

Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Examination

Questions of clarification from the Examiner to the Parish Council (PC) and North Yorkshire Council (NYC)

Having completed my initial review of the Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan), I would be grateful if both Councils (as appropriate) could kindly assist me as appropriate in answering the following questions which either relate to matters of fact or are areas in which I seek clarification or further information. Please do not send or direct me to evidence that is not already publicly available.

Question 1

1. On 5 September 2023, the Government updated the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) a few weeks after the extended Regulation 16 stage had ended and shortly after the examination had commenced.

The update focused on national policy for onshore wind. Transitional arrangements are set out in the updated NPPF. These explain that the policies on renewable and low carbon energy and heat only apply to local plans that have not reached Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 or would reach that stage within three months of the publication of the updated NPPF.

Although that relates to Local Plans, I consider the same principle can pragmatically be applied to this Plan. I therefore consider that even if the updates are relevant to this Plan, the updates do not apply and it is not necessary to have further consultation on this. I invite comments on this proposed course of action from the PC and NYC.

Question 2

2. Please could the date of the designation of the Plan area be confirmed?

Question 3

3. The introductory chapters to the Plan do not include any information about the strategic context of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please would the PC and NYC agree and provide a paragraph or two of text to be included in the Plan about the strategic planning context for it i.e. the position of the villages in the settlement hierarchy and the level of growth anticipated etc.?

Question 4

4. One of the aims of the Plan states “To not support further large-scale house-building and to control the building of any further new small-scale housing in the area.”. Given NYC’s growth strategy and Pannal’s position in the settlement hierarchy as set out in the Local Plan, please suggest a rewording for this aim to ensure it reflects the planning policy context.

Question 5

5. Policy GNE1 Green and Blue Infrastructure. Two matters arise:

- a. I have found it quite difficult to distinguish between the three corridors on the Policies Map. Please could a map which only shows the three areas be provided?
- b. Could a brief explanation be given as to how the three areas were drawn up?

Question 6

6. Policy GNE2 Crimple Valley Special Landscape Area. Six matters arise:

- a. Is this exactly the same area as the SLA in the Local Plan?
- b. The policy refers to key views. Appendix 3 contains details of key views and vistas. The appendix contains over 50 views. Views are also referred to in Policies BE1 Pannal Conservation Area – Development and Design and BE3 Local Heritage Areas – Development and Design and Policy BE5 Village Character Areas – Development and Design. How have the views been selected and appraised?
- c. I could not find Views P, Ai or AJ on the maps.
- d. Would it be helpful to attribute the views in Appendix 3 to each policy as relevant? I am not sure, I am simply raising the question, but if considered to be helpful, please can this information be supplied.
- e. Map 4 in the appendix is hard to read. Please can a larger scale map be provided? If the views are attributed to each relevant policy, then separate view maps for each policy could be produced.
- f. Lastly, please note that any views such as views O, Q, S, W, Z, AK and AL are likely to be recommended for deletion as they are either from inside the Plan area but look outside it, or are situated outside the Plan area looking into it. The Plan can only contain policies for the Plan area itself.

Question 7

7. With regard to Policy GNE3, Local Green Space Protection, please could more detailed maps showing the boundaries of each proposed LGS be provided.

Question 8

8. Policy GNE6 Land at Almsford Bridge:

- a. Is this intended to be an allocation?
- b. Is part of the land also identified as a proposed Local Green Space?

Question 9

9. Please could a copy of the Pannal Conservation Area Character Appraisal be provided?

Question 10

10. Policies BE2 Local Heritage Areas and BE3 Local Heritage Areas – Development and Design refer to Local Heritage Areas. How have the Local Heritage Areas been devised?

Question 11

11. Policy BE3 Local Heritage Areas – Development and Design refers to “surviving historic buildings”. Would it be helpful to identify these?

Question 12

12. Policy BE5 Village Character Areas – Development and Design identifies a number of Village Character Areas.

- a. How have they come about?
- b. Please refer me to the evidence that supports the various buffers and distances referred to in this policy.

Question 13

13. Reference is made to a Design Codes Report produced by AECOM. Please can a copy of this document be provided? It should form part of the suite of submitted documents.

Question 14

14. Policy ED1 refers to Local Plan Policy EC1 and seeks to use the criteria in the LP policy for the three sites it identifies as employment sites. Two issues arise:

- a. Use Classes E and F2 are cited in Policy ED1, but the LP policy refers to Use Classes B1, B2 and B8. Is “employment sites” the right terminology to use for Almsford Bridge, Crimple Hall and Spacey Houses?
- b. Regardless of the answer to a. above, are the criteria A – K in LP Policy EC1 appropriate given that the three sites do not appear to be in Use Classes B1, B2 or B8 (recognising the Use Classes Order has been amended during this time)?
- c. Would it be preferable to identify the three sites by a different named local designation and adapt the criteria in LP Policy EC1 to stand on their own two feet for the neighbourhood plan policy? If so, I invite the PC to suggest some suitable wording.

It may be the case that on receipt of your anticipated assistance on these matters that I may need to ask for further clarification or that further queries will occur as the examination progresses. These queries are raised without prejudice to the outcome of the examination. Where I have invited changes to be suggested, this is entirely without prejudice to my consideration of the issue.

Please note that this list of clarification questions is a public document and that your answers will also be in the public domain. Both my questions and your responses should be placed on the Councils' websites as appropriate.

With many thanks,

Ann Skippers MRTPI
Independent Examiner
16 September 2023