

Changes to Collingham Neighbourhood Plan following Ian Mackay informal review and Linton Examiner's Report

1. Date changed to 2015-28.
2. Para 1.7 - Ian asked for more explanation of what smaller settlement and lower order local centre means. Examiner said reduce the introductory paragraphs. So take out 1.7 as we are not allocating land in the Plan nor including any business policies. All covered by Leeds.
3. 5.12 – Ian asked this to be reworded – suggest – Traffic Management measures commensurate with the village setting will be introduced to mitigate congestion resulting from development in and around Collingham.
4. 6.16 – change end to policies of Leeds City Council
5. 11.3 – take out policy O – and revise for any changes to the other policies.
6. 12.4 – add new paragraph – Appendix 1 shall be used as a reference in determining any impact on the village setting resulting from planning proposals. Policy A becomes:

POLICY A: PROTECTING THE VILLAGE SETTING

Development shall protect the village setting by taking into account that Collingham is part of a community of small rural villages and wishes to retain its unique identity.

Development shall have a positive impact on the rural and landscape character and special features of the village setting. It shall be proportionate in scale and reflect the character of its locality.

Development should be sensitively designed, particularly where highly visible in open landscape as defined by the areas highlighted in blue on map 5, and utilise appropriate planting and screening in order to minimise visual intrusion. Such new landscaping should be appropriate to the habitat and landscape character of its locality. Preservation of undeveloped wooded hillsides and ridgelines is a key consideration.

7. Section B – Protecting Local Heritage Assets – The Examiner said of Linton that this section is not required because it is properly covered by NPPF section 12. This does not concur with Conservation Officer Matt Bentley's opinion and he is keen to be provided more teeth by having conservation included in Neighbourhood Plans. Therefore we need to make it clear section B of the plan is providing Collingham centric details in support of NPPF.

Add new para at the start – National Policy recognises the country's heritage assets as irreplaceable (Para 126 of NPPF). Chapter 12 of the Framework sets out a detailed approach to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. This section of the Neighbourhood Plan describes those unique Collingham heritage features to be considered in relation to chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Policy B becomes:

POLICY B: PROTECTING LOCAL HERITAGE ASSETS

Where development has the potential to have a negative impact on a local heritage asset a report by an appropriate expert shall be provided describing how the proposal:

- a. Respects and protects its settings, particularly within the Conservation Area.
- b. Retains Positive Buildings (see Map 4) in all but exceptional circumstances, and protects them from unsympathetic development.
- c. Retains mature or important trees. Development that envisages the loss of ancient trees or trees of good arboriculture and/or amenity value will not be permitted unless justified by an acceptable professional tree survey/arboriculture statement. Where removal of such trees can be justified, replacement(s) with trees of similar amenity value and maturity should be provided.
- d. Ensuring that where appropriate archaeological investigations/recording takes place in advance of any proposed development.

8. Ian Mackay suggested making archaeology its own policy – Move paras 13.8 and 13.9 to new section and make a statement that WYAS have requested a policy to be included. Add new policy:

- e. In areas with an opportunity to encounter archaeological remains appropriate investigations/recording shall take place in advance of any proposed development.

9. Section C Design of Development – add new intro para:

Good design is recognised by national policy as comprising a key aspect of sustainable development. It is indivisible from good planning. National policy requires good design to contribute positively to making places better for people (NPPF para. 56).

Add new para after 14.4 - Appendix 2 includes detailed character area assessments and shall be used as a reference in determining the sufficiency of design proposals in accordance with this Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy becomes:

POLICY C: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT

Development proposals shall demonstrate that they:

- a. Recognise and reinforce the distinct local character in relation to height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings. The use of vernacular detailing is encouraged.
- b. Incorporate landscaping to mitigate the visual impact of development and to ensure that proposals merge into the existing village context. Landscape schemes should seek to include native species (where appropriate).
- c. Boundary walls, hedges and fences reflect the distinct local character in relation to materials and design including footways and grass strips in verges.
- d. Include architectural details and features similar to those of the neighbourhood or incorporated in the host building if the development is an extension.

10. Section D – Community Involvement add new para intro:

This Policy seeks to encourage community involvement in the planning process. This has regard to national policy, which is explicit in its aspiration of “allowing people and communities back into

planning” (Ministerial Introduction to NPPF). Many Policies allow for a degree of interpretation and use phrases such as “seek to”. It is the intention of this Policy to ensure that proposals are developed with a clear understanding of how the community wishes these policies to be applied to a site and therefore provide any subsequent application greater chance of approval.

Policy becomes:

POLICY D: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Planning applications for development of more than one new property shall be accompanied by a Statement of Community Involvement. This statement must include:

- a. An explanation of how the community has been consulted about the proposals;
- b. A demonstration that a range of means has been used to engage with local people;
- c. A record of the views expressed by local people;
- d. An explanation of how the proposals have responded to local people’s views;

This shall be demonstrated by a certificate signed by the Parish Council confirming that the community has been comprehensively consulted.

