

# INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE LEEKFRITH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

INDEPENDENT EXAMINER:  
Christopher Collison BA(Hons) MBA MRTPI MIED MCMi IHBC

To Peak District National Park Authority  
By email to Adele Metcalfe  
Copy to Joanna Bagnall Staffordshire Moorlands District Council and June Sherratt  
Clerk Leekfrith Parish Council.

Dated 3 December 2019

Dear Adele

## **Leekfrith Neighbourhood Development Plan Independent Examination - Examiner letter seeking clarification of matters**

In my initial letter dated 27 November 2019 I sought clarification regarding a matter raised by the Environment Agency. I now write to seek clarification of other matters:

I request any response is agreed as a joint response of the National Park Authority, the District Council, and the Parish Council if at all possible. This request for clarification and any response should be published on the National Park Authority website, with link from the District Council website.

- 1) Could you please direct me to the existing evidence to support the requirement in part A(i) of Policy 1 for garaging rather than parking facilities only.
- 2) Part 1(iii) of Policy 1 could result in incompatible uses, for example general industry and housing, being mixed-in with one another. Is it intended that the acceptable uses referred to would be subject to compatibility with nearby uses?
- 3) Part B of Policy 1 comprises statements rather than policy components. I recommend these are transferred to supporting text. In terms of housing numbers, I note page 7 of the Basic Conditions Statement refers to strategic policy. Could you please confirm that neither the Peak District Core Strategy nor the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy include a housing requirement figure for all, or part, of the Neighbourhood Plan area? Could you please direct me to the part of the emerging Local Plan that sets out the aspiration for 4-8 windfall dwellings. With respect to affordable housing provision could you please confirm the requirements of strategic policies that would apply to the scale of scheme that is likely at Upper Hulme Mill.
- 4) The term "completely discouraged" in part C of Policy 1 does not provide a basis for the determination of development proposals. Is it intended that to be supported development proposals should demonstrate they will not result in additional 'on-road' vehicle parking?
- 5) The structure of Policy 2 could lead to some uncertainty whether points iv and v only apply in the case of circumstances set out in point iii. Would restructuring of the policy as follows meet the intention: Present points ii and iii as alternative circumstances, and then present points i, iv and v to apply in every case?

- 6) Policy 3 includes the imprecise terms “suitable” and “unacceptable” and the policy is without consequence. Is it intended that to be supported development proposals should demonstrate they will not result in additional ‘on-road’ vehicle parking?
- 7) It is not clear to me what purpose Policy 4 is intended to serve, in that the development to which the policy relates is permitted development. In fact, “up to” is more restrictive than the permitted development term “not more than”. Is it intended the Policy should refer to, and establish support for, associated works that are not permitted development, for example access alterations or surface matting?

In order to maintain the momentum of the Independent Examination I would be grateful if you could respond to this request for clarification of matters by 12.00 Noon on Wednesday 11 December 2019.

I should be grateful if the National Park Authority, the District Council, and the Parish Council could acknowledge receipt of this email.

Best regards  
Chris Collison  
Independent Examiner  
Planning and Management Ltd  
[collisonchris@aol.com](mailto:collisonchris@aol.com)