

Mrs Janet Cheesley  
Independent Examiner

Telephone: Email:

Our ref: Kings Clipstone Neighbourhood Plan

12/10/2018

Dear Ms Cheesley

### **Kings Clipstone Neighbourhood Plan Representations**

Since designation of the Kings Clipstone Neighbourhood Area on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2016 this Council has been working closely with the Parish Council on the preparation of its Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Through its own organisation and motivation the Steering Group has progressed its plan to the point of submission in July 2018.

Following receipt, we have considered the plan as a whole and in particular the ability to implement it as part of the Development Plan for the District. This followed the comments made by the District Council on the Pre-Submission Draft in October 2017 (enclosed) We are satisfied that the Plan is largely in accordance with the Strategic elements of the Newark & Sherwood Local Development Framework and could be implemented as part of it. We do however suggest a small number of amendments which would, in the view of the Council, boost conformity and aid implementation. These are set out in the Representation below.

#### **4. How does this Plan work within the planning system?**

There is an error at paragraph 9 which refers to the Allocation and Development Management DPD the document title should read Allocations & Development Management DPD.

#### **NP1: Sustainable Development**

To ensure that Criteria 1 (a) of NP1 is more clearly defined the District Council would suggest that specific reference should be made to the type of development being promoted i.e. is this specific to 'residential' or is it anticipated that all types of development will be directed to the built up area? Clearly there will be forms of development which are appropriate within the open countryside beyond the Built-up Area - indeed as recognised in Policy DM8 of the Allocations & Development Management DPD. Additionally it is considered that the reference to development 'needs' could be slightly misleading, given how the settlement sits within the Development Plan's Spatial Strategy (i.e. a Spatial Policy 3 settlement with no formal development requirements, but where under certain circumstances appropriate development would be supported). To remove uncertainty the wording of criteria 1 could be amended, taking account of the Plan's apparent emphasis of residential development, to read: *'directing residential development to locations within the Built-Up Area boundary as defined in NP 2'*

### **NP2: Development within the Built-Up Area Boundary**

Again it is considered that the policy could be more specific about the type of development it is supporting – is it restricted to residential development? Criteria 1 of NP2 refers to proposals for ‘infill development’; In light of the built up area boundary including land at ‘The Archway’ which if developed would in the opinion of the Council be better described as an extension rather than infill the District Council would suggest removing the word ‘infill’ from criteria 1 of NP2.

It is also noted that the playing field outlined on Map 10 is included within the built up area, outlined on Map 4 where proposals for infill development are encouraged subject to criteria set out in Policy NP2. Whilst the playing field would benefit from protection from undesirable development under Spatial Policy 8 – (Protecting and Promoting Leisure and Community Facilities) of the Core Strategy for the avoidance of doubt the District Council would recommend removing the area of the play space from the boundary as detailed on Map 4 of the NP.

### **NP3: Protecting the Landscape Character of Kings Clipstone Parish**

To ensure that views of landscape value not included within the view cones are considered it is recommended to ensure that it is clear that the view cones are ‘indicative’. Map 6 ‘Key View Points and Vistas’ could be made clearer by including images/titles of the 4 vantage points. Additionally to ensure easier reading of Map 6 it would be beneficial to change the colour of the key landscape viewpoints.

Additionally to ensure clarity Viewpoints A, B, C and D should be clearly referenced against each point of Policy NP3.

### **NP4: Design Principles for Residential Development**

In line with National Policy the District Council promotes high design quality for residential development. Proposals are assessed against Policies DM5-Design and DM6-Householder Development of the Allocations & Development Management DPD (Adopted July 2013) along with the Householder Development SPD (Adopted November 2014) although the District Council does not directly use the traffic light system associated with Building for life 12 (BFL12) the wording of Policy NP4 that ‘encourages’ the use of BFL12 to encourage high quality design at the earliest stage of application is supported.

### **NP5: Protecting or Enhancing Heritage Assets**

Section 12 of the NPPF provides a graduated approach to heritage assets, along with a scale of harm. There is otherwise a presumption against development that would be harmful to designated heritage assets and their setting. Consequently in order to make policy NP5 NPPF compliant, the Council recommends a re-wording to criteria 1 of NP5 as follows: *“Development should avoid harm to the significance and setting of King John’s Palace, a Scheduled Monument of national special interest (as defined by Historic England and identified on map 5). The setting of the Palace includes the Great Pond.”*

### **Aspirational Policy 1: Pedestrian Safety (Section 20)**

Whilst the Council understands the reasons why local residents consider road safety to be too important an issue not to be represented in the Neighbourhood Plan, our view remains that this kind of aspirational policy is beyond the scope of neighbourhood plans and as such the Examiner may exclude non-planning related policies as has been the case with previous NP examinations.

**Design Guide**

Page 16 of the Design Guide shows images of actual properties located with King Clipstone with crosses against them suggesting that the dwellings are of poor design. The District Council consider using images of actual properties located within the Parish is in-appropriate and request that these images are removed from the Design Guide. In addition images of cars and vans that include number plates are visible, for the purpose of data protection and privacy of residents the District Council would request that these images are also removed.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Norton  
Business Manager – Planning Policy