

Examination of the Enfield Local Plan 2019-2041

Inspector: Steven Lee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Programme Officer: Annette Feeney

Tel: 07775 771026

Email: annette.feeney@enfield.gov.uk

Examination webpage: [Local plan examination \(enfield.gov.uk\)](https://enfield.gov.uk/local-plan-examination)

IN1: Preliminary Matters and Questions

Introduction

1. As you know, I have been appointed to examine the Enfield Local Plan 2019 – 2041 (the Plan). Based on what I have read so far, I have several initial questions and/or requests for further information and clarification. The Council's response to these points will help inform the Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) for subsequent discussion at the hearings and the timetable for the examination. These do not cover the full range of issues I shall be considering through the examination but may help to narrow its focus.
2. I may ask additional preliminary questions, including in relation to allocations, in due course.

National Policy

3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in December 2023. The Plan was published for consultation under Regulation 19 on 28 March 2024. As per the transitional arrangements set out in paragraph 230 of the NPPF, the Plan will therefore be considered against the December 2023 version of the document. Should national policy be revised during the examination process, I shall consider the implications of this as necessary, including any transitional arrangements that are put in place.

Legal compliance and scope of the Plan

Representations

4. I have been informed by the Programme Officer that some issues have been identified with the database of representations made at the Regulation 19 stage. I am also aware of the statement placed on the examination website, which explains that the Council are committed to addressing any discrepancies as soon as possible. It is, of course, imperative that I have access to all the representations made. Please keep the Programme Officer informed of progress on this work and any further issues that arise. Whether any further actions are necessary will be determined once this work has been completed. The Council

should, of course, ensure that the relevant requirements of the Regulations and Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) have been adhered to.

5. Under Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) the Council is also required to produce a document setting out the number of representations made, and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations. Document SUB12 is intended to meet this requirement.
6. I have identified some areas of concern with this document. These include some summaries of representations being attributed to certain policies seemingly in error. There are also instances where comments about individual allocations have been attributed to the 'place making' policies, or policies such as H1 and E1, rather than in relation to the sites themselves. This can be confusing, and it would be preferable if specific comments made about an allocation were listed against that allocation. I assume that some of these issues may relate to the database issues referred to above and I look forward to them being resolved.
7. However, there are other issues with the document that could be looked at in any revised version. Firstly, there are two schedules of summaries with different numbers of columns and headings. It would be helpful if these were combined into a single schedule. This would aid navigation. To that end, it would also be helpful if an index page was included setting out the page numbers in the schedule for each policy. You will understand that a document of over 4300 pages is not easy to use without this.
8. The schedule of representation summaries also contains a significant amount of repetition. It would be reasonable to assume that some of this may be because the same representation has been submitted many times. If this is the case, then I would ask the Council to investigate whether it would be possible to present the information in a way which provides a summary of the representations once, but with a list of the representors who made it separately. This may be preferable, and make the document more usable, than needing to scroll through many rows of the schedule that effectively say the same thing. As it stands, for some policies, it can be difficult to discern where different points are raised.
9. In addition to the above, I would also appreciate it if the revised version of the document included a table setting out how many representations have been made to each policy and allocation. This table, and the summary schedules, should also highlight any representations that have been specifically made about the Integrated Impact Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment.

PQ1. Could the Council:

- a) Continue to identify and resolve the issues identified with the representation database;
- b) Once completed, provide a note to me outlining the issues that have been identified, what has been done to correct them (if necessary) and whether there are any outstanding issues that have not been resolved;
- c) Subject to the above, produce a revised version of SUB12 which corrects any errors in the schedules and addresses the points raised above, and

d) Provide a timetable for the completion of work covered under a)-d).

Submission Plan

10. Document SUB10 is entitled “Table of Minor Amendments”. It states that the table included sets out all the changes that have been made to the pre-publication version of the Plan (December 2023) to the version for approval at Full Council Meeting on 19 March 2024.

