

# INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE DAVENHAM and WHATCROFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: ROBERT YUILLE MSc DipTP MRTPI.

Davenham & Whatcroft Parish Council

c/o Rosie Morgan

Cheshire West and Chester Council

Examination Ref: 02/RY/D&WNP

Via email:

[Rosie.Morgan@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk](mailto:Rosie.Morgan@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk)

19 June 2017

Dear Sir or Madam

As you know, I have been appointed to conduct the examination into whether the Davenham and Whatcroft Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) meets the Basic Conditions. I would like to give the Parish Council an opportunity to respond to any or all of the points made at the Regulation 16 stage if it so wishes.

Following a preliminary reading of Regulation 16 representations I would be particularly interested in the Parish Council's comments on the following points.

1. The claim that there is no evidence to support the proposed 'cap' of 25 dwellings that **Policy VC 1** places on housing development and that this 'cap' will fail to significantly boost the supply of housing land.
2. The claim that the proposed settlement boundary referred to in **Policy VC 2** should be reviewed to allocate housing land to ensure that the minimum requirement of 4,300 houses in the Northwich area is met.
3. The claim that insufficient justification has been provided for the designation of the Local Green Spaces referred to in **Policy VC 3** – particularly Sites 1 and 2 as shown on Figure 5.5.
4. The claim that that **Policy VC 7** is unnecessary and unjustified and that the requirement that buildings should be of 'modest height' is imprecise.
5. The claim that there is no evidence that the proposed requirement in **Policy HL 2** that account be taken of specific traffic flows identified in the Plan is based on robust traffic data obtained in normal traffic conditions.
6. The claim that **Policy S&LN 1** is unnecessary as consultation carried out as part of any planning application would establish whether there was a need for additional infrastructure or a financial contribution towards the provision of this.
7. The claim that the word 'must' in **Policy S&LN 2** should be replaced with the word 'should'.
8. The claim that **Policy BS 1** adds nothing to the Plan.
9. The claim that **Policy L&PA1** should not specify a threshold of 25 dwellings and that its requirement that 20% of the site area be open space is excessive and unjustified. Such a requirement should be based on site characteristics, the amount of development proposed and the existing supply of open space. **Appendix 6** should not include minimum dimensions for landscape buffers.
10. The claim that there is no justification for the areas identified referred to in **Policy W2** as having 'high or medium ecological value/distinctiveness' and identified in Fig 7.5\*.
11. The claim that **Policy G1** seeks to pre-empt the planning balance which should be carried out on a case by case basis and that the terms of this policy are not consistent with the National

Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 8) in that they assert that some aspects of sustainable development should always be given more weight in the planning balance than others.

12. The claim that **Policy G2** is unworkable (in that it would be difficult to monitor or enforce) and it is unreasonable (in that many benefits of development, such as infrastructure delivery, are beyond the control of developers).

\* I have previously asked the District Council to provide a map showing various designations and boundaries. As Figure 7.5 of the Plan is unclear, I would like to see a map that clearly shows the position of the areas of 'high or medium ecological value/distinctiveness' on an Ordnance Survey base. It would be useful if the District Council could add this information to that map.

May I have the response to the above by 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2017 please?

In the interests of transparency, may I also prevail upon you to ensure a copy of both this letter and the respective response (in due course) are placed on the relevant Parish and District Council websites?

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

*Robert Yuille*

Examiner