

Claverham Neighbourhood Plan

Examiner's Clarification Note

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.

Policy-based clarification

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the Plan area. I am now in a position to raise initial issues for clarification with the Parish Council. The comments that you make on these points will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions. I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan.

Policy D1 – I understand the general thrust of the policy. However, what is the intended purpose of the final two paragraphs of the policy? Are they necessary within the context of the second element of the policy?

Policy D2- This is headed as a design policy. However, it addresses a wide series of areas which are not necessarily of a design nature. Is this a policy that sets out criteria for residential extensions of which the first two criteria are design based? Would the intention of the policy be fundamentally changed if I recommended a modification to achieve a general residential extension-type of policy?

Policy D3 – I recognise that this policy sits at the heart of the Plan.

Is the policy based around an opportunity to rationalise a non-conforming use or is it the outcome of a wider site search to identify an appropriate housing site in the Plan area?

What is the evidence to support the assertion that the site is non-viable for employment purposes? Assuming that there is evidence to this effect why would a potential developer then need to demonstrate non-viability for employment use (part 5 of the policy)?

Is it envisaged that access would be achieved into the redevelopment of the site by way of the existing access?

Is it envisaged that the residential development of the site would be physically incorporated into the village? Alternatively, is it intended that it should be self-contained?

Policy R1 – How would you define schemes that offered 'direct benefits to local residents'?

Would applications be refused that did not offer 'direct benefits to local residents'?

Policies T1/T2 (parts 3-6)/T3 (part 1)/PT1 are non-land use policies. Nevertheless, I can see their importance in the neighbourhood area. My suggestion is that they are retained but relocated to a non-land use/proposals part of the Plan in accordance with national planning policy. Do you have any comments on this suggestion?

Policy LS1 – Are your two types of shops too restrictive? In any event how would they be regulated and monitored? What harm would be caused by the opening of general shops in the settlement boundary? Should the types of shops anticipated be highlighted in the supporting text as an example of the type of facilities that are sought?

Policy CF1-CF3 – I can see that the facilities concerned are worthy of safeguarding. Nevertheless, the three policies offer no advice on how they are to be retained. Is it your intention that the policies concerned prevent their use for alternative/non-community purposes?

Policy Y1 – This is a supporting policy and therefore the policy bar is lower than other policies which require something to happen or which restrict uses. Nevertheless, how is it intended that the land use planning process addresses inclusivity (essentially a management issue) and planned with the full engagement of local residents (partly a planning process issue but mainly a community engagement issue)?

Policy ENV2 – Does a neighbourhood plan have the ability to identify locally listed buildings? Does NSDC have a local list or is one in preparation?

Does the third part of the policy effectively restate Local Plan/Green Belt policies? Or do the fields concerned also have historic importance?

Policy ENV4 – What is the size of the proposed LGS 2 (Streamcross)?

Given the comments at the top of page 45 has an assessment been made of the need for the designation of LGSs in the neighbourhood plan where existing protection is in place (see Planning Practice Guidance 37-011-20140306)?

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for comments from the Parish Council by 8 September 2017. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

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 could it all come to me directly from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the section concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft,

Independent Examiner

Claverham Neighbourhood Plan

29 August 2017