

# Bethersden Neighbourhood Plan

August 2015 Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

## Part 2 Questions and Answers as at 24<sup>th</sup> November 2015

Comments were received from Residents, Ashford Borough Council and, Brian Whiteley of Planning Aid England. This is a list of answers to comments on grammar, punctuation and other minor matters not included in the main Q & A.

1. The one consultation response received was countersigned by three Households and supported the Neighbourhood Area Application. Page 5 - Is this needed? Is it more appropriately included in the Consultation Statement?

Decide to remove from text altogether.

2. Page 5 - Does this mean by Ashford Borough Council? If so why not make that clear to the Examiner? The plan area is considered acceptable in planning terms.

New paragraph start: "Ashford Borough Council have confirmed that the" Plan is considered.

3. Page 8 - All other figures in this section have percentages quote as well - for the sake of completeness why not also include those comparisons here?

.....rise in the number of people aged over 65 since 2001 (from 261 - 364 people). This was alongside a fall (from 272 -247) in the numbers of children.

Percentages included "..... rise in the number of people aged over 65 since 2001 from 261 to 364 people(+39%) . This was alongside a fall from 272 to 247(- 9%) in the numbers of children".

4. Page 9 - Is a full stop or semi-colon missing at the end here? Growth patterns given above.

Agreed full stop added.

5. Page 10 - Word missing here? people Bethersden.

Yes, several - that a significant number of people in Bethersden are .....

6. Page 11 - Rather than have this text here in the plan, do you want to make this clear in the accompanying explanatory PR accompanying the public consultation - or in the introduction? It is therefore our intention to include the Design Statement and unfinished elements of the Parish Plan into our Neighbourhood Plan.

Suggest we leave it in, but omit the word "unfinished" done.

7. Page 11 - Word missing here? this from them 45 volunteers were

Yes! & a comma ...this and from them, 45 volunteers were

### Section 6 Green

8. Typing error

Corrected

9. Page 4 / Policy R2 - Policies R1 & R2 - are these new policies adding something specifically about the character and amenity of Bethersden village/or the plan area or do they simply re-iterate policies already included elsewhere?

Policies R1 and R2 reflect core objectives and as such should remain despite overlapping other policies.

10. Is policy R1 specifically aimed at future development in Bethersden village - in which case should its title make that clear?

R1 looks fine to (OB) Green Group Leader.

11. Is policy R2 meant to apply to the whole plan area? Is the current wording incomplete? What specific aspects will be taken into account to ensure a proposed development "protects and where possible enhances the established local character"? Won't every developer otherwise claim their scheme does that?

*Development in the parish shall be designed in a way which protects & enhances the particular landscape character area within which it is located, and, where relevant, any adjacent landscape area. Proposals shall have particular regard to the following: a) Landform, topography and natural patterns of drainage; b) the pattern and composition of trees and woodlands; c) the type and composition of wildlife habitats; d) the pattern and composition of field boundaries; e) the pattern and distribution of settlements, roads, ditches and footpaths; f) the presence and pattern of historic landscape features; g) the setting, scale, layout design and detailing of vernacular buildings and other man made features; h) any relevant guidance given in the ABC Landscape Character Assessment i) views into and from the site" ....*

R2 is missing the word " development". As for specific aspects, the original policy had been more detailed and read as italics above before editing. Brian's W comments imply we need to be more specific. Included in R2 Justification

15. Page 7/Policy Justification R 7 Drainage & Water Management - Is this within the remit of the neighbourhood plan?

- and the authorities carry out regular inspections and maintenance

Q15/Q18, Not sure how the plan could proceed without adequate coverage of the drainage issue, included as a key local concern in orange section.

16. Page 7 - Sustainable and Resilient Community - Is some wording missing here? from the provision of housing and jobs through to the community benefits that might be achieved, such as improved or new facilities and parish infrastructure.

Q16/Q17/Q19/Q20. Clare Wright is best placed to address the section on Sustainability and Resilient Community. As the plan is revised.

17. Page 7 - Not clear what this means? Is it saying that once the Neighbourhood Plan is made, development on the sites allocated by these policies will be implemented as part of the overall Local Plan? This is permitted through the Ashford Borough Local Plan (2008), the emerging Local Plan to 2030.

