

Broughton and Old Dalby Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2036

Questions from the Independent Examiner

Prepared by

JOHN SLATER BA(Hons), DMS, MRTPI

John Slater Planning Ltd

14th October 2017

Introduction

1. As you will be aware I have been appointed to carry out the examination of the Broughton and Old Dalby Parish Neighbourhood Plan. I have carried out my initial review of the Plan and the accompanying documents and am about to start drafting my report. I also carried out a visit to the area on 9th October 2017.
2. My view is that I should be able to deal with the examination of this Plan by the consideration of the written material alone but I do reserve the right to call for a public hearing, if I consider that it will assist my examination. There are a number of questions that I have arisen before I start writing my examination report upon which I would appreciate the comments from both the Qualifying Body (QB) and possibly, the Local Planning Authority (LPA).

Questions

3. I note that pre-application discussions are taking place regarding a new model village at Six Hills. I note that the plan states that the NP will need to be reviewed if the proposal were to be approved. In which case could the LPA and the QB comment on whether it is premature for the neighbourhood plan to be proposing a separation area and how confident can I be that the boundaries shown are appropriate. How is the Six Hills proposal being advanced – will it be through a planning application or as a Local Plan allocation.?
4. Can the LPA update me as to the likely timescale for the decision to be taken on planning application 17/00397/OUT, which covers the proposed housing reserve site?
5. Can the QB explain to me the rationale behind the inclusion within the Limits of Development of the parcel of land fronting Dalby Road on the west side of Marquis Road at Queensway– is there an extant planning consent on the land?
6. I note that the Plan refers to the possible release of additional land by the MOD at Old Dalby. Can the LPA or the QB identify the land on a map and let me know what policies would relate to that land – is it classed as countryside
7. I noted on my site visit the existing housing development at Station Lane, plus the fact that planning consent has been granted for a further 20 units, plus the proposed allocation of the site beyond, as a reserve site under Policy H2. Did the QB consider the possibility of proposing its own Limit of Development for this residential enclave or should proposals be considered under countryside policies? In respect of that land between the industrial development and the railway line, would it be covered by the limit of 10 for

windfall development set for Old Dalby? I see on the table of planning decisions on page 27, that the decisions are recorded as Old Dalby but that Queensway limit on the opposite site of the road is set at 3.

8. I note that there is an outstanding planning application for part of the land at Central Field, Nether Broughton for 3 dwellings. Can the LPA provide me as a likely timescale for its determination, as it would not be appropriate for it to be allocated as LGS, if there is an extant planning consent. Similarly, I noticed that the Parish Council did not object to the planning application on the basis that it would secure the protection and enhancement of the open space in the central section of the site. Would the QB have a view as to whether the extent of the LGS designation should be reduced to cover that just section and should the whole field be included within the Limit of Development
9. Can the QB provide me with copies of the correspondence that shows that the owners of the land proposed for designation as LGS were contacted prior to the publication of the proposals, as recommended by the Planning Practice Guidance?
10. I understand that the proposed affordable housing percentage has changed with the latest version of the emerging Local Plan. Would the QB want to made plan to reflect that change and could the LPA and QB suggest a revised wording for me to consider, in making my recommendation, or does the QB want to keep it as submitted? I note the Policy H5 supports a local connection affordable housing policy. Is there any evidence such as a Local Housing Needs Assessment that would support the need for such a policy?
11. Is there an inconsistency between Policy H3 which requires the inclusion of 4+ bedroom properties on windfall sites and Policy H4 which requires the provision of 1,2 and 3 bed properties and refers to an issue of under occupation of larger properties in the parish? Perhaps the QB and the LPA could both comment.
12. A number of policies e.g. ENV 3 and EN7 refer to “Permitted development” which has a specific meaning in planning terminology, as development covered by the General Permitted Development Orders. Is that the intention or is it a reference to development which has been permitted by the grant of a specific planning consent? Could the QB please clarify?
13. Policy CF1 refers to buildings and land currently or last used as a community facility. In order to avoid uncertainty as to what facilities are covered by the policy, at development management stage, I would wish to see a list of the plan area’s community facilities and for these to be shown on a map including showing the extent of the sites.
14. I have some comments regarding the scoring methodology used for the selection of LGS. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF sets out 3 criteria to be used to decide whether the sites are appropriate and in the second criterion gives examples of possible attributes that could constitute “particular local significance”. However, the Steering Group has seen them as capable of

being scored separately. If a site displayed historic significance and tranquillity with ecological importance would score higher than say a village sports field. I do not think that was the way the NPPF was drafted to secure the protection of LGS. However, I would appreciate understanding why the QB adopted this approach.

15. Can I be appraised as to the acreage of the site covered by Old Hall Parkland LGS and would both the LPA and the QB comment on whether it constitutes an *extensive tract of land*?
16. Is the QB envisaging that Policy BE2 Working from Home would allow employees, who do not reside at the property could be employed at people's houses? I need to be clear that was the intention, (which I suspect it was).
17. Finally, I am intrigued by the Policy BE4 Old Dalby Test Track. Could the LPA confirm to me whether there are any planning controls that restrict the use of the line to "the testing of trains and railway equipment" or is it available to all railway use including passengers and freight. Furthermore, are there any planning restrictions that relate to the operating hours of the line and if there are, what are the permitted hours of use and are they enforceable?

Concluding Comments

18. It would be helpful if I could have responses to these questions within the next 14 days to allow me to conclude my examination report expeditiously
19. I would be grateful if this note and the subsequent responses could be placed on Melton Borough Council's and the Neighbourhood Plan's respective websites.

John Slater BA(Hons), DMS, MRTPI

Independent Examiner

John Slater Planning Ltd

14th October 2017