

LAVENDON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Submission Draft Version

Lavendon Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions by Independent Examiner, Rosemary Kidd

Rosemary Kidd, Dip TP, MRTPI
NPIERS Independent Examiner
3 September 2019

Lavendon 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.

1. Would you confirm the number of households in Lavendon at 2011.

The number of households reported in the 2011 census was 571.

2. Would you confirm whether there had been any response from the statutory environmental bodies on the HRA screening.

Environment Agency 25th March 2019. SEA not required.

Historic England 2nd April 2019. SEA not required.

The QB do not have a response from Natural England.

3. Would the QB and LPA like to propose any revisions to Policies E2 and E3 in view of the comments made by Natural England.

The QB suggest that we include a plan showing the location of ancient woodland and other designations within the Parish. We are considering an adjustment to the wording of Policy E2 and E3 to include reference to the protection of these designated areas.

An amended version of the Policy will be submitted for consideration.

4. Policies E2 and E3 refer to "high quality trees and shrubs". Would the QB define what is to be expected by this requirement.

The expectation was to achieve landscaping that enhances the quality of the proposed development and surrounding area, using native species that benefits wildlife and biodiversity and uses plants of a size and planting density that create a reasonable level of positive impact from the outset. We were seeking to avoid planting schemes that use inappropriate planting species or have plants that are too young and small taking a long time to become established.

5. Policy CD2 first bullet point: How is it intended that the design of development should demonstrate that the proposal supports village facilities?

Suggest we change the wording to the following:

"Demonstrate how proposals achieve sustainable development and are integrated into the village to promote social inclusion and support of village facilities."

6. Has any work been undertaken to demonstrate that Policy FR2 is feasible and deliverable? It is considered that the final paragraph of Policy FR2 is a Community Aspiration and I propose recommending that it be removed from the policy and placed in the section on Community projects.

Yes, locations of the flood storage ponds were identified in a study commissioned by MKC. A copy of this is attached.

7. Would the LPA comment on whether they consider it appropriate for Neighbourhood Plan policies to specify that they should be applied to reserved matters planning applications in Policies HT1 and H3.

MKC to respond. We have adopted this approach in other NP's where the policies seek to influence the final detailed design of schemes.

8. Would the LPA comment on whether the final paragraph of Policy HT1 is deliverable through a planning condition? Would the QB confirm that it is intended that the final paragraph should apply only to new housing development and not all forms of development?

The final paragraph is applicable to housing development first and foremost but could also be applied to any employment development proposals that come forward, where encouraging non-car modes of transport would be beneficial.

9. Policy CF1 defines the community facilities; these should be identified on the Policies Map which should be enlarged so that the boundaries of the sites can be shown clearly. Would you supply me with a map to show The Copse and confirm that this is an area of land owned / managed by the Parish Council or is publicly accessible.

A revised plan is being prepared to show community facilities.

From discussion with the OB there are other facilities that we need to show including:

*Baptist Church
St. Michaels Church
Lavendon Village Hall
The recreation area and Pavilion
The copse
The allotments*

10. The final paragraph of Policy CF2 is a Community Aspiration and I propose recommending that it should be deleted from the policy and placed in the Community Projects section.

Change accepted.

11. The NPPG states that when neighbourhood plans have decided to make provision for housing in their plan, the housing requirement figure and its origin are expected to be set out in the neighbourhood plan as a basis for their housing policies and any allocations that they wish to make. The Plan is not explicit about its housing requirement figure and is unclear about whether the sites with planning permission are considered to be commitments as they are excluded from the settlement

boundary. I shall propose the inclusion of a new policy and welcome the QB and LPAs comments on this:

“The LNP will provide for about xx new homes to meet the housing needs of the parish over the plan period 2019 – 2031.

New housing will be supported on sites that lie within the Settlement Boundary of Lavendon in accordance with other relevant policies of the development plan.

New housing will be delivered through:

- a. Dwellings which have been constructed or have planning consent granted since 2018 (confirm date);***
- b. Windfall opportunities in accordance with Policy H2 and Plan:MK Policy DS5 and the NPPF;***
- c. The housing allocation for about 8 dwellings at Harrold Road under Policy H4.”***

“Plan MK does not specify a housing figure for villages and rural settlements, other than to state that housing should be in compliance with Neighbourhood Plans. Paragraph 10.3 of the NP specifies that the housing need for villages has been set at 1 dwelling. The NP makes a positive allocation of 8 dwellings, taking account of the 132 dwellings recently permitted in the village.”

12. Paragraph 104 of the PPG on Neighbourhood Planning states that the indicative housing figure should be tested at the examination. The NPPG states that housing policies should take account of the latest and up-to date evidence of housing need Has the QB undertaken a Housing Needs Assessment or similar review of the level of housing need in the Plan area? If not, how has the level of housing provision been determined? It is considered that the general neighbourhood plan questionnaire referred to in para 10.9 does not constitute an assessment of housing need. Would the LPA comment on the level of housing need in the plan area and the provision set out in the NP.

A separate housing need assessment has not been undertaken, but we have taken into account the recent planning permissions that have been granted and not completed. As the housing requirement for the villages has been set at one single dwelling, the NP and recent permissions far exceed this figure.

13. Is there any reason for excluding the housing sites with planning permission from the settlement boundary?

A view was taken that only completed sites would be included. The proposals map could be updated to reflect more recent completions. Housing sites that have not commenced were not included to prevent attempts to significantly increase the density and therefore the number of houses being brought forward. Including all sites in the settlement boundary could reduce the level of control to prevent significant increases in housing numbers.

14. I propose deleting the final paragraph of Policy H3. I shall propose adding a paragraph to the justification to the policy to state that developers will be expected to demonstrate through their design and access statements how the policy requirements are to be delivered and that consultation with the Parish Council will be welcomed. I propose that reference to the Parish Council's wish to be engaged in

considering options should be included in a Community Projects section. The views of the QB are welcomed on this.

The alteration to Policy H3 as suggested is acceptable to the QB.

15. Paragraph 10.16 refers to the proposed open space being a “sports field” but Policy CF2 does not include any requirement for sports facilities. Would the QB confirm that “sports field” in para 10.16 should be replaced with “community open space”.

The alteration to para 10.16 is acceptable and agreed. Reference to sports field was in error.

16. I consider that Policies E4, DC1, and HT3 do not add any locally specific requirements to the strategic policies and I shall be recommending that they should be deleted. Supporting text may be added to reference the relevant strategic policies.

The recommendation to delete Policy E4 is accepted.

Policy DC1 (CD1?) was included to reflect feedback from Historic England. This policy was supported and welcomed by Historic England in their response to the regulation 14 consultation, so the QB would prefer to see the policy retained.

The recommendation to delete the first part of Policy HT3 is accepted. It would be preferred if the second part of the policy controlling frontage car parking is retained in some way, perhaps into one of the other highway and transport policies.

Rosemary Kidd
Independent Examiner
3 September 2019