

Landulph Neighbourhood Development Plan

Independent Examiner's Clarification Note

Context

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 is very well-presented. The quality of the photographs and maps is very good. It results in a very readable and interesting document.

The Plan provides a clear and distinctive vision for the neighbourhood area. It is also clear that the production of the Plan has been underpinned by comprehensive research and evidence-gathering.

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 in a position to raise some initial issues for clarification. They are designed for the Parish Council. The comments that are made on these points will be used to assist in the preparation of my report. They will also inform any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

Policy 1 Part 1

I can understand the purpose of the bulk of the policy and its relationship to policies in the Local Plan.

However, on what basis has section ii of this part of the policy been prepared?

Is it reasonable to expect potential development sites to be entirely 'standalone' and not to adjoin the three types of sites listed in this section of the policy?

I have looked at the section in the Basic Conditions Statement which refers to this policy. It identifies a range of policies in the adopted Local Plan which provide a context for this policy. Do any or all of the three criteria (a-c) feature in any of the Local Plan policies listed?

This was a recommendation from Cornwall Council and was to prevent a developer developing in a single field a series of five house developments that would end up making an estate.

Policy 1 Part 3

I agree fully with the importance of the approach adopted. Nevertheless, is it a Building Regulations matter rather than a land use, planning matter?

The policy came about in response to input from the Fire Officer report. However, the examiner is correct in that this would be a Building Regulations matter anyway.

Policy 4

For absolute clarity does 'development' as used in the opening part of the policy refer specifically to proposals for waterfronts, quays, slipways and paths?

This is a very interesting and observant comment. The answer being that policy 4 regarding development under Waterfront, Quays, beaches, slipways and paths SHOULD be read in conjunction with Policy 1.

This was a recommendation from NATURAL ENGLAND to strengthen the protection of the unique and beautiful shoreline from Pentillie Castle in the north to the top of Kingsmill creek in the south.

So it doesn't stop development as long as the criteria are fulfilled.

Representations made to the Plan

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

The varied and interesting comments from the public were incorporated and/or answered by the NDP group.

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for comments by 7 March 2019. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It reflects the factual basis of the questions raised.

In the event that certain responses are available before others I am happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled please can all responses be sent to me by Cornwall Council and make direct reference to the policy/issue concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Landulph NDP

28 February 2019