

East Hanney Neighbourhood Development 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.

Initial Comments

The Plan provides a clear vision for the neighbourhood area. A key success of the Plan is the way in which the Vision, Themes and Objectives result in the grouping of the resulting policies into the four identified themes.

The presentation of the Plan is good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is clear. The Plan makes good use of various high-quality maps.

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 able to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of the examination 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:

General

Several of the policies are written in a way which will be difficult to apply on a day-to-day basis by the District Council. This includes commentary that issues should 'be considered' and that certain works 'will be encouraged' which appear throughout the Plan.

Please can the Parish Council explain its thinking on this matter? Could the relevant policies be modified so that they become supporting policies?

Policy EHNP1

This is an excellent policy which is underpinned by the submitted Design Code

In the round it is a very good local response to section 12 of the NPPF.

Policy EHNP2

This policy proposes a well-defined boundary which is underpinned by the details in Appendix C. Developers (Responses 8 and 13/14) comment that the use of a settlement boundary is restrictive. Does the Parish Council wish to comment on these responses?

Policy EHNP3

The first sentence of the second part of the policy is explanatory text and not a land use policy. As such, I am minded to recommend that it is deleted and repositioned into the supporting text.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Policy EHNP4

This is an important policy in the Plan.

Given the relationship of the East Hanney/West Hanney gap with the identified gap in the made West Hanney Plan, did the Parish Council consider using the same policy approach (Policy RS2 of the West Hanney Plan) to ensure consistence for development management purposes?

Did the Parish Council assess the extent to which the proposed gap between East Hanney and Grove should be addressed differently in the Plan than that between West Hanney and East Hanney given that it is both larger in scale and does not yet exist in the form proposed to be protected by the policy?

Policy EHNP7

Is there any specific evidence to support the policy's requirement for a 20m buffer beyond the commentary in the supporting text?

Policy EHNP8

I looked at the proposed local green spaces (LGSs) carefully during the visit. I have also looked at the details in Appendix D.

Please can the Parish Council advise about the sizes of the various LGSs (other than D and H).

The final section of this note provides an opportunity for the Parish Council to respond to the various comments made on some of the proposed designations

Policy EHNP10

The 'Policy Context' helpfully draws attention to Policy 23 of the Local Plan Part 1. I can also see the way in which the submitted Plan has addressed local circumstances.

Nevertheless, is the Parish Council satisfied that the policy is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan?

The third part of the policy is difficult to follow. Please can the Parish Council explain its approach?

Policy EHNP11

The fifth part of the policy reads as explanatory text rather than policy. As such I am minded to recommend that it is deleted and repositioned into the supporting text.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Policy EHNP12

The second part of the policy reads as an aspiration. Was this the Parish Council's intention?

Should this part of the policy acknowledge that its mathematical approach would better apply to major developments?

Policy EHNP17

The policy has been presented in a different way to the others and is difficult to navigate. Please can the Parish Council explain its thinking and (if applicable) propose a revised policy.

To what extent does the policy add specific value beyond the details in Policy 25 of the Local Plan?

Is the second part of the policy aspirational?

Representations

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

I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representations made by:

- Landan Homes (Response 8);
- Frances Dudley (Response 9);
- Lagan Homes (Response 13/14);
- Bloor Homes (Response 15); and
- Dijkman Planning (Response 16).

The District Council proposes a series of revisions to certain policies and the supporting text in the Plan (Response 5). Does the Parish Council have any comments on the suggested revisions?

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for responses to the questions raised by 30 August 2023. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I would be happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled, please could it come to me directly from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

East Hanney Neighbourhood Development Plan

2 August 2023