PQ2. For the avoidance of doubt, can the Council confirm that documents SUB1-SUB6 are the documents which were consulted on between 28 March 2024 and 20 May 2024 and have not been amended in any way since, including in terms of the changes set out in SUB10?

Superseded Policies

11. Regulation 8(5) of the 2012 Regulations states that where a local plan contains a policy that is intended to supersede another policy in the adopted development plan, it must state that fact and identify the superseded policy. I note that paragraph 1.15 of the Plan lists the documents which the Plan will supersede.

PQ3. Is the Council content that they have met the requirements of Regulation 8(5)?

PQ4. Could the Council confirm what elements of the development plan would not be superseded by the Plan?

Duty to Cooperate and General Conformity with the London Plan

12. Section 24(1)(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires the Plan to be in general conformity with the London Plan. I note there is currently no Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the Greater London Authority (GLA) in this regard. This is necessary for my assessment of legal compliance including whether or not the Council has met the Duty to Cooperate and should therefore be completed and submitted to the examination as soon as possible.

13. Many of the requirements of the Plan’s policies will be derived from London Plan. However, it is not always clear which London Plan policies are relevant, where the requirements are simply repeated or where there is any divergence. Some clarity on this would be helpful.

PQ5. Could the Council confirm that the Plan and each specific policy is in general conformity with the London Plan? Where any policy is not considered to be in general conformity with the London Plan can the Council explain why and what is being done to address it (this could be presented as a separate ‘Conformity Topic Paper’)? A separate SoCG with the GLA should also be produced.

PQ6. In responding to the above question, could the Council also produce a schedule setting out which policy or policies in the London Plan are particularly relevant to each policy in the Plan (where applicable)?

Site Selection Methodology

14. The Site Allocation Topic Paper¹ identifies a 6-stage process for assessment potential sites. Paragraph 4.7 of this document states that in addition to identifying suitable allocations, there was a need to consider the opportunity to achieve a sustainable release of land as part of the spatial strategy in order to meet housing targets. It goes on to state the appraisal of strategic options and reasonable alternative are covered in the Integrated Impact Assessment.

PQ7. Which sites or allocations are considered to be 'strategic' in the context of paragraph 4.7 of the Site Allocation Topic Paper?

PQ8. Could the Council confirm whether 'strategic sites' were assessed using the process set out in Table 1 of the Site Allocation Topic Paper? If not, on what basis were the 'strategic sites' identified and assessed?

15. Paragraphs 4.8 – 4.10 refer to employment sites and the issues that were considered.

PQ9. Could the Council confirm whether employment sites went through the same assessment process as set out in Table 1 of the Site Allocation Topic Paper?

Gypsy and Traveller Needs

16. Paragraph 63 of the NPPF states that planning policies should reflect the needs of different groups in the community, including Travellers. Policy H10 states that there is a need of 21 pitches over the plan period, which will be accommodated through a separate Traveller Local Plan. The need is stated to have been identified by the Gypsy and Traveller's Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA)² produced in 2020.

17. In the Council's response to Hertsmere Borough Council's comments (page 412 of SUB12) there is reference to the Council commissioning an updated needs assessment and contributing to the GLA's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment.

PQ10. Could the Council confirm that its intention is for this Plan to identify the scale of need, and overall requirement, for Gypsy and Traveller pitches?

PQ11. If so, is the requirement for pitches based on an up-to-date assessment of need? Further to this, does the Court of Appeal judgement in *Smith v SSLUHC & Ors [2022] EWCA Civ 1391*, have implications in terms of the need identified in the GTAA and/or Policy H10?

PQ12. Could the Council explain and confirm the position with regard to any additional evidence that is being prepared in relation to the assessment of need for Gypsies and Travellers? If additional work is being prepared, then please include the relevant information in the schedule requested under PQ22.

¹ Document TOP2

² Document HNE4

PQ13. What is the Council's justification for preparing a separate 'Traveller Local Plan'? Is such an approach consistent with national policy or any other statutory requirements (for example, the Public Sector Equality Duty)?

