

Tiddington-with-Albury 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 concise vision for the neighbourhood area.

The presentation of the Plan is very good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. The Plan makes good use of various high-quality maps and photographs.

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 able to raise issues for clarification both with the Parish Council.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of the examination report and in recommending 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:

Policy TwA1

Part C addresses different matters and potential outcomes of planning applications.

I am minded to recommend that it is split into its component parts

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Policy TwA2

Does the first sentence of Part C of the policy add any local value beyond the national policy approach on Green Belts as set out in Section 13 of the NPPF?

Policy TwA3

This is a good policy underpinned by the contents of Appendix 3

Policy TwA7

I looked at the proposed Local Gap carefully during the visit. Its purpose is self-evident.

However, there is an inconsistency between the two parts of the policy and between the policy and the supporting text. On the one hand, the text comments that 'land included in the gap is considered to be the minimum to ensure that the visual openness of the space between the two settlements is protected'. On the other hand, Part A of the policy is simply concerned to avoid the coalescence of the two settlements.

Please can the Parish Council advise of its intentions?

Policy TwA11

Whilst the purpose of the policy is clear its language is rather confusing and its opening element uses both positive and negative wording.

I am minded to recommend modifications so that the policy takes on a simpler format which requires proposals to meet the three criteria.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

For my clarity should the reference to 'lept' be 'kept'?

Representations

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

I would appreciate comments from the Parish Council on the representations made by Fisher German (Representation 9).

The District Council proposes a series of revisions to certain policies and the supporting text in the Plan. Does the Parish Council have any comments on the suggested revisions?

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for responses and the information requested by 19 December 2022. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I would be happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled, please could it come to me directly from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Tiddington-with-Albury Neighbourhood Development Plan

21 November 2022