

# **Cheveley Neighbourhood Plan**

## **Parish Council response to Examiner's Clarification Note**

**April 2024**

The Neighbourhood Plan Examiner published a Clarification Note on 25 April 2024. This paper provides the Parish Council's response to the questions raised in the Note.

### **Policy CHEV 1 – Spatial Strategy**

The Examiner asks whether the Parish Council has any comments on the District Council's representation about the way the Development Envelope has been defined around Duchess Drive (as shown on the map in that representation)?

#### ***Parish Council response:***

The regulations relating to the preparation of neighbourhood plans are quite clear that they cannot cover areas outside the Neighbourhood Area. The Inset Map is quite clear that it does not cover land to the west of Duchess Drive. Perhaps a solution, if it is considered to be a problem, would be to annotate the Inset Map to suggest users refer to Local Plan Map 8.29 Newmarket Fringe for designations in that area? However, that would suggest that such a requirement is needed around all boundaries and is not common practice in neighbourhood plans

### **Policy CHEV 2 – Housing Mix**

The Examiner asks:

1 – is the incorporation of the housing size figures from the Assessment directly into the policy a practical solution?

2 - would the figures be capable of being implemented by the District Council through the development management process?

#### ***Parish Council response:***

The Parish Council acknowledges that it will not be possible to deliver the precise mathematical split of housing on a development as the division would result in a fraction of a number. For this reason, the Examiner might like to consider taking the approach that he has in other neighbourhood plan examinations and rounding the figure to the nearest 5% and using the term "approximate"? However, in doing so it is noted that rounding the figures to the nearest 5% could total 105%.

### **Policy CHEV 5 - Equine Related Activities outside the Development Envelope**

The Examiner notes that settlement gaps are not shown on the Policies Map and seeks the Parish Council's advice on this matter.

The Examiner also asks that the Parish Council explains the reference to Local Plan Policy EMP5 and the representation from The Jockey Club on the relationship between the two policies.

**Parish Council response:**

1 – It is acknowledged that the Policies Map does not illustrate Settlement Gaps but there are distinct settlements (defined by the Development Envelope) and other distinct clusters of development such as found at Broad Green and at Oak Tree Corner, Saxon Street Road that are an important characteristic of the parish. Development that would otherwise be in accordance with Policy CHEV 5 could have the effect of eroding these gaps without careful consideration of visual impact.

2 – The Parish Council is of a view that Policy EMP 5 of the adopted Local Plan provides a generic approach to the consideration of proposals for equine related development. However, reflecting the characteristics of the landscape of Cheveley parish, additional and locally derived criteria are also required to supplement and work alongside the Local Plan. It is noted that The Jockey Club considers Policy EMP 6 to be a strategic policy. However, then District Council has not indicated as such in making representations on this and other neighbourhood plans. Regardless, the Parish Council is of the opinion that the policy is in conformity with Policy EMP6.

**Policies CHEV 1 / 5 /16**

The Examiners seeks views on the District Council’s comments about the overlaps between the wording used in Policies CHEV1/5/16.

**Parish Council response**

The Parish Council acknowledges that there is some overlap between Policy CHEV 1 and CHEV 6 but that there is no contradiction. In terms of overlaps with Policy CHEV 16, it is considered that the latter policy provides a greater explanation as to how impact will be assess and is appropriate to the policy.

**Representations**

As requested by the Examiner, the Parish Council provides a table below with responses to the comments received, addressing in particular the points raised by:

- Anglian Water;
- The Ramblers Association;
- The Jockey Club; and
- East Cambridgeshire District Council

The Parish Council does not wish to comment further on other comments submitted at the Regulation 16 stage.

Summary Comment	Parish Council response
<b>Anglian Water</b>	Anglian Water were consulted at Regulation 14 stage, but no comments were received.

Summary Comment	Parish Council response
<p>Policy CHEV 7 Anglian Water seeks clarification that the use of permeable surfaces also includes areas of paving such as car parking.</p> <p>Policy CHEV 14 Anglian Water suggest referencing the emerging Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS)</p> <p>Policy CHEV 15 Anglian Water suggest that It should be made more explicit within the policy that development will be managed in these areas as set out in the NPPF, in order to provide the policy basis for decision-making.</p>	<p>The references in paragraph 9.6 and the Design Codes could be amended should the Examiner consider it necessary in order for the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>The Parish Council does not consider this is necessary</p> <p>The Parish Council does not consider this is necessary</p>
<p><b>The Ramblers Association (RA)</b> The Ramblers Association did not comment at Regulation 14 stage.</p>	
<p>Policy CHEV 5 The RA would like to see mention of exploring opportunities to enhance the PRoW network as part of this policy</p> <p>Policy CHEV 7 The RA seek an amendment to the statement in the policy “include pedestrian and cycle links where possible to local amenities and facilities;” to include links to existing recreational rights of way and permissive access.</p> <p>Policy CHEV 13 The RA seeks an amendment to the policy to include the provision of additional recreational routes where mitigation is required. .</p>	<p>The existing PRoW in the parish are protected by the statutory requirements to maintain them. However, the Parish Council recognises the significant value of the horse racing industry and the impact on security that creating additional routes could cause.</p> <p>The Parish Council considers that the suggested wording would not be sufficiently explicit as to what is required. However, the Examiner might consider that an amendment to include links to the PRoW network would be appropriate.</p> <p>The Parish Council is of the opinion that the requirement for a developer to provide additional recreational routes may not be necessary to make a development acceptable and might therefore fail the tests for planning contributions set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.</p>
<p><b>The Jockey Club</b></p>	

Summary Comment	Parish Council response
The Jockey Club did not comment at Regulation 14 stage	
The Jockey Club's comments are primarily focused on the relation of the Plan with Policy EMP6 of the Local Plan	The Parish Council has responded to this matter above at the request of the Examiner and has nothing further to add.
<b>East Cambridgeshire District Council</b>	
<p>Policy CHEV 6 The District Council proposes that the term Housing Development Envelope' it should be just 'Development Envelope'</p> <p>Policy CHEV 14 The District Council considers that the supporting text, in particular, should be updated.</p>	<p>The Parish Council accepts that this should be amended</p> <p>The Parish Council acknowledges that matters in relation to biodiversity net gain have moved on since the Plan was submitted. The Parish Council is also aware that the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan examination has recently concluded where the same Examiner has recommended a new updated paragraph. It is considered that a similarly worded paragraph would be appropriate to update the Cheveley Plan.</p>

