

Kempsey 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.

Initial Comments

The Plan is well-presented and provides a clear and distinctive vision for the neighbourhood plan area.

It is clear that there has been a close overlap between the evolution of the Neighbourhood Plan and its evidence base. In addition, the Plan clearly sits within the context provided by the SWDP. The combination of these two factors is best practice and follows the approach set out in Planning Practice Guidance.

Points for 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 some initial issues for clarification. The comments that you make on these points will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

I have some general points and then I set out specific policy clarification points in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan.

General clarification

Policies Map – Local Green Spaces

Using the Policies Map (Fig.5) I was able to find the local green spaces on my visit to the Plan area. In all cases, they show up on electronic map bases. They comfortably meet the criteria in paragraph 77 of the NPPF.

However, for the purposes of development management they do not show the sites with sufficient clarity. Subject to any comments at this stage I will be recommending in my report that the local green spaces are shown on separate insets maps of an appropriate scale for accurate identification purposes.

Identification of policies

I can see that the policies are shown in a different colour from the supporting text. With other elements of the presentation of the Plan this is sufficient to meet the basic conditions. You need not take any further action on this point for examination purposes.

Nevertheless, you may wish to consider including the policies themselves in text boxes. This is a technique used in many other neighbourhood plans and local plans. It makes it easier for the reader of any plan to be able to identify the policies at a glance.

Policy-based clarification

K4

Is there any specific reason why the second part of the policy has been included?

As I read that part of the policy it is a repeat of the supporting text to Policy SWDP2. In this context, it reads as supporting text to a policy rather than as a policy itself.

K7

Figure 11 has not reproduced in a particularly clear fashion. I will be recommending that this matter is remedied.

Figure 11 will also need a key. In particular, the overlap is not clear between the final part of the policy and the green infrastructure shown on figure 11. Please can this point be clarified?

K8

What would be the intended relationship between the application of this policy and Policy 37 of the SWDP on a day-to-day basis?

K10B

I looked at the K10B i and ii sites on my recent visit to the Plan area.

A series of linked questions are set out below:

- How will the assessment of criteria a) and b) take place?
- What will be the respective roles of the Parish Council and MHDC (as the local planning authority) in this process?
- How will the minimum amount of enabling development be determined? Will the limit be on the number of houses to be delivered or on the extent of land-take within the site shown in the neighbourhood plan or the minimum necessary for the enabling development to be viable?
- Should the Plan include any further guidance on how the enabling development should be delivered?
- Should the Plan include any further guidance on how the land for community, recreation and sport is delivered?
- To what extent can the proposed recreation area be satisfactorily accessed from Pixham Ferry Lane?
- Have either MHDC or Worcestershire County Council come to a decision on the acceptability or otherwise of the proposed passing places in Pixham Ferry Lane as described in the Planning Statement (paragraph 6.25) submitted with the current planning application (16/01396)?

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for responses from either the District Council or the Parish Council (or both) by Tuesday 6 June 2017. Please let me know as soon as possible if this timetable is unrealistic. It is intended to maintain momentum on 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 topic concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Kempsey Neighbourhood Plan

19 May 2017