

## **Ketton and Tinwell Neighbourhood Development Plan**

### **Examiner's Clarification Note**

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

### **Initial Comments**

The Plan provides a distinctive vision for the neighbourhood area.

The presentation of the Plan is very good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear.

Section 3 profiles an excellent profile of the neighbourhood area. In addition, the summary of major issues and related policies sets the scene for the remainder of the Plan.

### **Points for Clarification**

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now able to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council/Parish Meeting.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan:

#### *Policy KT1*

The intention of part b) of the policy are very appropriate. However, is it a process issue rather than a land use policy?

#### *Policy KT5*

This is a very distinctive policy.

#### *Policy KT9*

This policy reads well.

However, to what extent does it bring any distinctive local value beyond that already provided by existing development plan policies?

#### *Policies KT8-11*

The thought process involved in the various policies is clear.

However, is there a risk that the policies will largely have the same effect and therefore reduce the significance of the nationally-acknowledged local green spaces?

#### *Policy KT10*

I can see the analysis of the proposed local green spaces (LGS) against the NPPF criteria in the associated table. However, for clarity please can I be advised of the size of the proposed LGS 1/2/5/6/12/14/15/16?

For all the LGSs to what extent has the Parish Council/Parish Meeting critically assessed the extent to which the various proposed LGSs are already protected by any other designations applicable on a site-by-site basis?

*Policy KT13*

I can understand the circumstances which have caused the Plan not to propose the allocation of housing sites in the Plan. However, in this context is part a ii of the policy appropriate or reasonable? Is it a matter which the County Council would control at a strategic level?

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on the representation from the Vistry Group about the implications for the Plan following the recent appeal decision affecting Park Road, Ketton?

*Policy KT14*

As with Policy KT13 (in this case part a iii of the policy),

*Policy KT15*

This policy reads well.

However, to what extent does it bring any distinctive local value beyond that already provided by existing development plan policies?

*Policy KT16*

This is a well-considered and distinctive policy underpinned by the Evidence Base.

In the round it is an excellent local response to Section 12 of the NPPF.

*Policy KT17*

In the first part of the policy does 'prioritised' mean that one-, two- and three-bedroom houses should be the primary focus on housing developments?

Is the second part of the policy underpinned by evidence other than the existing number of four-bedroom houses?

Has the effect of the wider policy been assessed for any potential impacts on commercial viability?

*Policy KT19*

In general, the policy takes a positive approach to economic development in the neighbourhood area.

The fourth criterion refers to highways matters rather than planning matters. In any event is the matter generally addressed in the third criterion?

*Policy KT21*

I saw the significance of the A1 on the neighbourhood area first hand during the visit. However:

- Is the first part of the policy already addressed by national and local planning policies?
- Is the second part of the policy a matter which would be addressed by National Highways under separate highways legislation?

### *Community Aspirations*

The range of aspirations is very thorough. In some cases, they will complement the land use policies.

### *Monitoring and Review*

Section 7 of the Plan positively addresses this important matter in a very comprehensive way.

The proposal to review of the Plan six months after the adoption of the emerging Local Plan is best practice.

### ***Representations***

Does the Parish Council/Parish Meeting wish to comment on any of representations made to the Plan?

Does it wish to comment on the representation received from the Vistry Group?

The County Council makes a series of detailed suggestions about the way some of the Plan's policies should be modified to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions. I would find it helpful to have the Parish Council's /Parish Meeting's comments on these matters

### ***Protocol for responses***

I would be grateful for responses and the information requested by 21 February 2023. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I am happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled please could it come to me directly from the County Council.

In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Ketton and Tinwell Neighbourhood Development Plan

24 January 2023