PQ14. Could the Council confirm the scope and anticipated timescales for the preparation and adoption of the 'Traveller Local Plan'?

18. Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) states that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. It goes on to state that, if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional, limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (which might be to accommodate a site inset within the Green Belt) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan-making process and not in response to a planning application. If land is removed from the Green Belt in this way, it should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only.
19. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries but where a need for changes to Green Belt boundaries have been established through strategic policies, detailed amendments to those boundaries may be made through non-strategic policies.
20. Policies PL10 and PL11 refer to the provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches being explored subject to the policies and proposals to be set out in the Enfield Traveller Local Plan.

PQ15. Is the Council seeking to establish the exceptional circumstances needed for potential Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Green Belt through this Plan? If so, where is this set out in the evidence base?

PQ16. Would the requirement to 'explore' the provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the Green Belt areas be consistent with the PPTS?

PQ17. If known at this stage, does the 'Traveller Local Plan' seek to allocate land for pitches in the Green Belt, either within the PL10 or PL11 areas, or elsewhere?

21. Part 3 of Policy H10 refers to the Council maintaining continuing cooperation with neighbouring local planning authorities to identify the appropriate need and facilitate provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

PQ18. Has this issue been addressed through the duty to cooperate? If so, could the Council point me to where this is set out in the evidence base?

PQ19. Has the Council sought to meet some of the need identified in other authority areas and/or is the Council intending to accommodate need from any other local authority area?

Other groups in the community

22. As well as the needs of Gypsies and Travellers, paragraph 63 of the NPPF refers to other groups, including but not limited to older people and students.

PQ20. Is the most recent assessment of need for other community groups' needs to be found in the Local Housing Need Assessment dated November 2020³? If so, does this constitute an up-to-date assessment of need?

PQ21. With regard to paragraph 63 of the NPPF:

- a) Has any assessment been made of the strategic need for student accommodation, including needs generated in other areas? If not, what are the reasons for this?
- b) Has any assessment of the needs of houseboat dwellers been undertaken? If not, what are the reasons for this?
- c) How does the Plan seek to accommodate the needs identified for older people?

Other documents and evidence

23. I note in the Council's initial correspondence within the Planning Inspectorate that several additional pieces of work are currently being undertaken. This includes:

- A schedule of proposed modifications
- An update to the housing trajectory
- A flood risk topic paper
- An update to the playing pitch strategy; and
- SoCG with various bodies and groups.

24. Further to this, there are references in SUB12 and various SoCG to the Council's intentions to seek to make changes to the Plan, submit additional SoCG and/or prepare additional evidence.

25. As pointed out in paragraph 3.18 of the Local Plan Procedural Guide⁴, once the plan has been submitted for examination, no written material should be submitted by the local planning authority, or any other party, unless it has been requested by the Inspector. Unless I have specifically requested something, additional evidence will only be accepted exceptionally at my discretion. In such circumstances, it will usually be necessary to explain why it was not possible to submit the evidence at the appropriate time.

Proposed Main Modifications

26. There are several references in the Council's responses to representations to making changes to address the concerns raised. While it will ultimately be for me to decide whether main modifications are necessary to make the Plan sound or legally compliant, it can be useful to understand the Council's position on the issues raised. This can also help to pre-empt any issues I might identify and focus the discussion at the hearings.

³ Document HNE2

⁴ [Procedure Guide for Local Plan Examinations - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

27. Accordingly, a schedule of the modifications the Council considers are necessary would be helpful. I would ask, however, that this only includes the changes the Council considers would be necessary to make the Plan sound or legally compliant and not any minor issues, such as typographical errors or factual corrections. Please set out the revised wording using ~~strike through~~ for text suggested to be deleted and underlined for new or replacement text.
28. It is possible that, in responding to this letter, the Council may identify other potential main modifications. They should also be in the schedule.