See 16

19. Page 7 - Would it be better here to say that at the time of writing, a CIL is not in place in the borough for the funding of community infrastructure. New developments shall be required to contribute to and/or provide for such benefits to come to the community from developer contributions via S.106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), awaited at the time of writing.

See 16

20. National guidance already is in place regarding the imposition of S106 planning agreements - and what they can be used to provide funding for.

See 16

21. NB: is there an existing Local Plan policy covering the funding of local community infrastructure when new development comes forward - e.g. for school places when significant housing proposals come forward.

Reference ABC.

## SECTION 7 Red

23. Page 4 / Policies H1 & H2: Do you need separate policies here? Do you need these policies at all, given the detailed requirements for each site are then spelt out at policies H3- H5.

CS Group Leader - Happy to remove policies H1 & H2 if remaining policies are clear on their own. Substantial revisions in later edition of The Plan

24. It is not clear what the basis is for the maximum capacity figures quoted in H2. Are these a result of assessments by the Borough Council already - and in which case do they need repeating here? Or are they based on assessments drawn up from considering average dwelling size, amenity space requirements, off-street parking standards, etc.?

Based on our assessments not ABC. i.e. Site size, % POS & housing density.

28. Page 4 - Would it be preferable to include a section elsewhere in the plan which reports the key suggestions for future project funding raised in public consultations - which the Parish Council intend pursuing in future with the Borough Council over the allocation of future CIL spending in the Bethersden plan area?

Do we need to reinstate benefits into the Plan? Yes

29. This list of projects could then be justified in terms of their importance to the local community - as they were raised during public consultations for the plan – and supported by the Parish Council as key to helping achieve the plan's long term vision for the Bethersden plan area.

Refer to CS, SB Group Leaders and latest edition of Plan

30. Page 5 / Internet Speed - Is this a land use objective - or should the plan be aiming to encourage the provision of internet-capable building design for all future developments?

Refer to CS, SB Group Leaders. Yes

31. Page 5 / Policy H3 first paragraph - Is this achievable - i.e. has the viability of this requirement been assessed?

This policy has been amended

32. Page 5 / Policy H3 second paragraph - Ditto - Would it be better to leave this outside the policy and instead include it as a community project which the development of this site might help realise?

Yes Refer to Policy CT3 & justification, which requires editing.

33. Page 6 / H4 - Is this achievable - i.e. has the viability of this requirement been assessed? Are 10 parking spaces sufficient, given the mix of units proposed? Part of the public open space to provide the option of a car park for 10 cars with access from Wissenden Lane.

No OK as is. Comments as above. To aid parking for the school increased to 20 spaces.

34. Page 6 / H5 first para. - This reads as if the entire site should be developed solely for affordable housing – is that correct? designed to be affordable for both young couple and family occupation.

No, same as above. Affordable has a specific meaning not meant in this case; to be removed.

35. Page 6 / H5 second para. - Is this achievable - i.e. has the viability of this requirement been assessed? Are 10 parking spaces sufficient, given the mix of units proposed? - bed spaces designed for both family and active retirement occupation.

Decide this is for Public Car parking.

47. Page 11 /Policy H12-How does this car parking standard relate to the earlier policy H8 plus the Borough Council's local plan policies?

Consult ABC

48. If the same parking standard (& design approach in the VDS) is being used throughout the plan area, why have separate policies stating same standard applies within the village & then in the remainder of the plan area?

To be reconciled with ABC Policy, VDS statement and NP Policies.

## Section 8 Blue

50. Page 3 / Policy Statement CT1 - Is this more of an objective? It seems too general and imprecise to implement as a planning policy.

I thought that the justification was too general and imprecise. It talks about respecting character of surroundings in scale and design, and safeguarding amenity and safety. PolicyCT1 – “Proposals for Business or Commercial development shall demonstrate that they support local employment and are appropriate to the local setting”. All rewritten.

51. Page 4 / Policy Statement CT2 (2nd bullet point) – What is the justification and evidence behind this? Does it tie in with local plan policy? Loss of A1 shop units as a result of proposals for redevelopment or for a change of use where planning permission is required is not supported.

