

# **Thriplow and Heathfield Neighbourhood Development Plan**

## **Examiner's Clarification Note**

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt, matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

### **Initial Comments**

The Plan provides a clear and concise vision for the neighbourhood area. It is underpinned by a series of background documents which directly inform some of the policies. This is best practice.

The presentation of the Plan is very good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. In addition, the Plan makes good use of various high-quality maps.

### **Points for Clarification**

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now able to raise issues for clarification both with the Parish Council.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of the examination report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions. I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan:

#### **THP1**

Could the send part of the policy be combined with the first part?

The third part is supporting text rather than a policy. I am minded to recommend that it is relocated into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

#### **THP2**

Paragraph 6.4.1 helpfully advises that the policy is aspirational. In principle such an approach is acceptable. However, are such facilities likely to be delivered in the Plan period?

#### **THP3**

This is a very good policy which captures the character of this part of the neighbourhood area?

#### THP4

To what extent has the Parish Council assessed the two proposed Countryside Frontages against parts a) and/or b) of policy NH/13 of the South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan policy?

#### THP5

As submitted, the policy has a negative approach and does not advise about what a development proposal would need to do to secure planning permission. Was this the Parish Council's intention?

The Parish Council's comments on the District Council's representation views 11 and 12 would be very helpful (see the request later in this Note).

#### THP6

I am minded to recommend that the policy comments about use classes in the Use Classes Order rather than to specific uses. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

#### THP7

The policy proposes a well-considered selection of Local Green Spaces.

However, I am minded to recommend that the policy element takes on matter of fact approach in NPPF (and as suggested by the District Council). Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

#### THP8

The policy takes a robust approach towards biodiversity. However, it has significant overlaps with local plan policies. Which

It would be helpful if the Parish Council highlighted the parish-distinctive elements in the policy

#### THP9

This is another robust policy. Nevertheless:

- should Parts 1 and 2 be applied proportionately?
- the third part of the policy is supporting text and I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

#### THP10

This is a very detailed policy which sets out comprehensive guidance for the development of this sensitive site

#### THP11

The policy takes a well-considered approach to rural exception sites in Thriplow. However, does it bring any added value above national and local planning policies?

THP12

The policy is a combination of policy and supporting text. I am minded to recommend that the non-policy elements are relocated into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

THP15

The approach taken towards the use of potential future CIL funding is appropriate. However, is the issue a land use policy?

### **Representations**

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

I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representations received from Cambridgeshire County Council and the Environment Agency (both generally and on Policy THP10).

The District Council make a series of comments both on the policies and other general matters. It would also be helpful if the Parish Council responded to this representation.

### **Protocol for responses**

I would be grateful for responses and the information requested by 15 November 2024. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I would be happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled, please could it come to me directly from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Thriplow and Heathfield Neighbourhood Development Plan

28 October 2024