11. Section E – Sustainable Development – Amend Policy:

POLICY E: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Proposals for sites of more than 0.4 hectares will address any impact on Collingham’s services, infrastructure and facilities.

Proposals that increase flood risk in Collingham Beck or The River Wharfe will be refused.

Proposals that impact on good quality agricultural land will be required to assess the impact on the remaining agricultural business and provide appropriate mitigating measures.

12. Section F – PAS Site – The Examiner stated this same policy should be removed from the Linton Plan. The Linton Plan did not provide any justification and evidence to describe why protection over and above that provided by the Core Strategy and UDP is necessary. Currently the Collingham Plan is in the same position, the Justification basically being a description of why the Miller Homes application should be rejected.

If this policy is to remain we need some other text. Can we say:

“Developers have a history in the Local Area of making planning applications on land not allocated for housing, and then using the appeal process to investigate the 5 year land supply as an argument to gain planning approval. This is against the main spirit of the NPPF which requires development to be plan led and should therefore be discouraged.

The Core Strategy Policy H2 allows development of housing on unallocated land which is too small to allocate or becomes unexpectedly available. This does not therefore allow development of PAS sites

which tend to be large and also cannot be considered “unexpected” as they are already in the Site Allocations Plan.

This Policy therefore seeks to add support to the Local Plan by ensuring that land safeguarded for future development remains undeveloped until its long term allocation can be determined through the proper process.”

I would then probably take out most of the Leeds Road text.

Please provide your thoughts.

13. Section G – add to 18.10 Section 7 of the Village Survey Report concludes:

Change policy to shall and fewer rather than less.

14. Section H – Village Facilities. The Linton Examiner did not understand that we intend to apply for things to become Assets of Community Value and therefore we need to make this clear by using a different term in the text from Assets of Community Value. Suggest we use “Services and Facilities valued by the local community”.

Add Introductory Para “Chapter 8 of the NPPF, Promoting Healthy Communities, requires plans to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs (NPPF para 70). This Policy sets out which facilities and services in Collingham should be safeguarded in this manner.

Change Policy to:

POLICY H: VILLAGE FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Development will not be supported that results in the loss of, or has a significant adverse effect on, the following village facilities and services:

- St Oswald’s Church
- Methodist Chapel
- Memorial Hall
- Scout Hut
- Primary school
- Post Office
- Doctors’ surgery
- Shops and services Hastings and Elizabeth Court
- Nursery School
- Public House, restaurant and bistro
- The football club, the junior football club, the cricket club and the squash and racketball club all affiliated to Collingham and Linton Sports Association (CALSA)

- The Bowling Club
- The Tennis Club

The improvement of these facilities and services for the benefit of the residents of Collingham will be supported

We do not accept the Examiner's modification to include the phrase "unless it can be demonstrated further to a period of marketing, that the existing use is no longer viable". On page 26 of his report the Examiner says that non-land use planning matters should not be included in a Neighbourhood Plan, and to demonstrate that a proposal would ensure the viability of a business would be appropriate within the land use planning context. Surely the same applies here.

15. Section I – Parking

Change wording of Policy:

POLICY I - PARKING

The improvement of central parking facilities will be supported.

The loss of parking spaces shall not be acceptable.

Development will seek to provide and improve the safety of walking or cycling into Collingham.

16. Section J – Green Infrastructure – Ian Mackay found this section confusing and suggested a rethink. The meeting agreed we should just refer to our maps and apply the Core Strategy text to our Green Infrastructure. Hence reword the Policy:

POLICY J – GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Where a development is considered to be acceptable within or adjoining areas defined on Maps 5, 6 and 7 development proposals should ensure that:

- a. Green Infrastructure/corridor function of the land is retained and improved;
- b. Where appropriate, the opportunity is taken to extend Green Infrastructure by linking green spaces or by filling gaps in Green Infrastructure corridors. Street trees and green roofs are particularly encouraged;
- c. A landscaping scheme is provided which deals positively with the transition between development and any adjoining open land;
- d. The opportunity is taken to increase appropriate species of woodland cover.

17. Policy K – Take out the Core Strategy reference in the Policy, just say The following are designated as Local Green Space.

18. Section L – Footpaths etc – National Cycle Route 66 no longer runs through Collingham apparently – change the reference in para 23.5
Soften the policy to "Wherever practicable development shall..."

19. Policy M – Examiner said take the equivalent section out from the Linton Plan, but this was mostly to do with the fact we were referring to sympathetic traffic arrangements at Trip Lane and Northgate Lane which are poorly defined. Change the wording of the Policy to: Development shall take reasonable measures to contribute to reducing the speed of traffic in Collingham.

20. Policy N – reword to soften

POLICY N: FOOTWAY AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Development will seek to provide new crossings on A659 and A58. These should be located relative to existing features such as bus stops.

Development will seek to complete footways and provide new surfacing and drop kerbs on routes leading to the village centre and to the Primary school.

21. Projects – take out Policy number column - not required.

22. As a general point the projects are the Parish Council wish list and any reference to “ours” needs to say the Parish Council, because eventually the Plan becomes the property of Leeds City Council.

23. Various minor amendments to the maps were agreed.

