JW suggested responses to examiner

Questions for Oxenhope Village Council

1. Should the Homes and Neighbourhoods Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document be referenced in various Plan policies as suggested by Bradford Council?

Yes. The NDP was produced prior to the adoption of the Homes and Neighbourhoods Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and its omission in the NDP is due to it not being refreshed. We are happy to include reference as suggested and agree it will be useful.

2. Policy GP5: Is there any particular reason why this statement of intention has been included as a policy?

Agree it is more of a statement than policy. Happy to remove policy and include as a statement. Capture of a greater % of CIL was important to local people and it was felt this policy communicates where CIL will be spent in line with local priorities.

3. Policy GP6: Is there clarity over the term "communications infrastructure"?

It was felt that 'communications infrastructure' is future-proofed to include any new technologies not yet available but at present covering phone and internet connections. This is also the terminology used in the NPPF, although the NPPF does then expand on this further.

4. Policy GP7: Does "support" mean giving favourable consideration to planning applications (in this policy and elsewhere)?

Oxenhope VC is committed to becoming a sustainable and low-carbon village and it was felt that supporting these types of proposals would help to achieve this and would signify the stance of the VC. The policy tries to balance this support recognising that the village centre is predominantly covered by conservation areas so felt that this policy strikes a balance between encouraging renewable energy provision and any potential impact on heritage that may arise from the inclusion of renewables in schemes.

5. Policy GP7: Is the policy directed at supporting proposals that *include* small scale renewable energy technologies and infrastructure rather than technology / infrastructure per se?

The policy is directed towards homeowners or developers that would like to include renewables on their proposal but could also apply to schemes such as solar farms.

6. Policy GP7: Is it proportionate to require a visual impact assessment in all cases (eg for an eco-friendly house)?

No. The accompanying assessment / demonstration should be commensurate with the scale of the proposal. Smaller cases should still provide some form of demonstration regarding the impact but not an extensive amount of information.

7. GP8 – "interest of the area": Is this a reference to visual interest?

Visual, historic and architectural interest of the area

8. GP8 – "key open spaces and key views": How will an applicant know what constitutes a key space or view? Are they identified somewhere?

These are identified in CBMDC Conservation Area Appraisals. This could be clearer and signposted in the NDP or included in the appendix.

9. Policy H1: Please respond to the comments of Bradford Council.

Agree that reference to Lifetime Homes should be removed and replaced with reference to M4(2) Accessible and Adaptable dwellings.

Agree that threshold of 9 greens and no reds to BfHL scoring could be removed.

CBMDC suggested amendments to policy H1 are accepted and are welcomed.

10. Policy H4 – "seek to achieve Biodiversity net gain": Is this requirement "strong" enough?

No, we agree this should be stronger. I.E 'must achieve Biodiversity Net Gain of 15%'. This policy was drafted some time ago and the planning context has since changed. Happy to revise to make this stronger.

11. Policy H4: Will an applicant know what is involved in preserving the Bradford Wildlife Habitat Network? Is the network identified somewhere? Please provide a link (and also to the National Pollution Strategy and the Biodiversity Net Gain Good Practice Principles).

No it is unlikely they will know. There is a network identified on a map provided courtesy of West Yorkshire Ecology which is included on p.57 of the NDP. Further information can be gained from CBMDC

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-pollinator-strategy-2014-to-2024-implementation-plan

https://cieem.net/resource/biodiversity-net-gain-good-practice-principles-for-development/

12. Policy H4 – "design and management": Design and management of what?

The design and management of 'green infrastructure provision'.

13. ED1: Please respond to the comments of Bradford Council.

Agree with this comment and support revisions to make this policy clearer and include flexibility around under what circumstances change of use or loss would be acceptable in line with Core Strategy policy EC4.

14. Policy GS1 and Appendix 2: Please identify any spaces where owners have not been consulted about designation / where objections have been raised (with details).

I do not have this information. VC to provide.

15. Policy MT1: Do the designated visitor parking bays necessarily have to be "on-street"?

No they do not.

16. Policy MT1: Please respond to the comments of Bradford Council.

Agree that MT1 should include reference to Core Strategy Policy DS4 and Appendix 4. It should also be revised to reference Homes and Communities Design Guide, and references to content of the emerging Local Plan.

17. Policy MT2 – routes where the existing provision is poor: How are these going to be identified?

Through liaison with CBMDC, highways authority, and Oxenhope VC

18. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published by the government on 20 July 2021 alongside a final version of the National Model Design Code. I would be grateful if you could please advise me whether you consider any modifications in relation to the non-strategic matters covered by the draft Oxenhope Neighbourhood Development Plan are necessary as a result of the publications (other than amended referencing) and, if so, what these are?

Defer to CBMDC