Policy CT2 -- discuss with ABC. ?? Recent govt. policy – “conversion shops to dwellings”

52. Page 4 / Policy Statement CT2 (4th bullet point) - Do you want to add a proviso that this will be subject to other (local) plan policies - i.e. sometimes a proposal to improve a pub may be contrary to the interests of local residents? Proposals to improve the facilities of the public houses in the village and wider parish will be supported where this is demonstrated to benefit the business. Proposals that involve change of use, where planning permission is required, will not receive support.

Good idea to add this proviso, 4<sup>th</sup> point - agree change needed - amend text – “Proposals that : a) involve change of use, where planning permission is required or b) adversely affect local residents, will be resisted. (Re Local Plan Policies)” – check with ABC.

53. Page 4 / Policy Statement CT2 (5th bullet point) - Is this a statement of opinion rather than part of the policy? The above perform a vital function in the economic and social wellbeing of this Community and are greatly valued.

Agree – should be moved into the justification section and out of the policy. 5th point – not a policy! So omit. Note- The Justification text needs a rewrite; also discussion on what constitutes a Service Centre, i.e. should it include the financial and legal services at The Thorne.

54. Page 5 / Policy Justification: CT 3 Services - Is this already a local development management requirement by the Borough Council? Otherwise can a specific case be made and evidence provided for Bethersden in support of this policy? Any new development will demonstrate how it will contribute to and be compatible with local high speed fibre Internet connectivity. A competent professional 'Connectivity Statement' shall be submitted along side any planning applications.

Don't know about ABC requirement. Internet access was only identifiable point from the business survey. Policy CT 3 Services Rewrite; most is about internet & far too detailed – will be out of date next year! The Policy includes a para. On "power etc"., not mentioned in the text, but cover in Green policies R7 & R8! Policy CT3 – draft 1st point – "Any new development shall show how it will provide for high speed internet access, including provision for connectivity upgrades as technology develops, and shall provide a Connectivity Statement with its Planning Application" ??? check with ABC policy. Substantially rewritten in line with ABC Local Plan

55. Page 7 /Policy Statement: CT 4 Heavy goods traffic – new facilities - Is this already part of general development management requirements by the Borough Council?

Don't know, but no one seems to be making any effort to do anything about HGVs in the village so it bears repeating Policy CT4 – discuss with ABC

56. Page 8 / Policy Statement: CT 5 Traffic Flow and Highway safety - Is this policy already covered elsewhere - e.g. in the local plan?

Don't know whether it is covered in the local plan Policy CT 5 – discuss with ABC – is this in the Local Plan

## **B) Community Feedback from Fete & Village Hall Exhibitions & Newsletter**

57. Aug 3 Yes G Feaver, 3 St John's Cottages, The Street. We need affordable homes and with the population living longer we require more retirement homes.

Included in The Plan.

58. Aug 6 Yes/But Mrs P Goodsell, "Ashdene" Forgefield. 54 years in Forgefield. I would like to see some small 2 bed bungalows near a bus stop. Any chance of a bus stop opposite the Dene – some buses stop, some don't. I cut through the footpath from Forgefield to the Dene to catch a bus to Ashford, to save walking up Church Hill with a walking stick. Is the footpath up from Forgefield across the George Field ever going to be "tarmacked"? The flint stones are dreadful to walk on! I am one of the properties in Forgefield that now get flooded from the 5 new houses George Grove

58. Refer to PC (Now PC Project) 58a No plans to tarmac this country footpath (George Field)

59. Aug 7 Yes Mrs K Kirk, Swans Nest, Pimhurst Lane Support Plan to make improvements as a community.

Noted

60. Aug 7 Yes Brenda Hawkes, 14 Chester Ave. A Neighbourhood Plan would be a very good thing for the village.

Noted

61. Aug 10 Yes Mr&MrsJCollins,Maple Cottage, AshfordRd The road through the village needs redoing urgently.

Noted

62. Aug 23 Yes P Stappers, Weald Cottage, Ashford Rd The Plan represents the views of the villagers who have had opportunities to input into the Plan.

Noted

64. Aug 26 Yes/But C Adams, Jones Cottage, Bull Lane Need speed limit in Bull Lane, very dangerous for family with small children, a number of elderly, disable people, and no footpath.

Noted PC item does not qualify under KCC Highways rules.

