Scotton Neighbourhood Development Plan

Response to Mr. Ashcroft's - Examiner's Clarification Note

General background

Scotton Neighbourhood Development Plan was largely compiled by the local village Steering Group during the tenure of the previous Parish Council. The Steering Group disbanded after the newly formed Parish Council had taken office in July 2019. Residents who had been part of the group were subsequently invited to reform, however, this offer was declined and those involved chose not to take any further part in the process.

Questions for the Parish Council

Policies 1-5

Is the Parish Council currently satisfied that the identified sites are commercially viable and deliverable within the Plan period?

Yes, throughout the Site Assessment process the Steering Group have been in regular contact with the site owners and have asked whether they intend to apply for planning within the next 5 years. All stated they would and some site either have planning permission or are going through the planning process currently such as site 13 and 15a. We are confident that all identified sites are deliverable.

Each policy includes an * after dwellings. Did the Parish Council intend to include an appropriate definition?

The * can be removed from the text. It is a typographical error.

Policy 1

How does the proposed site area overlap with the existing uses at the Three Horseshoes PH?

The developable part of the site is to the rear of the existing car park. Map 3 on page 27 could be revised to show a clearer boundary. The car park and public house would remain.

Is the proposed residential allocation consistent with the identification of the PH as a community facility in Policy 11 of the Plan?

Yes, the public house is to remain open as a community facility and the proposed dwellings to the rear are likely to be developed by the same landowner as the pub. These will either self-build units or smaller accommodation for younger families.

If it is so, to what extent might the implementation of the policy support the continued longer-term operation of the public house?

It is unsure whether the development would be for immediate family members or for the open market dwellings. There was no discussion about linking the development of the site to the continued viability of the public house.

Policies 2 and 3

Given the general approach taken towards residential development in Policy 6 is the specific allocation of these two sites necessary?

Yes, the identified sites accommodate some of the identified level of growth for the village. It was an important factor during the consultation that the plan identified as many sites to

accommodate the development as possible. A great deal of work has been undertaken with the landowners to make sure the sites are deliverable.

To what extent would the detailed criteria in each of the policies add value to those in the first part of Policy 6?

A possible solution could be to have Map 3 above Policy 6 (maybe a revised Policy 1?) and link the allocation of sites directly to the criteria in Policy 6 and delete the site-specific policies so that the allocated sites and any other development have a consistent criteria for consideration?

Policy 6

In the first part of the policy should a separate policy approach be applied to Scotton and to Scotton Common?

Scotton and Scotton Common are all part of the Scotton Parish and should be treated as one.

The second and third parts of the policy read as supporting text rather than as policy. Please can the Parish Council provide information on the way that it has designed these parts of the policy.

Part 2 has been designed to prioritise infilling within the village before the use of sites on the edge of the settlement – something which became a consistent message during the consultation with the community.

Part 3 is linking this Policy with the CCLP Policy LP2/4 on necessary policy requirement for any additional growth to be supported by evidence of community support.

Policy 7

Does 'Where appropriate' add any value to the policy?

Was the intention to have a policy approach which supports extensions which comply with the various criteria?

Yes, that was the intention. There have been cases, as identified in the pictures on page 42 where extensions have been almost doubled the size of the existing house and have not always complimented local character of the existing dwelling or the wider street-scene. This issue became a regular talking point during the public consultation events.

The photographs on page 42 have no explanation or context unlike those elsewhere in the Plan. Please can the Parish Council provide the necessary text/explanations.

These are two examples of where the original dwellings looked, either completely different (one was a small cottage) or are more than double the existing dwelling size.

Policy 8

In the General Principles part of the policy the approach sets out a preference rather than a policy. This would not bring the clarity required by the NPPF.

I am minded to combine parts 1 and 2 of the policy to set out principles for the conversion of existing buildings. Thereafter a separate part of the policy would address proposals for their replacement with new units.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

We agree with your suggestion. We believe that this will make the policy clearer for application.

Policy 9

As West Lindsey District Council comment the four criteria in the policy are technical matters controlled by other bodies rather than by the District Council in its capacity as the local planning authority. I am minded to reposition them into the supporting text.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Yes, we agree with the suggestion to reposition these into the supporting text.

Policy 11

Is the 'safeguarding' included in the first part of the policy the detailed approach in the second part of the policy? How about the following revision:

2. Proposals to redevelop, or change the use of, an existing community facility, as identified on Map 7, will only be supported where one of the following is met:

a) the facility is demonstrably no longer fit for purpose and the site is not viable to be redeveloped for a new community facility; or
b) the service provided by the facility is met by alternative provision that exists within reasonable proximity; what is deemed as reasonable proximity will depend on the nature of the facility and its associated catchment area; or
c) the proposal includes the provision of a new community facility of a similar nature and of a similar or greater size in a suitable on or offsite location.

The first and second parts of the policy are potentially confusing. Are there any other community facilities in the neighbourhood area beyond those listed in the first part of the policy?

Map 7 suggests that this is not the case. No other community facilities.

Policy 12

The Character Area descriptions are well-considered. Thank you.

Question to the District Council

Will there be an update to the Local Plan Housing Growth Monitoring Report (currently 28/02/2020) during the examination period?

If so, please will you advise me when it becomes available.

Representations

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan in general?

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on the representations made to the Plan by the Historic England and by the District Council?

No further comments.

Historic England comments change depending on who replies. The land development on Eastgate has had different comments in that there was no comment and then they raise concern about the view of the Church.

Scotton Parish Council

18th April 2020