Statements of Common Ground

29. I have already requested some additional SoCG above. Such documents are always likely to be helpful to the examination. I am therefore content to receive additional SoCG as and when they are prepared, prior to any relevant hearing session. It is particularly important that these identify any areas of remaining dispute between parties. It would be helpful, however, if the Council could provide a schedule of SoCG it is currently intending to prepare and the timetable for their production.

Housing Trajectory

30. Paragraph 69 of the NPPF requires the Plan to identify a supply of specific, deliverable sites for five years following the intended date of adoption. Accordingly, it is important that the examination is based on the most up-to-date assessment of housing supply. I am therefore content to accept an updated trajectory once it is complete. As well as the overall supply position, this should set out what the anticipated five-year housing supply position would be based on the proposed housing requirement.
31. As part of this work, I would also ask the Council to provide the information set out in Appendix 1 for each site it considers to be part of the deliverable supply. This will aid discussion at the relevant hearing session.

Flood Risk

32. In terms of flood risk, the SoCG with the Environment Agency refers to the re-doing of the sequential and exception tests due to concerns raised about the conclusions of the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). This also states that any sites that “still fail the tests should be subsequently removed as site allocations”. If this is accurate, and the Council is intending to redo this work, I shall require an explanation as to why the work is necessary, a timetable for its completion and how the work will be carried out. I will also need to consider the outcome of this exercise before deciding whether any further actions are needed.
33. I note that the production of a Flood Risk Topic Paper is mooted as a way of addressing this issue. Clearly, this would be helpful in understanding how the Council has considered flooding issues more generally, and the implications of any additional work intended to be carried out.

Playing Pitch Strategy

34. The SoCG with Sport England refers to the production of a new Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS). It goes on to state that this would be used to interpret any future policy changes where required. It is not clear from this whether or not a revised PPS has been commissioned and/or whether it is intended to influence this Plan

or not. I would appreciate some clarity on this, including an explanation as to why this is considered necessary, the timetable for its completion and what, if any, effect this would have on the Plan's policies.

35. I do not know if this represents the full list of additional documentation or evidence the Council is in the process of producing or hoping to submit. If the Council intends to produce any additional evidence over and above what is outlined above, then it should let me know as a matter of urgency by including reference to it in the schedule referred to under PQ22.
36. It is inevitable that the examination timetable will be affected by the need to consider some or all of this evidence prior to publishing the MIQs. Indeed, this work may result in a need for further preliminary questions.

PQ22. Could the Council provide a schedule of the additional documentation (as discussed above), including SoCG, it intends to provide, the reasons why this work is being carried out now and a timetable for its preparation? This should also include the timetable for any additional documents that I have requested, such as the Transport Topic Paper (see below).

PQ23. Where applicable, could the Council provide a schedule of proposed modifications it considers would be necessary to make the Plan sound?

PQ24. Could the Council complete the site delivery schedule set out in Appendix 1 for each site included in the five-year supply?

Other Matters

37. The following cover a range of issues where some clarification, or additional information, is required to assist in drawing up the MIQs.

Vision, Spatial Strategy Key Diagram

38. Paragraph 22 of the NPPF states that where larger scale developments, such as new settlements or significant extensions to villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years) to take account of the timescale for delivery. A substantial amount of housing delivery on allocated sites is expected to come forward beyond the end of the plan period.

PQ25. What implications, if any, does paragraph 22 of the NPPF have for the Plan?

39. The key diagram (figure 2.4) identifies the non-rural areas of Enfield as being 'gentle densification areas'. There is reference to this in Policy SS1 – Spatial Strategy.

PQ26. Other than in regard to Policy SS1, what other policies in the Plan refer or relate to the concept of 'gentle densification'?

Placemaking areas

40. Each of the placemaking sections contains a 'vision' and a plan illustrating the extent of the area, some of its features, including any relevant allocations, and

various 'opportunities'. Although the resolution of the plans in both the printed and electronic versions is quite poor, it appears that the opportunities (for example, the infill opportunities) are numbered. It is not immediately clear from where these numbers are derived or what purpose they have.

