

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF WINKLEIGH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Mrs Melanie Bickell
Clerk to Winkleigh Parish Council

Mr Ian Rowland
Senior Planning Policy Officer
Torridge District Council

Examination Ref: 02/AM/WNP

10 June 2020

Dear Mrs Bickell and Mr Rowland

WINKLEIGH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINATION

Having carried out my visit to the Winkleigh Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) area, I have identified some matters on which clarification from the Parish Council and Torridge District Council would assist me in my examination of the WNP. May I request the submission of responses to my questions below **within two weeks** of the date of this letter, although an earlier response would be most welcome.

Question for the District Council

1. Has the Village Design Statement been adopted by the District Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance?

Questions for the District Council and the Parish Council

2. Policy H1. I can appreciate the reasoning behind the policy, but has the Parish Council or the District Council any suggestion to make which would enable “substantially larger” to be quantified? For example, would “40% larger than the original building” be appropriate?
3. Policy E4. Would it be possible to define “small scale retail development” in more detail and specify to which Use Classes the policy would apply? I appreciate that the District Council made this point in its representations (ref: 84) but, with the benefits of its breadth of experience as a local planning authority, I would appreciate any further comments in order to make the policy more effective for development management purposes.
4. Policy H4. Paragraph H9 refers to two large sites being granted planning permission for up to 125 dwellings in total. Please could a map be provided to show the location of the two sites and with reference numbers (or links) to enable me to read the plans and decision notices? Both paragraph H20 of the Plan and Policy H4 imply that, even though granted planning permission for up to 125 dwellings, the development might not proceed. What is the basis for those views? In its representation (ref: 65), the District Council suggested that the area of land with planning permission for housing should only be indicated broadly and not included on the Policies Map because this would infer a higher status such as an allocation. Given that the land already has planning permission, is it not remiss to exclude the land from the Policies Map, especially as the second part of Policy H4 specifically deals

with it? Indeed, what are the reasons for not including the land within the development boundary?

Questions for the Parish Council

5. Policy H3: bullet 2. To which adjoining land are the links intended and is it suggested that the links should be vehicular?
6. Policy E2: bullet 4. Is the conversion of traditional buildings for economic development intended to include buildings in the countryside, in addition to those within the development boundary?
7. Should the Employment Land (Policy E1) coloured blue on Appendix A be extended at the Beechlea Industrial Estate to include the site of planning permission 1/0890/2018/FULM as shown in the representation from Beechlea Holding Limited?

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure that a copy of this letter and any subsequent response are placed on both the Parish Council and Local Authority websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

Andy Mead

Examiner