

Slyne with Hest Parish Council Responses to NP Examiner's Initial Thoughts

8. The Parish Council thanks you for your offer and is happy for you to make your own recommendations for alternative wording.

10. We will delete Policy HRA1, if you are minded so to do, which we included on the recommendation of our consultant

We will delete the second paragraph of HE3 (see response 25).

11. We will take the City Council's advice and replace bullet points 2 and 4 with a single bullet reading:

Affordable housing must be provided in line with the requirements in the Local Plan.

12. The expectation of the Parish Council is that the HAPPI principles should be applied to any housing that could be occupied by any age group, which we assume would be interpreted as dwellings without staircases.

13. City Council response

14. City Council Response

15. It was the nature of the site that was responsible for the figure. Given that very few choices were available, we felt that the Parish was already being well used by way of strategic sites, and that as an identified sustainable settlement, the Local Plan required us to make a contribution to housing numbers. We wanted to avoid other sites, also in green belt, which could have resulted in the loss of the village as an integral settlement.

16. The permanence of the Green Belt as it would be drawn by the Local Plan is the wish of our community as evidenced in feedback received in consultations with residents. However, we realise that we have little influence over this.

The Parish Council was advised that para 140 of the NPPF can be interpreted to mean that our Neighbourhood Plan could amend the

Green Belt boundaries changed by the strategic policies of the Local Plan.

This is a detailed amendment as it changes the status of one small field. The Parish Council was working on this document at the same time as the Local Plan was being prepared. The strategic policies established the need for a change to the boundaries. We consider our Neighbourhood Plan's proposal a part of the change. Para 140 only refers to 'boundaries' and not to 'boundary'.

17. It is possible that our proposal would form a precedent, but we are not qualified to comment on this.

19. City Council response

20. We consider that the house frontages will show a much more pleasing appearance viewed from the canal towpath. We have maintenance of the amenity value of the canal in mind here. The proposed footpath/cycleway will separate the access or gardens from these houses from the wildlife corridor, which will sit in the strip of land adjacent to the canal. Developers will have to follow the requirements of Policy T3 of the Local Plan.

Checking this section has brought attention to our need to renumber DM44 and DM45 to DM43 and DM44.

21. We were not aware of the significance of the Minister's statement and would be willing to amend the requirements in 9 and 10. A description of M4(2) requirements would be possible in 9. We may consult the City Council with regard to its Climate Emergency amendments to the Local Plan, which may go some way towards replacing the requirements of 10.

22. City Council response

23. Thank you for pointing this out. The wording should be amended to delete the words 'attached to or...'

24. Yes

25. Yes. We can delete that.

26. City Council response

27. Our inclusion of Class E g) 3 iii was felt to be justifiable because although there is a safeguard written in that class usage i.e. the phrase, 'without detriment to the amenity of that area', it was thought this was not enough to protect individuals well being from the impact of 'industrial processes' being carried out from residential properties.

28. The references should read paragraph 84 and 85 of the NPPF and not 89 and 90.

29. We felt including this class restriction created a balance in supporting appropriate sensitive sustainable growth and expansion of our local rural economy without having a detrimental impact on the green belt, village or individuals. Having industrial processes operating within the green belt is not something we wish to support.

30. Should be Paragraph 159 not 155

31. We recognise that there is some duplication in this Policy but throughout the consultation process this was one of the major concerns raised by the local community and would like to maintain some reference to it in the Neighbourhood Plan that shows we have taken their concerns seriously. Bullet Point 3 about using evidenced local knowledge gives some additionality. The Parish Council over the years have gathered and commissioned several reports etc that could provide robust evidence about local flooding issues.

32. We are currently working with the City Council to provide the improvements to mapping you suggest, along with 10 figure grid references and illustrative photographs. The Views policy is important to us, although we are aware that views are a subjective issue. We believe that they are one of the more important features of our Parish.

33.

34. We have considered your comment and, if you are minded to remove this policy, we would support that.

35. Our response to follow as agreed by yourself.

36. Our response to follow as agreed by yourself.

37. Our response to follow as agreed by yourself.

38. Our response to follow as agreed by yourself.