

# **NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

## **Submission Draft Version**

**North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions  
by Independent Examiner, Rosemary Kidd**

Rosemary Kidd, Dip TP, MRTPI  
NPIERS Independent Examiner  
28 May 2019

## North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions

Following my initial assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan and representations, I would appreciate clarification and further evidence on the following matters from the Qualifying Body and/or the Local Planning Authority. In order to ensure openness and transparency of the examination process, these questions and the responses should be published on the Council's website.

A number of policies state that certain types of development "will be permitted" or "will be refused". The NPPF paragraph 11 states that "*Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.*" The decision making authority will consider the policies of the development plan as a whole as well as other material considerations in determining planning applications. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine whether a particular form of development will or will not be permitted. I shall be recommending modifications to the policies where relevant to address this matter.

1. Has the LPA provided an indicative housing requirement for the NP area? If not, would they comment on the adequacy of the calculation derived from the Plan's Local Housing Needs Assessment. Has an assessment of the level of affordable housing need in the Plan area been prepared?
2. I shall be recommending that the housing requirement should be made explicit in a policy (rather than in the justification) and that this should include housing commitments and an estimate for windfall development as well as the three housing allocations. Would you provide me with data on current commitments and completions in the parish since 2018. Has an estimate of the level of windfall housing development been prepared?
3. Would you provide me with a plan to show the distance of 15m from the foul pumping station adjacent to sites H3 and H4. I note that the wording has been proposed by Anglian Water. Would the QB/LPA comment on the suggestion by North Crawley Estates to measure the distance to the dwelling rather than the boundary of the curtilage. What would happen to the area of land within the 15m separation zone if it were to be measured to the plot boundary?
4. Would you provide me a measurement of the developable areas of the three housing sites and approximate density of the development proposed.
5. How is it intended that site H4 should be accessed? Is it dependent on an access through site H3 or would it be possible to gain an access directly from Orchard Way? Should the means of access be stipulated in the policy requirements?
6. Would the QB explain what is intended by the term "enhanced affordable housing" in Policy H5. Is there any local evidence on the number and type of affordable housing required? If not would the QB agree that the criterion on affordable housing should state that it should be delivered in accordance with Plan:MK Policy HN2?
7. Has there been any assessment or discussion with the Highways Officer about how access to Site H5 is to be achieved? Is it usual to request tracking diagrams for small residential developments such as this?

8. Would the QB/ LPA comment of the following suggested revisions to Policy H5:
  - a. **Revise line 1 to read "...residential development of *about 15 dwellings...*"**
  - b. **Revise line 2 to read "...*Development proposals should satisfy all the following criteria:*"**
  - c. **Revise the first criteria to read: "*Proposals should include a mix of housing types, sizes and tenures in accordance with the latest evidence of housing need. A terrace of two bedroomed dwellings suitable for first time buyers would be supported.*"**
  - d. **Revise the second bullet point to read: "*Proposals should incorporate affordable housing in accordance with Policy HN2 of Plan:MK.*"**
  - e. **Combine the third and sixth bullet points to read: "*The housing should be laid out and designed to make a positive contribution to the conservation area and its setting to enhance the entrance to the village. Open space should be laid out to safeguard the protected horse chestnut tree. The right of way should be retained across the site.*"**
  - f. **Combine the fourth and fifth bullet points to read: "*Access to the proposed development should be designed to the satisfaction of the Council's Highways Officer. Parking should be located within the plot and should accord with the Milton Keynes Parking Standards SPD January 2016. The transport statement should consider how the access to the development can contribute to creating an entrance to the village.*"**
9. Representations from AAH Planning and Ken Graham have challenged the adequacy of the Housing Site Assessment Document. Would the QB respond to the comments made.
10. I shall be recommending that Policies T1 and T2 should be included in the Plan as Community Projects as they do not set out planning policy. Would the QB explain what the second sentence of Policy T2 refers to and how it is to be applied.
11. It is considered that Policy T3 does not accord with NPPF paragraph 28 which supports the development of the rural economy. Would the QB comment on the following proposed revision: "***Proposals for new employment development will be supported provided that they demonstrate that traffic generated will not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the local highway network and that adequate on site parking can be provided***".
12. It is considered that the first part of Policy HD3 is overly prescriptive and does not take account of national guidance on advertisement control. I shall be recommending that it be deleted.
13. The Local Green Space Assessment indicates that Kilpin Green and Nixey's Walk are designated as village greens. If this is correct, is there any need to protect the areas further by designating them as LGS? The map for Nixey's Walk proposes that only the area to the east of footpath to be designated. Why is the land to the west of the footpath not included?
14. I shall be recommending the following revision to Policy L1 so that it reflects national guidance in NPPF 78. "***New development in these areas will be***

***supported to enhance the recreational use of the area. Inappropriate development will not be supported except in very special circumstances.”***

15. The first part of Policy L2 is overly prescriptive. I shall recommend the following revisions to the wording of the Policy: ***“New development affecting a right of way should make provision for the right of way as part of the development or for its diversion on a convenient alternative route. Improvements to the standard of accessibility will be supported.”***
16. Policy C1 as worded does not accord with national planning guidance as NP policies cannot stipulate when permission will be refused. Many other NPs include a policy that sets out the conditions that have to be met when changes of use that would result in the loss of a community facility are proposed eg marketing for a given period, business no longer viable, or alternative premises being provided. Unless the QB can propose an alternative form of wording along these lines, I will have no option but to recommend that the policy is deleted. It should be noted that planning permissions relate to the use of a building and cannot stipulate which groups may or may not use a building.
17. Does Policy C2 refer to the use of any contribution to be made to the Parish Council through CIL? Has or is it intended to introduce CIL in the Council’s area? Has the QB undertaken any work to identify the type of improvements that are required as a consequence of the new development proposed in the Plan?

Rosemary Kidd  
Independent Examiner  
28 May 2019