PQ27. What status are figures 3.2 to 3.14 intended to have? For example, are they intended to form part of the policy?

PQ28. How are the 'opportunity areas' expected to be used in a decision-making context? Where are numbers in the symbols for such things as infill opportunities, new public realm opportunities etc derived from and what relevance do they have to the policies and decision-making?

Rural Enfield and Green Belt

41. The Plan proposes to remove land from the Green Belt and I shall obviously return to this issue in more depth in my MIQs. The Plan also identifies several other allocations within the Green Belt, including relating to burial and sport and recreation. The Key Diagram identifies an area as 'Rural Enfield'. Chapter 11 contains policies relating to 'Rural Enfield', which appears to largely coincide with the Green Belt.

PQ29. Could the Council confirm how much land is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt, both in absolute terms and as a proportion of its existing extent?

PQ30. Could the Council confirm that site RUR.08 – Sloeman's Farm is not being removed from the Green Belt? Is the inset map on page 352 accurate in this regard? What built form is envisaged for this area and has any assessment of whether this would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt been carried out?

PQ31. In relation to Policy CL4 and allocations RUR.06 and RUR.07, could the Council clarify what built form is envisaged as part of any development on these sites and has any assessment of whether this would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt been carried out?

PQ32. For the avoidance of doubt, are there any areas identified as 'Rural Enfield', as identified on the key diagram, outside the Green Belt? If not, how does this correlate to figure 3.10 and Policy PL9?

PQ33. Are the policies in Chapter 11 – Rural Enfield – meant only to apply within the Green Belt?

PQ34. Are the areas to which Policy PL9 and policies in Chapter 11 apply identified on the Policies Map?

Housing

42. Part 1 of Policy H2 – Affordable Housing refers to the aim of securing 50% of all new homes, based on habitable rooms, over the plan period to be genuinely affordable. Part 2 refers to a minimum of 35% or 50% affordable housing depending on the type or location of development.

43. Part 1g of Policy H3 – Housing Mix and Type sets out the size and mix of dwellings that should be provided.
44. Paragraph 67 of the NPPF states that within the overall housing requirement, strategic policies should also set a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations.
45. Paragraph 70a of the NPPF requires at least 10% of the housing requirement to be on sites of no larger than 1 hectare, unless it can be shown through the preparation of relevant plan policies that there are strong reasons why the 10% target cannot be met.

PQ35. For the avoidance of doubt, are the affordable housing requirements in part 2 of Policy H2 based on the proportion of habitable rooms or units?

PQ36. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1a of Policy H3, could the Council confirm what evidence part 1g is underpinned by and whether it is considered up to date?

PQ37. Could the Council confirm whether there are any designated neighbourhood areas within the Borough and, if so, whether the requirements of paragraph 67 of the NPPF have been met?

PQ38. Could the Council confirm what proportion of the anticipated housing land supply would be made up sites no larger than 1 hectare (it is acceptable for this information to be provided as part of any revised housing trajectory referred to above)?

Economy

46. I have found Policy E12 – Meridian Hinterlands and the extensive reasoned justification difficult to follow and would thus appreciate some clarification. It appears that much of the policy relates to the redistribution of land identified as Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) and Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS).

PQ39. Could the Council provide a brief summary of the context of Policy E12?

PQ40. Could the Council explain why it is necessary for the Plan or policy to seemingly 'work through' the process of redistributing SIL and LSIS areas? Why is it not sufficient to identify these areas as finally proposed and then consider whether they are sound and legally compliant (including the justification for the redistribution) through the examination process?

PQ41. What is meant by 'aspirational change' from SIL to LSIS within the policy?

PQ42. What is the intended status of figures 9.3, to 9.6, table 9.4 and the tables in the policy?

Climate resilience

47. The Government published a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) relating to energy efficiency standards in December 2023. This sets out the Government's position on the setting of standards in development plans.

