

Pampisford Neighbourhood Development Plan

Examiner's Clarification Note

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt, matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

Initial Comments

The Plan provides a clear and concise vision for the neighbourhood area. It is underpinned by a series of background documents which directly inform some of the policies. This is best practice.

The presentation of the Plan is very good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. In addition, the Plan makes good use of various high-quality maps.

Points for Clarification

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now able to raise issues for clarification both with the Parish Council

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of the examination report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions. I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan:

PAM1

Does the reference to homes built to Building Regulations Part M4 (2) mean that all the houses should be constructed to this standard?

It would be helpful if the Parish Council comments on the intended purpose of the final part of the policy. As submitted, it does not have regard to national policy (NPPF paragraph 65)

PAM2

Does the policy bring any added value beyond the details in local plan policies?

PAM3

Should the second part of the policy be applied proportionately to acknowledge that not all development proposals will have an impact on any, some or all of the criteria?

The proportionate element issue also applies to the final part of the policy. In addition, what is meant by a 'generous and comprehensive' landscape buffer?

PAM4

As the District Council comments, the policy does not refer to the type or scale of development where contributions will be sought. In this context the policy might not be suitable for all types and scales of development. What types of development does the Parish Council anticipate would be affected by this policy?

PAM5

The policy simply lists the proposed Local Green Spaces and does not set out any policy guidance. I am minded to include the matter-of-fact approach used in NPPF107 at the end of the policy. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

PAM6

This is an excellent policy which is underpinned by the details in the Design Code. In the round it is a very good local response to Section 12 of the NPPF.

PAM8

I looked carefully at the site of the former Chequers PH during the visit. The policy is both positive and non-prescriptive. It also reflects the sensitive location of the site.

The final element of the policy reads slightly out of context. As such, I am minded to reposition it into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

PAM9

In general terms the policy takes a positive and non-prescriptive approach to climate change issues and sustainability issues.

The final element of the policy describes a process rather than a land use policy. As such, I am minded to reposition it into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

PAM10

The thrust of the policy is very appropriate. Nevertheless, does the policy bring any added value beyond national policy (including the Building Regulations) and the details in local plan policies?

PAM 11

The Parish Council's comment on the District Council's representation on this policy would be very helpful (see the request later in this Note).

PAM12

The second part of the policy largely restates national policy. In this context, could the local delivery element of this part of the policy be weaved into the third part (as submitted)?

PAM13

The thrust of the policy is very appropriate. Nevertheless, does the policy bring any added value beyond national policy (including Section 9 of the NPPF) and the details in local plan policies?

PAM14

The thrust of the policy is very appropriate. Nevertheless, does the policy bring any added value beyond national policy (including Sections 6 and 8 of the NPPF) and the details in local plan policies?

PAM15

Should this policy be applied proportionately to the scale and nature of the proposed development?

PAM16

As its wording suggests does the policy bring any added value beyond the details of Policy PAM4?

PAM17

The Parish Council's comments on the District Council's representation on this policy would be very helpful (see the request later in this Note)

Representations

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representations received from Cambridge Past, Present and Future and Cheveley Park Farms Limited.

The District Council make a series of comments both on the policies and other general matters. It would also be helpful if the Parish Council responded to this representation.

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for responses and the information requested by 15 November 2024. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I would be happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled,

please could it come to me directly from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Pampisford Neighbourhood Development Plan

25 October 2024