

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE SUDBROOKE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: Patrick Whitehead DipTP (Nott) MRTPI

Examination Ref: 01/PW/SNP

Ms Christine Myers
Clerk to Sudbrooke Parish Council

Mr Nev Brown
West Lindsey District Council

Via email

12 August 2019

Dear Ms Myers and Mr Brown

SUDBROOKE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINATION

Following the submission of the Sudbrooke Parish Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) for examination, I would like to outline several initial procedural matters and seek further clarification on a number of points pertaining to the Plan.

1. Examination Documentation

I can confirm that I am satisfied that I have received a complete submission of the draft Plan and accompanying documentation, including the Basic Conditions Statement, the Consultation Statement and the Regulation 16 representations, to enable me to undertake the examination.

Subject to my detailed assessment of the draft Plan, I have not at this initial stage identified any very significant and obvious flaws in the Plan that might lead me to advise that the examination should not proceed.

2. Site Visit

I will undertake a site visit to the neighbourhood plan area during the week commencing Monday 19 August 2019. This will assist in my assessment of the draft Plan, including the issues identified in the representations.

The site visit will be undertaken unaccompanied. It is very important that I am not approached to discuss any aspects of the Plan or the neighbourhood area, as this may be perceived to prejudice my independence and risk compromising the fairness of the examination process.

3. Written Representations

At this stage, I consider the examination can be conducted solely by the written representations procedure, without the need for a hearing. However, I will reserve the option to convene a hearing should a matter come to light where I consider that a hearing is necessary to ensure the adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case.

4. Further Clarification

I have set out in the Annex to this letter some initial questions seeking further clarification from Sudbrooke Parish Council (SPC) and from West Lindsey District Council (WLDC). I would be grateful if

written responses can be provided within **two** weeks of receipt of this letter. It is possible that I may have further questions, following my site visit.

5. Examination Timetable

As you will be aware, the intention is to examine the Plan (including conduct of the site visit) with a view to providing a draft report (for 'fact checking') within 4-6 weeks of submission of the draft Plan. However, as I have raised a number of questions I must provide the opportunity to reply. Consequently, the examination timetable may be extended. Please be assured that I will seek to mitigate any delay as far as is practicable. The IPe office team will seek to keep you updated on the anticipated delivery date of the draft report.

If the Parish Council or Local Planning Authority has any process questions related to the conduct of the examination, which you would like me to address, please do not hesitate to contact the office team in the first instance.

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure a copy of this letter is placed on both the Parish Council and the West Lindsey District Council websites?

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Yours sincerely

Patrick Whitehead

Examiner

ANNEX

From my initial reading of the Sudbrooke Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting evidence, I have the following preliminary questions for SPC and for WLDC:

1. The Plan does not include an indication of the period over which the Plan is to take effect. Could SPC confirm that the Plan period is that shown in the Basic Conditions Statement (paragraph 1.8) as 2018 until 2036?
2. If the Plan is 'made' it becomes part of the Development Plan for the area, and has the same legal status as the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP). The Plan makes no reference to the local planning policy framework, including the CLLP, or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) document. The Basic Conditions Statement, whilst referring to the NPPF, also omits reference to the local policy framework (although it does include a table *Development Management Policies and conformity with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan*). In order to provide clarity, would the SPC and WLDC agree to a new section being incorporated into the text of the Plan following the Introduction section, setting a policy context for the Plan including the NPPF and the CLLP? If this is the case, please can SPC and WLDC provide the appropriate text for insertion.
3. Section 7 makes reference to the CLLP proposal for a 10% increase in new housing in Sudbrooke amounting to around 71 new dwellings, but advises that 181 new homes have already been permitted in the Plan area, with around 155 at Sudbrooke Park. Can WLDC provide reference numbers for the permissions covering the more significant of these developments, and – where possible - links to websites providing the documentation?
4. In the case of Policy 3, Local Green Space, and in order to have due regard to the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 37-019-20140306), could SPC confirm that the relevant individual landowners have been contacted at an earlier stage in the Plan-making process?
5. Policy 5 refers to identified 'protected trees', shown on figures 11 and 12. Figure 11 shows large areas coloured as Protected Trees (TPOs). Can WLDC confirm that these green coloured areas are, in all cases, Area TPOs?
6. Figure 12 refers to Nettleham Beck and Balancing Ponds, shown as notional linear features. For the purposes of Policy 6, can SPC confirm that the balancing ponds are located within these linear features?
7. Figure 14 shows the identified settlement breaks. Area 1 has a western boundary which follows an identifiable feature – Sudbrooke Road, and the Parish Boundary for a short distance, but then turns eastwards and then northwards away from any identifiable feature on the ground. Can SPC provide a reason for this? Figure 14 also shows a boundary for Area 2 which follows the Parish Boundary and some identifiable features for the eastern and southern boundary, but large parts of the northern and western boundaries appear to be arbitrarily defined. Can SPC provide a justification for this?
8. For the purposes of Policy 10, non-designated – or locally listed – heritage assets are identified in Appendix 2 and have been assessed using the criteria in the NPPF. Can SPC confirm that individual owners also been consulted about the proposed inclusion of their properties as suggested in Historic England's Advice Note 7, paragraph 23?

9. Does SPC have any further comments it wishes the Examination to take into account relating to the Regulation 16 responses?