

SILKSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Submission Draft Version

Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Questions by Independent Examiner, Rosemary Kidd

Rosemary Kidd MRTPI
NPIERS Independent Examiner
8 March 2023

Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan Examiner's Questions

Following my assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan and representations, I would appreciate clarification and comment on the following matters from the Qualifying Body and/or the Local Planning Authority as appropriate. In order to ensure openness and transparency of the examination process, these questions and the responses should be published on the Council's website.

In addition to questions, I am including proposed modifications to the wording of policies and the justifications where I consider it necessary, in order to give the QB and/ or LPA the opportunity to respond, if they wish, in advance of receiving my examination report. A full explanation will be included in my examination report of the reasons for proposing the modifications.

The Policies Map should cover the whole of the Plan area. Would the LPA provide me with a map of the parish as a whole and showing the location of the Inset Maps for the 2 villages and any sites referred to in the policies located outside the Inset Maps (eg the Green Corridor).

The **Policies Map** shows some areas shaded green on Map 1A and green hatched on Map 1B. What do they represent? They are not marked in the key.

What is the status of the **Silkstone Design Code**? Does it form part of the SNP or is it proposed to adopt it as SPD?

Policy H1 – the settlement boundaries for the two villages are not shown on the Policies Map. I note that there is grey shading over the villages in the Barnsley Local Plan Maps in Appendix 6 but it is not clear what this defines. Have settlement boundaries been defined in the Local Plan or are the grey areas on the Local Plan maps the areas inset from the Green Belt. Are settlement boundaries to be defined through the SNDP? If not, I propose replacing the term "settlement boundaries" with "areas inset from the Green Belt". Are there any proposals for development on the safeguarded land SL25?

Paragraph 5.1.25 – The statement in paragraph 5.1.22 is anecdotal evidence. In order to provide the evidence to justify a Rural Exception Site, a local housing needs assessment should be carried out for the parish. It is suggested that reference to this is included in paragraph 5.1.25. Is the QB aware that sites for rural exceptions housing may be considered through the route of planning applications as well? Should the reference be to a "Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order". Would the QB confirm that the following is acceptable:

In the first instance a Local Housing Needs Assessment would be carried out to determine whether there was a need for affordable housing and the type and size of homes required. If the need was demonstrated, there would be a 'call for sites' 'preferred sites'. The scheme could be progressed through an application for planning permission or through a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Policy NE1 – The green corridor is shown indicatively in the Design Code. To enable Part 2A to be interpreted consistently it should be shown on the Policies Map. Would the QB and LPA agree on the area to be shown and provide me with a map.

Policy NE2 – paragraph 3 of the policy and points 1 -3 set out examples of how biodiversity net gain could be achieved. As such they explain how the policy could be applied and would be more appropriate in the justification. Similarly, the second sentence of the fourth paragraph gives further examples. Would the QB confirm that they accept that these examples should be placed in the justification.

Policy LGS1 – Most of the proposed LGS appear to be identified on the Local Plan as Green Spaces to be safeguarded under BLP Policy GS1. As far as I can make out from the on line plan, only sites 1 and 2 are not identified on the BLP Map. Would the LPA / QB confirm that this is correct.

Would the QB confirm what additional benefits would be gained by designating the sites as Local Green Space?

Policy LGS1 - The Policies Map shows a narrow ribbon of land as sites 2A and 2B. The Assessment refers to the landscaping one to two metres either side of the path adding to its attractiveness. Is it intended that an area on both sides of the path incorporating the adjacent landscape belt should be included as Local Green Space or solely the route of the footpath? Would the QB confirm that the area shown on the Policies Map A1 is correct.

Policy BH1 – The map in Appendix 3 shows the location of the candidate non-designated heritage assets with asterisks on each location. In order for decision makers to interpret the policy consistently, the properties and their curtilages should be shown on a clear OS base map in the assessment and on the Policies Map. It would be helpful to include photographs of the properties in the assessment.

Policy D1 section 1 - I have concerns that these generic sustainable building design principles from the Design Code are too prescriptive to be included in a neighbourhood planning policy. Some of these topics are addressed through Building Regulations. Would the QB and LPA confirm that they would accept that they should be included in the justification as examples of how the policy could be implemented, otherwise they should remain solely within the Design Code document.

Policy D1 Point 2A relates to the location of new residential areas. As possible future windfall locations are set out in Policy H1, it is recommended that this point should be included in Policy H1.

Policy D1 Point 2B encourages opportunities to be taken to link open spaces to create wildlife corridors. It is recommended that it would be better positioned in Policy NE2.

Policy D2 - It is considered that point 1D is overly prescriptive for a planning policy. In any case the Design Code sets different standards for 2 and 3 bedroomed homes. Would the QB confirm that the following modification is acceptable: ***“Private amenity space should be provided relevant to the size of the dwelling.”***

Policy D2 section 2 – I am proposing to recommend that a cross reference to this section should be included in the justification to Policy BH1. ***“Policy D2 and the Silkstone Design Code 3 set out principles for the design and landscaping of proposals that involve the conversion of historic buildings.”***

Policy R1 – If the type of improvements are examples rather than firm proposals, I am proposing to recommend that they should be set out in the justification to the policy.

Is the penultimate paragraph of the policy on landscaping schemes necessary in this policy in view of the more detailed Policy NE1?

The paragraph on Green Belt policy replicates national and strategic policy and is not necessary.

Policy RD1 – This policy only supports “appropriate” proposals in the built up areas of the two villages. How do you define “appropriate”? How are proposals outside the villages to be considered? How is overnight stabling to be provided in the villages? To overcome these issues, I am proposing to recommend that the restriction to “within the two villages” is deleted and reference is included to development being in accordance with BLP Policy E6. Would the QB and LPA confirm that this is acceptable:

Revise the first paragraph of the policy to read: “Development proposals which promote appropriate rural diversification and provide local employment opportunities will be supported *in accordance with Barnsley Local Plan Policy E6.*”

I shall propose that the examples should be included in the justification. Reference to Airbnb should be deleted as it is an example of a letting company.

The paragraph on Green Belt policy replicates national and strategic policy and is not necessary.

Policy T1 – I am proposing to recommend that the first paragraph of this policy should be moved to Policy H1 (to be consistent with my recommendation on Policy D1 point 2A) as it relates to the location of new residential areas.

Would the QB confirm that the station referred to is at Silkstone Common. The station should be named in the policy for clarity.

Points from Representations

Does the QB wish to include a reference to Noblethorpe Woods in Section 5?

Would the LPA confirm that site EC11 referred to in a number of representations was not allocated in the BLP.