

# Ashbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

## Response to examiner's clarification note – part 2

This section of the parish council's [PC] response to the examiner deals only with the feedback generated by VWHDC's publicity period, and the feedback references used correspond with the nomenclature as it appears on the VWHDC website.

We consider that the feedback from respondents ppr01, ppr05, ppr07 & ppr08 do not impact on the Plan and hence do not require a response or any further action by the Council/Steering group.

For the remainder we comment as follows:

Feedback from	Brief summary of comment or objection - for full commentary see feedback form.	Proposed remedial action
ppr.02 - VWHDC Leisure Team	Supports those aspects that would make the wider community more active	This chimes with the PC's current project where funding is being sought to exploit the land acquired at Wixes Piece to provide outdoor activities for all age groups.
ppr.03 - VWHDC NP Team	Makes constructive suggestions on how to enhance specific Plan policies and further clarify some aspects of the supporting text	We propose incorporating the majority of the recommended changes as part of the review & revision exercise arising from the examination
ppr.04 - Gladman Developments	The submission comes from a developer with no obvious interest in the parish, and while we accept some of the observations made we consider it necessary to respond to the points raised where this lack of local knowledge is most evident.	V&O's: we would argue that these statements are positive given the constraints arising from 65% of the parish falling within an AONB. LGS's: we maintain that those proposed for such status meet the criteria in all respect.
ppr.06 - Historic England	Makes a number of valid points that chime with our thoughts on the importance of the parish's historical setting, but their comments appear to ignore policy 1 and the listing of important sites.	The individual elements of section 2 'character appraisal' sets out both listed assets and others of special interest in each area. As a result of the data gathering for the appraisal, the PC identified that gaps did exist, and intends cataloguing of parish assets, with that for current assets already started and that for historical assets due to commence on completion. Both will be reported as part of the monitoring & review process.
ppr.09 - OCC	Makes constructive suggestions on how to enhance specific Plan policies but questions the relevance of CIL list.	We propose incorporating the majority of the recommended changes as part of the review & revision exercise arising from the examination while others are addressed by the points made in respect of ppr.06 above. With regard to the CIL list, this was generated and adopted as a result of parish surveys.
ppr.10 - R Stewart	Makes a number of points of criticism that appear to echo those in ppr.04 above and again seemingly without any knowledge of the parish.	For the most part we would respond as for ppr.04, but would add that the cases referenced in point 4 were 'case specific' and hence the comments are considered erroneous.

Cliff Davies

28<sup>th</sup> March 2019

pp Ashbury Parish Council & ANP steering group

# Ashbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

## Response to examiner's clarification note

Very many thanks for your prompt feedback following your appointment as the independent examiner to the Ashbury Neighbourhood Development Plan [ANP], and the observations/constructive criticism contained therein, it is much appreciated.

For ease of reference in response, we reproduce each point made followed by the steering group's feedback:

### *Policies 1&5*

Both policies are well-designed. Are they both intended to ensure that (as appropriate to the proposal concerned) new development satisfies all the criteria/factors?

***P1 Yes, other than criteria 5 where, as this may not be relevant in some instances, we would welcome a potential modification to amend the wording to reflect local circumstances.***

***P5 Again yes, albeit we accept that criteria iii is unlikely to be financially viable on smaller scale developments.***

### *Policy 3*

This policy is also well-designed. However, should the detailed technical criteria be located in the supporting text? In addition, how would the policy cope with an update of the technical standards within the Plan period?

***P3 The inclusion of the technical data was intended to better frame the policy, however, we would be happy to move it to the supporting text if advised to do so.***

***With regard to updates, our intention is that these will be dealt with under the proposed 'monitoring & review' procedures [appendix 4 refers] with meetings of the M&R group set no more than 6-months apart – the M&R group is already shadowing the current steering group. If it would be better to reference this within the supporting text we would be happy to do so.***

### *Policy 6*

I looked at the proposed LGSs in detail. The Evidence Base was helpful.

LGS5 presents inevitable challenges on clarity for development management purposes. Could the policy objective better be achieved by its incorporation into an additional policy (by way of a recommended modification) which offered protection for chalk streams/watercourses?

***P6 We would welcome any thoughts that better enabled us to protect the chalk springs & streams, many of which cross residential properties, given their importance as wildlife habitat.***

### *Policy 7 (Community Facilities)*

This policy is another well-considered element of the Plan. I saw the importance of the facilities included in the policy in the neighbourhood area.

However, the policy suggests that there might be other community facilities to which the policy would apply. How would the potential uncertainty on facilities be addressed as part of the development management process?

***P7a We are not aware of any other community facilities that have not been listed, but should any be notified to us then such facilities would be added into the policy through the 'monitoring & review' procedures***

Policy 7 (Infrastructure)

Should this be Policy 8?

***P7b Or perhaps 7b to keep both elements more closely aligned, but a very valid point, and we would be happy to separate this if advised to do so.***

I suggest that the first and third paragraphs are supporting text rather than policy. As such I am proposing to recommend that they are repositioned accordingly. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

***Equally valid, and again we would be happy to the text if advised to do so..***

In the second part of the policy what is meant by 'active support will be given...'? Does it mean that the development highlighted 'will be particularly supported'?

***Yes. With an aging population that makes up a higher proportion of residents than the national average we are very aware of the dependence of many on public transport and hence improving same is high on our CIL 'wish-list'.***

### **Representations**

Does the Parish Council have comments on any of the representations made to the Plan?

***For the most part these appear low key, the exceptions being those from OCC, Gladman Developments, and Rob Stewart.***

***We are currently working through the comments made by these and the other parties and will present in tabular form our immediate responses under separate cover.***

***On completion of this exercise we will acknowledge and respond to all parties where we have contact details, setting out our responses to their specific points.***

Cliff Davies  
21<sup>st</sup> March 2019

pp Ashbury Parish Council & ANP steering group