

PETERSTOW NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Submission Draft Version

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

Rosemary Kidd, Dip TP, MRTPI
NPIERS Independent Examiner
29 August 2018

Peterstow 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 send me copies of the representations from G Gibbons and Herefordshire Highways (referenced 7 and 10 in the Schedule of Representations at Regulation 16 Stage) as these were not included in the pack sent to me.
2. Paragraph 5.2 refers to "recent planning decisions that have identified matters that should be taken into account in considering where development proposals should be regarded as 'major'" and refused in accordance with 2012 NPPF paragraph 116. Would the LPA comment on this statement and whether they consider it appropriate for the NP to include factors to be used in assessing whether proposals constitute "major development" in addition to those set out in the NPPF. Does the LPA consider that the wording set out in Policy PTS2 is sufficiently clear to enable decision makers to make consistent decisions?
3. Policy PTS3 refers to the ecological corridor along Wells Brook. Would you provide a map to show this area.
4. Policies PTS2 and PTS5 employ the word "preserve". I shall recommend that it be amended to "conserve" to accord with national and strategic policy. Policy PTS4 refers to "preserves and enhances" I shall recommend that it be amended to "protected, conserved and where possible enhanced" to accord with strategic policy. Would the QB confirm that this is acceptable.
5. Policy PTS5 includes text within the policy box that is not emboldened. I have assessed whether this is in fact policy or descriptive text. Where it is descriptive text under points 1, 2 and parts of 5 and 6 I shall recommend that it is included in the justification. Would the QB confirm that this is acceptable. Is it intended that the improvements under point 7 will be sought through development proposals or would it be more appropriate to include their promotion in the Plan as a Community Project (in terms of the Parish Council will seek....)?
6. Does Policy PTS6 add any locally specific requirements to that set out under Core Strategy Policy SD3?
7. Would the QB provide me with an assessment of the proposed Local Green Space against the factors set out in 2012 NPPF paragraphs 76-77 to demonstrate why the site is considered to be demonstrably special. Is the common protected by law or by any other designation?
8. Policy PTS10 sets out a Community Project to reduce the impact of traffic in the village through the use of developer contributions. I consider that this is not a planning policy and should be included in a separate section of the Plan on Community Projects. However, the bullet points and the last sentence of the first paragraph set out measures that development proposals should implement where possible. In view of

the small scale of potential development in the village, is it likely that the traffic measures could be implemented through development proposals?

9. Paragraphs 3.7 to 3.8 sets out the housing calculation which includes an allowance for 10 dwellings at Yew Tree Residential Park Home. The Officer's Appraisal in the Peterstow Progression Report does not refer to this site and concludes that there is a residual figure of 16 dwellings at April 2017. Would the QB and LPA discuss and agree the figure for housing required and provide me with any amendments required to paragraphs 3.7 – 3.8.
10. I consider that the second paragraph of Policy PTS16 on live/work units does not provide a locally distinctive policy approach for this form of development and consequently I shall be recommending that this paragraph should be deleted.
11. Would the LPA confirm whether the 2018 Polytunnels SPD has been adopted?
12. Criterion a) of Policy PTS16 refers to "the requirements for exceptions set out in Policy PTS2". What is this intended to refer to as the bullet points in Policy PTS2 are to be used in determining whether a development constitutes major development in an AONB?
13. The final paragraph of Policy PTS18 could be considered to be a blanket restriction of this form of development in the AONB. NPPF makes provision for development in exceptional circumstances and the 2015 Government guidance on Renewable Energy states that "*proposals in ...Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and in areas close to them where there could be an adverse impact on the protected area, will need careful consideration*". Would the LPA and QB comment on the following proposed additional wording to be added to the final paragraph "**....except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest and they do not adversely impact upon the character of the AONB.**"
14. What was the number of households in the Plan area at 2011?

Rosemary Kidd
Independent Examiner

29 August 2018