matter that can be enforced through a planning condition.
2. Policy LG1 (g) is considered to be unclear. Would the QB confirm that the following wording is acceptable: "Housing development should not be located where existing agricultural or commercial uses would have unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity." This criterion would mean that criterion f) of Policy LG6 was unnecessary.
3. Instead of the term "vice versa" in Policy LG1 (g) it is suggested that a new criterion should be added: "Agricultural and commercial buildings or uses that are likely to give rise to noise or other pollution shall not be located where they would have an unacceptable adverse impact on existing or proposed residential development."
4. Policy LG2 refers to the "designated area". Is this the neighbourhood plan area?
5. Policy LG3 (d) refers to locally significant views. However Map 2 only shows one view point. Would the QB confirm this is correct.
6. Policy LG6 Would you confirm which NP site the appeal decision at Lustonbury relates to.
7. Paragraph 5.3.13 states that a range of housing sizes is required. However the allocations shown in Policy LG6 indicate 5 or fewer houses on each site which will result in very low density development which usually equates to large detached homes. Would the QB explain the rationale for the number of dwellings on each site, particularly the two largest sites? Would the QB comment on how it is proposed that the plan provides for smaller houses and affordable homes as set out in Policies LG6 and LG7. Has any evidence been collected of the type, size and tenure of homes required locally? Is there evidence of a local housing need for affordable housing in the plan area?
8. Table 1 in paragraph 5.3.7 sets a guideline housing requirement of 23 dwellings. Three have subsequently been allowed on appeal so this equates to 20 dwellings. The table in Policy LG6 shows 35 dwellings. If sites 136/212 and 136/214 were developed at a density of say 25 dwellings to the hectare this would result in an additional 28 dwellings. Would the LPA comment on whether this scale of development accords with the CS policy that the village should accommodate "proportionate housing development".
9. Would the QB provide the assessment of sites referred to in paragraph 5.3.10. Representations have been received citing concerns about the impact of the development on the local road network. It would be helpful if the Highways Dept could comment on the concerns raised. Would the QB confirm that suitable access arrangements can be provided at the sites proposed, particularly for the two larger sites should they be developed at a density of say 25 dwellings per hectare.
10. Would the QB confirm that they have evidence from landowners / developers that all the sites are available and deliverable for development within the plan period.
11. A representation objects to the housing allocation opposite Upper Court Barns. Which site does this refer to?

12. If it were not necessary to allocate all the sites, would the QB comment on which sites are the priorities for allocation in the plan. In particular would they comment on the merits of sites 136/221 and 136/223 which are located well outside the existing core of the village and lack public footpath access.
13. The Plan does not define settlement boundaries for Ashton, Eyton and Moreton. Policy LG7 proposes that new housing development should be on sites contiguous with the existing built form. How does the QB propose that Policy LG7 be interpreted consistently by decision makers in view of the loosely built form of these settlements?
14. Should Policy LG7 also refer to infill development, conversions of rural buildings and other forms of rural housing that are acceptable exceptionally under Core Strategy Policy RA3?
15. Has the QB identified the priorities for infrastructure that are required for the delivery of the allocated development? Policy LG8 identifies a number of possible infrastructure improvements that will be sought. Policy LG14 sets out specific priority infrastructure requirements. Would the QB define those that are necessary to deliver the new development and those that are aspirational. Would the QB confirm which are considered to be deliverable through developer contributions and CIL.
16. Would the QB comment on whether the proposals in Policy LG9 will be deliverable through development proposals bearing in mind the type and scale of development that is allocated in the plan and others that are likely to come forward in the plan area.
17. Has any work been undertaken to identify potential pedestrian/cycleway routes? Are those in Policy LG14 deliverable?
18. Policy LG12 includes 3 sites that are described as “common”. They are all sites in the countryside and would therefore be subject to the countryside policies which only permit development in exceptional circumstances. What is the rationale for seeking this additional protection on these areas. How does the status of the areas as “common land” affect the prospect of development on them?
19. Are there any employment sites within the plan area that are safeguarded under CS Policy E2 as “best” and “good”?
20. Has an assessment of Local Green Space against the NPPF criteria been carried out other than that in Table 4?
21. How is the plan area served by public transport? Is it realistic to require that any replacement community facilities are accessible by public transport as set out in Policy LG13 a). Should some flexibility be introduced into this element of the policy?