PQ43. Have the policies relating to energy efficiency been reviewed in the context of the WMS? If not, are any modifications necessary to ensure consistency with the WMS?

PQ44. Do any of the policies in the Plan go beyond current or planned building regulations? If so, could the Council direct me to the evidence required by the WMS to justify this (including any viability assessment that has been carried out)?

PQ45. Are requirements that are expressed as Energy Use Intensity consistent with the WMS?

Transport

48. A number of outstanding matters are identified in the SoCG with Transport for London (TfL). Paragraph 4.3 of this states that the Council will actively seek to address these concerns as the plan progresses through the examination. It is not clear to me how the Council is intending to address these matters and thus some clarity on this is sought. As part of this, it would also be helpful if the Council could also provide a summary of the findings of the transport evidence base.

49. I note that, at submission, there was no SoCG with National Highways. Both for matters of the Duty to Cooperate and consideration of soundness, it would be helpful if one could be produced.

PQ46. Could the Council produce a brief Topic Paper outlining the main issues relating to transport matters. This should set out the strategic transport issues, provide a summary of the main transport evidence produced and the outcomes, what areas of significant transport infrastructure investment are needed to deliver the Plan, what status those infrastructure projects have (for example, are the funded or not), how the interventions have been factored into any viability assessments, what, if any, areas of dispute exist with the relevant highway authorities and what the Council is doing to address these?

PQ47. Could the Council produce a SoCG with National Highways or, if not, explain why this is not possible or necessary?

Retail and Leisure

50. The Enfield Retail and Leisure Study Updated Needs Assessment was published in December 2021.

51. The Planning Practice Guide (PPG)⁵ states that planning policies are expected to define the extent of primary shopping areas.

⁵ Paragraph 2b-0020-20190722

PQ48. Are the policies in the Plan relating to retail and leisure needs based on up-to-date evidence?

PQ49. Is the most recent assessment of need for retail or leisure floorspace consistent with the proposed housing requirement?

PQ50. To what extent have the allocations, particularly those involving existing retail, been taken into account in identifying future retail needs?

PQ51. Does the Plan identify primary shopping areas as expected by the PPG?

Biodiversity

52. The PPG⁶ states that plan makers should be aware of the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, but they do not need to include policies which duplicate the detailed provisions of the statutory framework. It goes on to state that plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for site specific allocations unless justified. To justify such policies, they will need to be evidence including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development.

53. Notwithstanding the above, some representations have referred to the requirement in Policy BG4, and others, for a 20% biodiversity net gain and queried whether this has been assessed in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (WPVA). The Council's response to some of these comments is that it has been. However, I note in the WPVA there are references to 10% being tested as part of the base appraisals (albeit there are also references to 20% elsewhere in the document).

PQ52. What implications does the PPG have, if any, for policies in the Plan relating to biodiversity net gain?

PQ53. Where in the evidence is the justification required by the PPG for the 20% biodiversity net gain advocated by Policy BG4, and others?

PQ54. Could the Council confirm, by reference to specific paragraphs, tables or conclusions, that the requirement of 20% biodiversity net gain has been assessed as part of the WPVA?

Delivery and Monitoring

PQ55. What is the purpose of Policy D1 referring to payments needing to be made under various infrastructure levies? Are these outside the scope of the Plan?

PQ56. Could the Council explain the purpose of Figure 15.1 and how this would be used in a decision-making context, particularly given the circumstances in which

⁶ Paragraph 74-006-20240214

planning obligations can be sought and the provisions of parts 2, 3 and 5 of Policy D1?

PQ57. What is the purpose of Policy D4 in a development management context?

Appendices

54. Policies H1 and E1 makes the point that Appendix C should be read as policy. The effectiveness of this is something that I will likely return to in my MIQs. There are some matters set out below, where I would be grateful for some additional clarity, however. I have also identified some potential inconsistencies in the inset mapping in Appendix C that should be investigated to potentially save time later. This particularly seems to affect the Chase Park and Crews Hill areas. There also appears to be some discrepancies between the capacity figures set out in the main body of the Plan and Appendix C. For example, Table 9.1 suggests that site SA2.2 has an estimated capacity of 22,060 sqm, whereas Appendix C suggests a minimum of 22,120 sqm.

