

Cottenham 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 distinctive vision for the neighbourhood area. In particular it addresses a series of important issues in a positive and effective fashion.

The layout and presentation of the Plan is good. The various maps add to its depth and interest. The differences between the policies and the supporting text is very clear.

Points for Clarification

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan and have visited the neighbourhood area. I am now in a position to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council. The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

I also have a specific question for the District Council. It is set out towards the end of this Note.

Questions for the Parish Council

Policy 1-2

On what basis does the Parish Council expect developers to go beyond national standards?

Policy 1-5

In part b) why has the figure 3 been selected?

In part f) what harm would be caused with parking provision at the front?

Policy 1-7

Is any part of Les Wood affected by the Cambridgeshire County Council development?

Policy 2-1

The policy comments that the development framework should be extended. Does the Plan itself propose to do so or is the policy an expectation that the District Council would do so at some point?

Policy 2-2

Given the approvals which now exist in the neighbourhood area for new residential development what purpose will this policy serve?

Is the approach anticipated in paragraph 2-2e practicable?

Policy 3-1.1/3.1.2

I can see the relationship between Policies 3-1 and 3-1.1/2

However, the reference to the medical centre/drop-in centre in both sites is confusing. As submitted neither policy has the necessary clarity.

In particular:

- in the event that a medical centre is developed on either of the two sites could development simply proceed on the other site making the provision for sections B and C of each policy?
- in the event that a medical centre was delivered on another site in the village centre could development simply proceed on both the identified sites making the provision for sections B and C of each policy?
- in the event that it became clear that the provision of a medical centre was not viable could development simply proceed on both of the identified sites making the provision for sections B and C of each policy?

Subject to the responses to the points above I am minded to recommend that both policies 3-1/1 and 2 are modified so that they would support the range of uses identified in each case rather than the complicated association with the wider development of a medical centre. Does the Parish Council have any specific comments on this proposition?

Policy 3-2

I can see that associated residential accommodation would be desirable. However, is it essential if the over-riding ambition is to facilitate a new supermarket?

In any event is it practicable to include apartments within a supermarket (on upper floors) when most such buildings have vaulted roof structures rather than traditional upper floors? Might such design requirements otherwise prevent a supermarket from coming forward?

I am minded to recommend a modification which deletes the residential element. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Policy 3-2.1

I can see the relationship between Policies 3-2 and 3-2.1

However, on what basis has the Watson's Yard site been specifically identified as a site for a supermarket beyond and any other site in the village core?

On what basis have the numbers in parts C and D of the policy been determined? Are they too prescriptive?

Can the site actually accommodate the four types of development proposed?

Policy 4-2

Is the policy now necessary following the recent grant of planning permission for the use intended (S/2702/18/FL)?

Policy 4-3

Is the policy now necessary following the recent grant of planning permission for the use intended (S/2705/18/FL)?

Policies 4-4 and 5-1

Please can the Parish Council clarify the relationship between the two policies?

As I understand the situation Policy 4-4 proposes a defined parcel of land and Policy 5-1 is not site-specific. Is this correct?

Would the development of a second recreation ground be practicable and/or viable?

What would be the intended trigger point for the identification/delivery of a second recreation ground? As submitted the policy that it would occur if that Policy 4-4 is not fully achievable within 5 years. Does this mean that no progress has been made within that period?

In any event would the issue of a second recreation ground be a matter for the review of any made neighbourhood plan?

Policy 6-1

Is the policy supporting a general extension of burial grounds? Or a specific proposal as set out in the Evidence Paper E10? Or both?

Policy 7-2

The principle of rural employment is acceptable. However as submitted the policy has no spatial dimension. Was this intentional?

Policy 7-3

At face value this policy is contrary to the Green Belt policies in the NPPF. Similarly, it appears to be determining a current or a future planning application rather than setting out a policy.

Please could the Parish Council expand on its approach to this matter? Paragraph 7-3f appears to do so. However, it is not immediately obvious how an expansion on an existing brownfield site in the Green Belt would enhance the Green Belt. Plainly it would affect its openness.

Maps

Some of the maps in the Plan are confusing or at odds with one another. Please could I be provided with a comprehensive and large-scale map that showed the inter-relationships between the parcels of land affected by policies 4-2, 4-3 and 4.4 in and around the Recreation Ground

I would be happy for the District Council to assist with this task if necessary.

Question of clarification for the District Council

Policy 3-1.1

What is the anticipated timetable for the determination of planning application S/4698/18/OL?

Representations

Does the Parish Council have any comments on the various representations made to the Plan?

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for comments from the Parish Council by 3 June 2019. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

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 could it all come to me directly from South Cambridgeshire Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Cottenham Neighbourhood Development Plan.

13 May 2019