## C) ABC Comments Brenda Fazzani 21 Sept 2015

### Orange Section

83. Page 3 Still referring to GADF 2008 – the GADF was produced in 2004 as an evidence base for Core Strategy adopted in 2008

BNP Amendment required

84. Page 8,9,10 Section 5.4 - Health. Last paragraph considers that older people are living with long term illness but with less need for active care from family and friends, which may be the case but it doesn't take account of those who are receiving paid care (either self funded or via social services) but it is good to recognise pressures from an ageing population and a need for appropriate accommodation to assist those who wish to downsize. With regard to housing it's encouraging that the NP recognizes need for affordable housing now & in the future.

Noted

86. Page 4 Policy R2..... alongside existing.....? (words missing) Policy R3 d) Habitats (should be ?other wildlife habitats, or just change the word from habitats to biodiversity.

Amended

87. Page 5 Policy R4 C word missing ( could be 'provide', 'contribute towards' etc

Amended

89. Page 6 A little confusion over 'together with the agricultural land extending to Bateman's corner. NPPF para 74 doesn't really apply here as it is agricultural land without access. Should this be an allocation for Public Open Space?

Amended

90. Page 7 Policy R7 - Might be stronger if 'new developments will only be permitted if they include effective.....'

Amended

90a. Reference to Ashford Local Plan 2008 should be changed to Core Strategy for clarity.

Amended

90b. Energy policy has got misplaced. Needs to follow Justification.

Amended

### Red Section

91. Page 3 In the paragraph on page 3) that refers to the Mill Road site it implies the whole site is an exception site which is not the case. And there are 12 local needs homes (not 11) – 11 for affordable rent and 1 shared ownership property. In the site policies (H3, H4, H5) there is no provision for 1 bed homes (2 bed spaces) which may be important for younger people, singles and couples, for both affordable and open market.

Amended

92. Page 4 Words with letters missing in the last sentence NPPF.

Amended

95. Page 6 H5 Designed to be affordable? What does that mean?

Amended

95a. Public open space and car parking, WHEN?

Ten spaces school end when built phase 3.

97. Page 9 H8 should be 'Building for Life' web site is now [www.designcouncil.org.uk](http://www.designcouncil.org.uk) Third edition published Jan 2015

Noted

98. Page 11 Policy H12 policy a little confused, switches from parking to amenity and landscaping. Need to take 'This is where....' out of policy and put it somewhere else such as explanation.

Agreed needs re-writing

## Blue Section

99. Page 3 h) a reasonable amount of small scale new build....what sort of new build? Need to specify if this is business/commercial.

Page 3 Left column para h) amend " A reasonable amount of small scale new build business or commercial development.."

100. Page 3 CT1 Policy Statement 'shall be encouraged'? better to say the Parish Council will support

Page 3 Policy CT 1 ; suggests replace "shall be encouraged" with " The Parish Council will support business ....." We have not used the PC term anywhere else – I suggest no change.

101. Page 8 CT5 Would any proposal that helps traffic flow more freely (and faster) be supported? In line with strategic policies in Local Plan Not in accordance wit ABC strategic policies unless qualify.

Page 8 Policy CT5 – point 1 – she is concerned that the existing wording encourages faster traffic – my suggestion is, in line one "Development proposals that improve the free flow ....." - this could mean better sight lines etc. Don't understand her comment " In line with Strategic Policies ....." – where is this included?

102. Will the plan emphasise in its introduction that it aims to meet the needs of all the local community, but that in particular it has to aim to meet those of a currently ageing population?

Yes need the words to cover this. Done

103. In the interests of achieving a balanced community and local workforce, is the plan looking in particular to attract more families and younger people into the area – and if so should it state this more clearly, e.g. if it is aiming to provide mainly family-sized housing in the plan area?

The answer is a qualified yes needs to be re-written.

105. Similarly, might the encouragement of tourist interest in the area be a community project to pursue - with the broader objective of generating more locally-based employment?

Yes but not now

106. To address the existing high level of out-commuting from the plan area, should more be made of encouraging job-generating activities in redundant farm buildings, brownfield sites, etc. across the plan area?

We are keen to encourage more local employment and this is part of both the Parish Plan and NHP

107 Deleted

Minor updates made 21<sup>st</sup> March 2018