

KINGTON AREA NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Submission Draft Version

Kington Area Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions by Independent Examiner, Rosemary Kidd

Rosemary Kidd, Dip TP, MRTPI
NPIERS Independent Examiner
4 April 2019

Kington Area 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 the QB confirm that all landowners of potential housing sites and proposed Local Green Spaces were consulted on the proposals in the NP affecting their land.
2. Would you provide me with maps to show the location of the Views listed in Appendix 4 for my site visit. Appendix 4 includes a list of open spaces which differs from those listed under Policy LGS1. I shall propose that the list be deleted from Appendix 4.
3. Policy KANP ENV (ii) refers to the Characterisation Assessment. I can only find a draft version of the Kington Character Appraisal 2015 on the parish website. Is this the correct document referred to in the policy? If so, will you provide me with a link to the final version. Paragraph 9.1.6 also refers to the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment; should this be referred to in the policy?
4. How is it intended that the requirement to "not break the skyline" in Policy KANP ENV1(iii) should be interpreted?
5. What is the reasoning to include the turkey farm and adjacent land within the Hergest settlement boundary?
6. Policy KANP H2 (vii) requires new green infrastructure to be provided and this is shown in diagram 1. To address concerns in the representations about the loss of amenity space to provide the access road, I shall be proposing that the justification to Policy KANP H2 should include the following: "**Green infrastructure, including landscaped amenity open space and children's play areas, should be provided within the development to meet the needs of future residents and to compensate for any amenity land / green space lost to provide access to the site from Eardisley Road.**" Would the QB confirm that this is acceptable.
7. The final paragraph of Policy KANP H2 is a procedural matter and is not appropriate for a planning policy. I shall recommend that it be deleted from the policy and the following added to the justification: "**In view of the significance of the development to the local community, pre-application consultation on the proposed development with the community and Town Council will be welcomed.**"
8. Policy KANP H2 - Has access from the proposed housing site south of Kington directly onto Kingswood Road been considered?
9. Policy KANP H5 - I shall propose that the open space requirements in (iii) and (viii) should be combined and a caveat added that it should be dependent on the scale of the development. Would the QB comment on the proposed revision to criterion (viii) to read: "**Provide multi-functional green infrastructure or community amenity space proportionate to the number of dwellings or contribute to new or improved off site provision.**"

10. Would you provide maps to show the extent of the two industrial estates to be safeguarded under Policy KANP E1. How are these areas rated under Core Strategy Policy E2?
11. What is the evidence source for the four pedestrian / cycleway improvements identified in Policy KANP INF1 and other community infrastructure enhancements listed in the justification to Policy KANP CF1? Are they required to access / serve the proposed housing developments or are they Community Aspirations?
12. Is there evidence that the primary school will require expansion to accommodate the proposed housing development?
13. Policy KANP LGS1: Has the QB prepared an assessment of the proposed Local Green Spaces to demonstrate how they satisfy the criteria of NPPF paragraph 77. If not, would they please provide me with the assessment. I have found documents that describe the green spaces but these include some sites that are not shown on Plan 1 and does not include others that are. It is particularly important to demonstrate why the sites proposed are demonstrably special to the local community in order to support their designation as LGS. Note that the NPPF states that LGS designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or green spaces. Agricultural land and caravan sites are rarely demonstrably special green spaces.
14. In order to ensure that Policy KANP LGS1 accords with NPPF para 78, I propose revising the first paragraph to read: **"The following areas are designated as Local Green Spaces. Development that would result in the loss of green space will not be supported in these areas except in very special circumstances."** Would the QB confirm that this is acceptable to them.
15. A number of the areas are small amenity areas within housing estates (GS09, GS27, GS30, GS33 and small areas off GS17). Unless there is evidence to show that they are demonstrably special in accordance with NPPF 77, I shall propose that they should be identified as "valued local amenity areas" and the following policy wording included: **"The following sites shall be safeguarded as valued local amenity areas and shall be retained and enhanced for amenity and children's play."** Would the QB confirm that this is acceptable.
16. Policy KANP GI1: The policy refers to the Green Infrastructure network identified on the GI Study Plan. If the network is to be protected it must be clearly identified on the Policies Map so that the boundaries of sites can be identified. Map 5-5 in the GI Strategy 2010 shows areas in a diagrammatic form only and includes built up areas as well as open areas. It would not be possible to use this map to identify areas to be protected. I am proposing that map 5-5 from the GI Strategy should be included in the justification to the policy cross referenced from paragraph 9.11.1 and that the first paragraph of the policy should be revised to read: **"The Green Infrastructure network along the rivers corridors within and around Kington shall be safeguarded, where possible, and enhanced."** Would the QB and LPA confirm that this approach is acceptable.

Rosemary Kidd
Independent Examiner
4 April 2019