PQ58. In terms of Appendix C:

- a) Are all aspects of the tables intended to be policy?
- b) Are the inset maps meant to be read as policy? Are all the inset maps accurate and consistent with the key on page 361?
- c) Is the scale of development expected on allocations in Appendix C consistent with what is set out in policies H1 and E1? If they are not, then please explain why.
- d) What is the purpose of the coloured boxes for heritage and archaeology? What do the colours mean and how do they relate to policy?

PQ59. What is the intended status of Appendix D? Are the maps and associated text meant to be read as policy?

PQ60. What is the intended status and purpose of Appendix E? What are the implications of including precise financial contributions within the Plan? How would changes, such as inflation, be taken into account?

Policy interpretation

55. A substantial number of policies refer to applicants having to “demonstrate how” their developments will achieve certain outcomes. Several policies also contain references to examples in brackets. Given the prevalence of these references, it would be useful to understand their purpose now, to aid discussions later.
56. Various policies in the Plan refer to other documents, including but not limited to supplementary planning documents, that are not part of the development plan. Such documents may be material considerations that it would be appropriate to have regard to when determining planning applications. However, it is unlikely that a policy, or associated reasoned justification, requiring proposals to comply, accord, or align with such documents, would be justified.

PQ61. For the avoidance of doubt, and to assist in discussions at a later date:

- a) Could the Council confirm how the requirement to “demonstrate how” would be interpreted? For example, would it require additional assessments or documentation over and above what would normally be expected?
- b) Could the Council consider whether citing examples in policies is likely to be clear and unambiguous for decision makers and whether these would be better placed in the reasoned justification, perhaps with other examples where appropriate? If, in the alternative, the examples are meant to define the full scope of where a policy may apply, then would modifications be necessary to make this clear?

PQ62. Could the Council identify all parts of policies in the Plan that refer to other documents (that are not development plan documents) and consider whether it is necessary to refer to each and, if so, whether the reference is appropriately phrased?

Next steps

57. I would appreciate the schedule setting out the additional works intended to be carried out, including SoCG, and associated explanations and timetables referred to under PQ1 and PQ22 by **midday on 30 September 2024**. Answers to my other questions should be provided no later than **midday 1 November 2024**. I am content to receive the information requested above, including any SoCG or agreed documents (for example, Topic Papers) prior to this date if the Council is able to send it. If there are likely to be issues in meeting these deadlines, such as there being a need for additional work, then please let me know through the Programme Officer.
58. I have asked the Programme Officer to publish this letter on the examination website. Any additional documents produced and the answers to my questions will also be published on the examination website in due course. Representors are not being asked to respond to any of the matters raised in this letter at this stage.

Yours sincerely

Steven Lee

6 September 2024

Appendix 1

Housing Delivery Schedule – Expected Information

The following information should be provided for every site that the Council assumes will contribute to current 5-year supply.

A. All sites with detailed planning permission, and sites of <10 homes or <0.5ha that have outline planning permission.

Site Name					
Local Plan Ref					
Total Capacity					
Plan Period Completions					
Five Year Completions					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Completions					

These sites can be considered deliverable unless there is clear evidence that homes will not be delivered within five years.

B. Other sites (including those of at least 10 homes or at least 0.5ha with outline permission, with a grant or permission in principle, allocations, or identified on brownfield register)

Site Name					
Local Plan Ref					
Total Capacity					
Plan Period Completions					
Five Year Completions					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Completions					

Clear evidence relating to:

Developers' delivery intentions including anticipated start and build out rates

Current planning status and progress towards the submission of an application

Progress with site assessment work

Site viability

Availability: ownership, any existing uses, etc

Infrastructure provision