

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan

Independent 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 is well-presented. It provides a clear and distinctive vision for the neighbourhood plan area. Its focus on the character and history of the town is very appropriate. I saw from my visit to the Plan area the importance of the policies that set out to safeguard the role played by the town centre both in the Plan area and in its wider hinterland.

In addition, it is clear that there has been a close overlap between the evolution of the Neighbourhood Plan and its consultation and evidence base.

Points for Clarification

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the Plan area. I am now in a position to raise some initial issues for clarification. They are designed mainly for the Town Council.

The comments that are made on these points will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and 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.

General Policy clarification

Policy H1- Does Figure 5 provide sufficient clarity for the implementation of the Plan through the development management process?

Policy H6 – I can see the supporting text at 4.1.12.

However, is there any supporting evidence for the policy?

Why has a threshold of five dwellings been applied?

To what extent does the Town Council consider that the policy has regard to national policy?

Policy H7 – Is there any evidence to support the two threshold figures in the third paragraph of the policy?

Policy H8 – How does the Town Council consider that the policy is in general conformity with policies 44 and 46 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy?

Policies H10/11 – These policies read more as planning application validation requirements rather than policies. Are they appropriate for a neighbourhood plan?

Policy TT2 – I read this as a non-land use policy. I intend to recommend that it is moved to a separate part of the Plan. Does the Town Council have any comments on this matter?

Policy B4 – What is meant by a ‘significant’ part of the development should be commercial in nature? As drafted does the policy have the clarity required by the NPPF?

Could the site be displayed on a separate plan or on Figure 13 (as a specific policy)?

Policy LAF4 – What is the logic for the overlap between the proposed local green spaces and the wider range of open spaces in Policy LAF1?

Will there be an inherent conflict between policies LAF1 and LAF4 with regard to the five local green spaces?

I can see that the Open Space audit provides comprehensive information. However please can I be advised of the size of LAF4A Hallsfield Meadow?

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for comments by Thursday 26 October 2017. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain momentum on 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 can all responses be sent to me by Wiltshire Council and make direct reference to the policy concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan

18 October 2017