

Napton-on-the-Hill Neighbourhood Plan Examination

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

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. At the time the Plan was written and submitted, SDC was preparing a Site Allocations Plan (SAP). This was consulted on a proposed submission version in Autumn 2019. However, according to SDC's website, this version of the plan is not being proceeded with. It is not clear to me why this is the case. Anyway, the website indicates that work is now being carried out on a new version. It is envisaged that preferred options will now be consulted upon in October/November 2020 with a view to submission in April/May 2021.

It is clear that the emerging SAP influenced the development of the Plan. It contains numerous references to the SAP. How should these now be dealt with? If this version of the SAP is no longer being pursued, the Plan should remove all references to it. Would the Councils like to provide me with a list of those changes?

A reference to Policy SAP.1 Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding is attributed to the Core Strategy, but I think it should be the SAP (page 47 of the Plan). How should this be modified?

In relation to Policy 4, Site of the former Napton Brickworks, the policy refers to Proposal RURAL.1 of the emerging SAP seeking to add further requirements to a draft policy which was in the emerging SAP. As the policy in the emerging SAP no longer exists, what action could be taken in relation to Policy 4? Should the Plan allocate this site itself? Would this require further consultation? Should the policy be deleted? Or have events overtaken things and has planning permission been granted for the site? Please update me on the position including details of any planning applications and determinations and indicate what the preferred options might be moving forward.

2. Paragraph 2.3 on page 8 of the Plan refers to the July 2018 version of the NPPF. Should this be the February 2019 version?
3. Paragraphs 5.8 and 5.10 on page 22 of the Plan variously refer to 135 responses and 140 responses. Which is correct?
4. Please provide me with a copy of, or link to, the Housing Needs Survey prepared by Warwickshire Rural Community Council.
5. Map 3 on page 27 does not read very clearly to me. It mixes listed buildings with local amenities. This then does not seem to reflect those local services and facilities identified as part of Policy 13. It also seems that some of the numbers are incorrect; for example 9 and 20(?) Please could these issues be looked at and a revised Map or Maps be provided. It might be inset maps might be useful?
6. Policy 1 seeks to define a Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) for Napton. This in itself is acceptable in principle, but given that much of the supporting text in paragraphs 8.10 to 8.13

are now no longer relevant, please provide some suitable replacement text. This can form part of the list of changes referred to in Question 1 if preferred.

7. In relation to the BUAB, an amended map was received on 18 June 2020 from the Parish Council to SD to show an error; Manor Farm should be included. Please explain why this site should be included and whether any contact has been made with the landowner. Has this site inclusion been subject of public consultation at the formal pre-submission and / or submission stage?
8. Does SDC agree that around 21 dwellings is now the residual requirement for this Local Service Village? Table 6 details the permissions granted from April 2011 to July 2019. However, the plan periods for the Core Strategy and the Plan differ. Therefore Table 6 may give a false impression as to the residual requirement for the Plan to accommodate.
9. There is a reference on page 40 of the Plan that indicates the Core Strategy indicates only planning permissions within the BUAB contribute to the housing requirement. Please provide me with this reference, as I cannot readily find it. Can SDC confirm whether it is only permissions in BUABs that contribute to the housing requirement set out?
10. The Screening Document prepared by Lepus Consulting on page 12 indicates that a significant area in the south of the BUAB falls within the Impact Risk Zones of Calcutt Locks Meadows and Napton Hill Quarry Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). It indicates that any development other than householder development needs to be consulted upon and that in line with Core Strategy Policy CS.6 no development can take place in this area.

My reading of Policy CS.6 slightly differs from this and is that development likely to have an adverse effect on a SSSI will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. I would welcome comments from both Councils on whether my interpretation of Policy CS.6 is correct. Are there are sufficient and suitable sites within the BUAB to meet the residual housing requirement? Please provide me with clearer plans (than are in the Screening Document) to show the Impact Risk Zones of each SSSI.

11. Please could SDC confirm that the information in paragraph 8.36 of the Plan (page 43) relating to the SHLAA is correct and update me as necessary.
12. Please could the site referred to as Dog Lane/Fells Lane for self-build homes be identified on a map (this does not have to be high quality, just for me to see its location).
13. In relation to a proposed Local Green Space subject of Policy 9, e) Pastoral Field above Quincy Meadows Development, please update me on the current position with the appeal.
14. There are two references to the NPPF on page 83 and a further one on page 84 of the Plan. All three appear to be out of date. Please could these be checked and advise me accordingly.
15. Please could the Character Assessment be checked to ensure that its references to views are correct. Do some, for example, on page 21 of the Character Assessment, need updating to ensure they align with Table 8 and Policy 10 of the Plan? And if so, please provide me with a list of the updates.

16. Please could SDC clarify their comment in relation to “Page 44/45, para 8.40” in their representation?

17. Please could SDC confirm the number of representations received at Regulation 16 stage?

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. These queries are raised without prejudice to the outcome of the examination.

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 MRTPI
Independent Examiner
27 August 2020