

Examination questions - Corringham NP – Responses

Introduction The table below sets out the questions posed by the Examiner in his clarification note and outlines suggested responses from the **Corringham NP SG**. The positive comments from the Examiner on the NP, including the links between vision, objectives and policies, the evidence papers, presentation and maps are much appreciated. Consequently, the table focuses on the specific request for clarification.

Examiner Questions	Notes and responses
<p>Policy CNP1 The final paragraph reads as supporting text rather than policy. Please can the Parish Council clarify its intentions?</p>	<p>This is intended to be part of the formal policy. The PC would be happy for it to become Clause (ix): <i>Not increase the risk of flooding and/or exacerbate existing drainage problems.</i></p> <p>The final sentence could be moved to the Justification to read: <i>The drainage requirements are in line with the requirements of national policy, advice from the Environment Agency and the provisions set out in Policy LP 14 of the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017).</i></p>
<p>Policy CNP2 The policy uses the wording ‘may be developed’. I am minded to recommend that the various elements of the policy comment that ‘proposals will be supported’ to generate a more positive approach. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?</p> <p>There is a discrepancy between the Corner Farm site on the Policies Map and on the aerial photo details on page 41. Please can the Parish Council advise on the correct area?</p>	<p>It is accepted that the wording could be as follows: <i>Proposals that seek to develop the site for approximately 7 dwellings will be supported...</i> and for points B, C and D in a similar manner.</p> <p>The aerial photo represents the site area as originally submitted, appraised and proposed. We are happy to amend the Proposals Map accordingly.</p>
<p>Policy CNP3 The four criteria in the policy are both well-considered and locally-distinctive. Nevertheless, are they intended to apply only within the settlement of Aisby?</p>	<p>The detailed requirement emerged from the Character Study, which looked at Aisby in detail. However, we would wish the design principles to apply to any proposed new dwellings in Yawthorpe and the open countryside. Perhaps this could be best achieved by an additional clause, e.g.? <i>(v) where applicable to the plot or building in question, the same design principles should be considered for any proposed new dwellings in the open countryside.</i></p>
<p>Policy CNP8 The policy has a more restrictive approach than paragraph 203 of the NPPF (2021 version). Please can the Parish Council expand on its approach to this matter?</p>	<p>The intention is to give these locally significant buildings/structures as much protection as possible. However, it is acknowledged that the policy wording may vary from other examples in adopted NPs. Perhaps the approach taken in nearby Morton, see below, could be applied?</p> <p><i>Proposals for changes of use or other development affecting the identified unlisted buildings of positive character should demonstrate how this would</i></p>

	<p><i>contribute to its conservation whilst preserving or enhancing its architectural or historic interest taking into account local styles, materials and details and the character, context and setting of the asset. The effect of a development proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the planning application concerned. In weighing development proposals that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be taken having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.</i></p>
<p>Policy CNP10 There is an overlap between the proposed open spaces and the local green spaces (LGS) in Policy CNP11. Given that LGS designation is the most effective of the two approaches I am minded to delete the LGSs from Policy CNP10 Does the Parish Council have any observations on this proposition?</p>	<p>The overlap is recognised, but we are not sure that it is incompatible. However, the possible amendment is reasonable provided that it is made clear that the recreation ground also fulfils a formal recreational function in addition to its role as an LGS which relates to openness, views and the way that it brings open countryside into the village</p>
<p>Policy CNP11 The proposed LGSs have been carefully-chosen and take account of national guidance.</p>	<p>This is welcomed.</p>
<p>Policy CNP14 This is a good policy with a detailed recognition of the circumstances where exceptions may be appropriate.</p>	<p>This is welcomed.</p>
<p>Policy CNP16 The third part of the policy reads as a community action rather than as a land use policy. As such I am minded to recommend its repositioning into the Community Aspirations? Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?</p>	<p>We wish this idea to be pursued, but accept that it may not be, strictly speaking a land use or development related matter. Therefore provided that opportunities are not prejudiced, it could become a community aspiration.</p> <p>NB we note that in the final para of the justification it refers to the <i>...specified route (c)...</i> rather than (3)</p>
<p>Representations. Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan? In particular does it wish to comment on the comments from the District Council? WLDC</p>	<p>CNP2 (A) The comments made by WLDC are similar to those made at reg14. However, the Submission version included changes, making reference to the Character Assessment and flooding. (B) Ditto. (C) Ditto, the suggested amendments have already been made in the Submission version</p> <p>Maps: Noted, the maps/photos in the text will be reordered. The mapping inconsistency has been noted and the Proposals Map will be amended.</p> <p>CNP 3 This comment is similar to the clarification point from the examiner about whether the policy applies in the open countryside. As noted above it</p>

was the intention and clarification could be added, however, over-complication of the policy should be avoided.

CNP 4 A clause could be added, but the duplication of heritage policies needs to be avoided. Could they be cross referenced in the Justification?

CNP5 The question of the principles within the Character Assessment applying in open countryside needs to be addressed consistently. (These rural lanes are shown on the parish wide Proposals Map).

CNP6 Agreed, reference should be made to the Proposal Maps

- Agreed KV9 looks West and text needs correction.
- The appendix requested, for KVs, is not considered necessary, the information is already in the Character Assessment.
- The inconsistency between maps is noted. It is suggested that KVs are removed from the parish wide map (they are difficult to locate at this scale) and they are covered in the three insets.

CNP7 It is felt that the list in the policy and the uses of shading on the Proposal Map gives sufficient clarity. The PC does not wish to over complicate the maps and is conscious of the cost and time involved in producing unnecessarily complex maps.

CNP8 The matter of terminology could be addressed by a note in the text, rather than through what would be an extensive set of changes to the text of the Character Assessment and the Policy Document and to the Proposals Maps
As noted, The PC does not wish to over complicate the maps and is conscious of the cost and time involved in producing unnecessarily complex maps.

CNP 10 It is not considered that a separate table/appendix is necessary. These are clearly open spaces.
The inconsistency is note and it is subjected that the list in the policy is amended to read:

- A) Pond/Picnic site
- B) Recreation Ground
- C) Village Hall Grounds
- D) School Play Area.

CNP11 given the clarification above, it is not necessary to amend/complicate the Proposals Map

Savills (for Thonock and Somerby Estates)

1.3 In the interest of transparency, the Estate also submitted a site plan of its entire landholdings in Corringham, with a view to supporting any other sites within their ownership, which the Neighbourhood Plan Group might see as preferable options for accommodating residential development.

These comments are seeking to increase the number of new houses, by maximising densities and including additional sites. There is no planning or legal requirement for the NP to over-allocate sites and dwelling numbers. The Basic Conditions have been met. In any event, it is like that, because of flexibility in dwelling numbers on CNP(A) & CNP(C) and the prospect of infill development, more than 14 new dwellings will be provided in Corringham Village over the plan period.

In the interest of transparency Corringham Parish Council noted the submission of a site plan showing the entire landholdings but did not feel it was their place to suggest suitable sites. At the time the PC requested Savills to revisit the submission and present smaller and more focused sites for consideration and assessment. This supported one of the aims of the PC in producing an NP, which was to increase certainty about new development, to benefit the local community, landowners and developers, in accordance with the original philosophy of the Localism Act. The PC is satisfied that this has been achieved through a wide ranging and robust site selection process, reflecting the Regulations and good practice.