

The Parish Council is grateful for the Examiner's Clarification note and has set out below responses relating to the points raised. If, inadvertently, any responses appear incomplete or in need of further clarification, we will be willing to address any such concerns in a timely fashion.

Response to Examiner's Clarification Note.

Policy 1.

Add 'First Home' statement as Appendix 5. See attachment.

Policy 2nd para: amend to read "Starter Homes and the First Homes Policy (see appendix 5) will be prioritised"

Add 'see Appendix 5' in brackets to end of para 3.12

Reference to First Homes is made throughout the Review.

Insert new 4.1.2. "The parish has had a number of significant housing developments (e.g. 8 houses replacing 2 demolished dwellings) in recent years and with respect to the impact of further development on the character and AONB setting, the policy of appropriate housing (and other policies) is strengthened by the provision in NPPF section 15 including limitations on major developments." This is partially in response to the HNTS submission too.

Move 4.1.2 & 4.1.3 to 4.1.3 & 4.1.4 respectively.

Insert 4.1.5 "The current Government policy is for starter homes. First Homes is an emerging new policy promoted by MHCLG, which would provide appropriate housing (see appendix 5). It is likely that its introduction will be before the potential end of the life span of this Plan Review and maybe relevant going forward."

Policy 4.

Policy 2nd para: amend to read "Communal parking areas serving a maximum of 5 houses and providing parking for cars, boats and trailers to the standard above must be provided in suitable locations within close proximity to the development."

Add new 4.4.4 (and move the second paragraph 4.4.3 to 4.4.5). "Paragraphs 4.4.2 and 4.4.3 highlight the current parking issue associated with the growth of dwellings and the impact of tourism. This is further exacerbated by the increasing number of day visitors. Communal parking facilities are needed in developments of 5 or more houses to ensure that boats, trailers and cars are kept off the roads when visitors are staying in the developments. It is not expected that the communal parking areas will be large and they may be superfluous if developments clearly provide in excess of the required parking allocated to an individual dwelling."

The view over this issue is that the parking guidelines set out in 4.4.1 do not meet the need to relieve the congestion on the roads and that measures need to be introduced with new developments to ensure safety and the flow of traffic is not unduly impeded on the roads.

Policies 6 & 7.

It is accepted that the word 'encouraged' is unhelpful even though it follows on from the 'made' plan. In Policy 6, 1st para replace 'encouraged' with 'prioritised'. In last line of the policy statement, amend to read "Affordable/self-build units are required".

Policy 6. Include 'starter homes/' in first line between 'housing' and 'First Homes'. Add 'starter homes/' to 2nd line in 4.6.1 after 'affordable' and before 'First Homes'. Add to last line of 4.6.1 "See appendix 5 for First Homes".

Policy 7. Replace 'should be encouraged' by 'will be prioritised'. Add new 4.7.2 "Policies 6 and 7 in particular will support the three objectives of encouraging business, strengthening the opportunities for affordable social housing in future and promoting the sustainability of the local rural community and its future development by providing opportunities for permanent residents". Hopefully, it will also help to mitigate the problem of young employed residents continuing to be forced to move out of the village in future.

The Examiner's question concerning comments on a potential recommended modification to the policy which would offer 'support' to the types of development identified in the two policies is not clearly understood. Clarification would be greatly appreciated so as to enable the Parish Council to provide an appropriate answer for the Examiner.

Policy 9.

Policy 9: to give greater clarity, the Parish Council favoured the third paragraph reading as follows: "Developments of over 10 buildings must include a Masterplan setting out the proposed phasing taking into account the capacity of the local infrastructure, especially for highway parking/boat storage, to meet the residents' needs."

Distinctive local value to the Borough-wide approach/policy.

- a) It works in favour of retention of local residents and their families where the second generation are employed in the parish but unable to purchase a house. It adds to the sustainability of the rural community which is weakened by potential full-time residents leaving to live elsewhere while working in the parish.
- b) It helps to mitigate safety issues with the masterplan given the unchanged infrastructure in the parish.

Representations

KLWNBC comments.

Policy 1 and Policy 6. Please see the explanation of First Homes in appendix 5 and the explanation above covering the points made under the Examiner's Clarification note.

Accept the recommendation that Map11 has the following title added "AONB map including the settlements within this Neighbourhood Plan". In the last line above the map delete wording in bracket except (See Map 11).

HNTS submission.

Policy 8. The Parish Council felt that reference must be made to the impact the former Roman fort of Branodunum has as a strategic gap between the villages by adding the following sentence to 4.8.2: "The AONB management plan recognises the importance of such strategic gaps as the former Roman fort of Branodunum to the coastal villages".

The Parish Council felt that reference should be made in Policy 10 to the protection of biodiversity within the environment.

Policy 10. Insert “biodiversity” between environment and local landscape. Change 4.10.3 to 4.10.4.

Insert new 4.10.3: “Biodiversity in the local environment e.g. Branodunum (Map 6) and Barrow Common (Map 10) must be protected. Such protection must be applied to copses particularly within the Conservation Area in Brancaster and generally within the AONB.”

Fleur submission.

This submission was detailed referring to all policies and the depth of the submission was appreciated. It outlined the scheme Fleur wished to submit as phase 2 of their development to the south and east of phase one, north of The Close in Brancaster Staithe. However, the Parish Council considered that there was a conflict of interest between the Parish Council who wished to provide a Plan to meet the needs of the community going forward and Fleur whose recommendations were for the most part focussed on securing policies which, if adopted, might be interpreted as favouring acceptance of their phase 2 proposals. The very strong feeling is that their proposal for phase 2 should be subject to the procedures associated with gaining planning permission and not be a matter for influencing the contents of a Neighbourhood Plan.

But their comments were considered. Fleur may not have been aware that at one of the meetings with the Borough Council, it was recommended that the Review Plan should not allocate sites for development. The Parish Council accepted this recommendation. And it was felt that many of the suggested policy changes submitted by Fleur added little to the direction of travel already in the Plan. Indeed, it appeared that they attempted to simplify them and in places dilute the intentions of the Parish Council. However, in view of the lack of allocated sites, the Parish Council were in favour of adding a further policy, at Fleur’s suggestion, covering Windfall Residential Sites as stated below.

“Policy 11: Windfall Residential Sites

Proposals for windfall development should demonstrate that:

The site will deliver a mix of house types and sizes to meet an identified local need with a higher percentage of affordable homes than stipulated in national regulations;

The provision of access by walking to local services and facilities in the villages via a safe and secure route;

It meets with the requirements of the other policies within this neighbourhood plan.”

Other details.

Policy 2. 2nd para. Spelling ‘quoins’ not ‘coins’
Rectify typo AONB not ANOB in paras: 2.5, 3.6, 4.10.1.
Standardise the font in policy 9.

Jamie Campbell
Chairman, Brancaster Parish Council.