

Kingsland Neighbourhood Plan Examination

Questions of clarification from the Examiner to the Parish Council and HC

Having completed my initial review of the Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan), I would be grateful if both Councils could kindly assist me as appropriate in answering the following questions which either relate to matters of fact or are areas in which I seek clarification or further information. Please do not send or direct me to evidence that is not already publicly available.

1. Please confirm the dates of the 'first' Regulation 16 period of consultation, the date that Plan was withdrawn and the date of the Plan's resubmission and the 'second' Regulation 16 period of consultation.
2. Policy KNDP 5 refers to paragraph 135 of the NPPF. May I ask you to check that this reference is correct and to point me in the right direction if it is found to be incorrect?
3. In paragraph 3.6 which accompanies Policy KNDP 5, reference is made to archaeology and national planning constraints in respect of such heritage assets which "may constrain development". Please provide me with the relevant references in the NPPF/PPG which support this statement.
4. Are the criteria in Policy KNDP 6 taken from a Conservation Area Appraisal or other document that relates to the Conservation Area? Please could I be provided with a copy of any such documents relating to the Conservation Area.
5. Policy KNDP 13 identifies a number of areas as Local Green Spaces (LGS). One of these areas is the Mortimer Park Rugby and Cricket Grounds. This is an area to the western edge of Kingsland village, home to the Luctonians Rugby Club. This is an extensive open area of rugby and cricket pitches and associated buildings together with a car park which are also included in a 'washed over' LGS designation. Such a LGS designation may adversely affect the ability of the Club to expand or adapt in the future affecting its viability. Has this been considered by the Group? Have any discussions taken place with the Club and/or owners of this site? I would welcome any comments on this.
6. Meeting housing requirements is key. HC has put forward a numerical target and there is information in the Plan itself and in the supporting document 'Meeting Housing Requirements in the Parish' to assist with this. It is necessary to check that the boundaries for the three settlements as proposed in the Plan will enable sufficient housing development to come forward to meet the Parish's minimum requirement over the Plan period. At my site visit I found all three boundaries to be drawn relatively tightly and I am particularly concerned given the Conservation Area in Kingsland that whilst there are potentially areas available for development, it is unlikely development could go ahead without harm being caused to the Conservation Area. Therefore whilst these sites might in theory be developable, their location within or close to the Conservation Area may render any development unacceptable.

I would therefore find it helpful to receive an updated list of dwellings constructed and commitment sites (those with planning permission but not yet constructed) from 2011.

In addition if these could be shown on a map alongside the proposed settlement boundary for Kingsland, that would be most helpful. This work looks to have been started through the 'Meeting Housing Requirements in the Parish' document of June 2016, but it would be extremely helpful to have all the Kingsland sites shown on one map.

I am requesting this information (which I realise will cause a considerable amount of work to be done) because one option might be to include those sites with permission within the Kingsland settlement boundary. Another option might be to remove the settlement boundaries from Cobnash and Shirlheath to allow the potential for more development in those settlements in line with Core Strategy policies. These two options are not exclusive. I would be pleased to receive any thoughts on these options or any others that come to mind.

I have also requested any documentation relating to the Conservation Area in question 4 which will also help with this query.

In addition it would appear that the settlement boundaries were drawn up by the Group based on a walkabout and other criteria outlined in the Plan. Please send me a copy of the Walks Report and if there is any other information publicly available or previously published about the basis of the boundary definitions I would welcome having sight of this.

7. Paragraph 6.6 on page 44 of the NP refers to a site 'land north of Longford' and a change in designation; please could this site be indicated on the map as part of the request above and more information given on the change in designation.
8. Paragraph 6.16 on page 49 of the Plan refers to Local Wildlife Sites. It refers to a specific site, land at Kingsleane, to the south west of Kingsland village. It indicates that although this land has been identified as a Local Wildlife Site in the Core Strategy, it is understood that it is now unlikely to meet the criteria and surveys should be required. Please could this comment be clarified.
9. For Cobnash and Shirlheath, comments are made that a certain number of sites are available, but a fewer number are known to be available at this point in time (10 and 5 for Shirlheath, page 46 of the Plan and 9 and 6 for Cobnash, page 47 of the Plan). Please explain what is meant.

It may be the case that on receipt of your anticipated assistance on these matters that I may need to ask for further clarification or that further queries will occur as the examination progresses. Please note that this list of clarification questions is a public document and that your answers will also be in the public domain. Both my questions and your responses should be placed on the Councils' websites as appropriate.

With many thanks.
Ann Skippers
6 April 2017