

COTHERSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Submission Draft Version

Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions
by Independent Examiner, Rosemary Kidd

Rosemary Kidd MRTPI
NPIERS Independent Examiner
21 January 2022

Cotherstone Neighbourhood Development Plan Examiner's Questions

May I congratulate the Neighbourhood Forum for their very clear and well presented neighbourhood plan.

Following my assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan and representations, I would appreciate clarification and comment on the following matters from the Qualifying Body and/or the Local Planning Authority as appropriate. In order to ensure openness and transparency of the examination process, these questions and the responses should be published on the Council's website.

In addition to questions, I am including proposed modifications to the wording of policies and the justifications where I consider it necessary, in order to give the QB and/ or LPA the opportunity to respond, if they wish, in advance of receiving my examination report. A full explanation will be included in my examination report of the reasons for proposing the modifications.

1. Would the QB confirm that they have consulted all the owners of property proposed to be designated through the policies of the NP, particularly the Locally Valued Heritage Assets and the Local Green Spaces..
2. I note that the Appendices to the CNP include summaries of the assessments of the Locally Valued Heritage Assets, Local Green Spaces and Valued Views. Have full assessments of the properties and sites (with photographs and maps) been published as background evidence? If so, would you provide me with a copy of each.
3. East and West Greens are included for designation under Policy CNP2 as a LVHA and Policy CNP4 as a LGS. Would the QB explain whether both designations are necessary and what additional value in policy terms is to be achieved.
4. The area included in Policy CNP3 is part of the area to be designated under LVHA1. It is also within the Conservation Area. Would the QB explain why Policy CNP3 is considered necessary and what additional value in policy terms is to be achieved through this policy.
5. To improve the clarity of the policy to manage development in the LGS, I am proposing to recommend that the second sentence of Policy CNP4 should be revised to read: **“Inappropriate development that would be harmful to the openness of the Local Green Spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances.”** Would the QB and LPA confirm acceptance of this wording.
6. Would the QB comment on the suggestion by Natural England about including reference in the Design Code to demonstrating how a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain is to be achieved. Has the LPA adopted a policy or guidance on the subject?
7. Would the QB and LPA comment on the representation from WS Hodgson & Co that Policy CNP7 and the Design Code is unnecessarily restrictive and the proposed revision to the last line of the policy to introduce greater flexibility.
8. Would you also supply me with the full Screening Assessment on the pre-submission plan for the SEA and HRA as requested in the Procedural Note.