

East Hagbourne 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 distinction between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. The Plan provides a distinctive vision for the neighbourhood plan area in a challenging context in terms of the relationship between existing planning policy and the emerging Local Plan. The focus on its separation from Didcot and the designation of local green spaces is both appropriate and distinctive to the neighbourhood area. Policy H3 is well-constructed.

Points for Clarification

I have read the submitted Plan and its associated documents. 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 VC1a

The proposed Local Green Gap at Lower End Field as shown on Figure 5 does not appear to relate to features on the ground. This contrasts with the other three proposed Local Green Gaps.

I acknowledge that the neighbourhood area forms its eastern boundary. However please can the Parish Council explain its decision to identify the geographic extent of this Green Gap?

Could the concept practically be administered by the District Council through the development management process if its boundaries are not clear?

Policy VC1c

Does the 'long distance views' element of this policy overlap with Policy VC2 and Figure 6?

Policy VC6

Do the two parts of the policy largely say the same thing?

Is this policy intended to apply principally to the new housing allocation (Policy H1)?

Policy H2

Does the second part of the policy require a developer to comply with each of the three types of housing (where appropriate)?

Policy H3

This policy is particularly well-constructed.

Policy CF2

Should I conclude that the 'key East Hagbourne community facilities' are those listed on pages 48 and 49?

If so, should they be listed in the policy for clarity?

Policy E1

The Plan's assessment of Local Green Spaces (LGSs) is very comprehensive. It helpfully includes the sizes of the Spaces concerned.

However, I will be recommending that two of the proposed LGSs (Lawsons Orchard and Tudor House allotments) are shown on maps which would better identify the areas concerned.

The Policies Map (Figure 3) properly shows the overlap between the Green Corridor and the three proposed LGSs within its boundary. However, has the Parish Council considered any potential conflict that would exist between the different policy approaches (VC1d and E1) that would apply within the three proposed LGSs concerned?

Representations made to the Plan

I will contact the Parish Council again once the Regulation 16 consultation period has concluded. That communication will ask if Parish Council wishes to make observations on any representations that have been received by the District Council.

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for comments by Friday 7 December 2018. 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 the District Council and make direct reference to the policy/issue concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan

23 November 2018