

Mattersey Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Further Question Policy 15

I would appreciate clarification and further evidence on the following matters from the Qualifying Body and/or the Local Planning Authority with regard to Policy 15. In order to ensure openness and transparency of the examination process, these questions and the responses should be published on the Council's website.

Following consideration of the responses to my previous questions I am currently finalising my examination report and am giving further consideration to the site under Policy 15 Land south of Breck Lane. I would welcome comments from the Council and QB on the following:

The Highways Authority has stated that the road width to the north of the site will require improvement. Do you have any further information about what will be required?

QB Response: *Highways recommendations relevant to proposals for Manor Farm developments are :*

- *16/00505/OUT where planning permission was granted, but contained condition 5, which required that a road widening scheme to be submitted for approval, which should include a minimum Breck Lane carriageway width of 5.0m from a point south of the site access in a northerly direction connecting to the existing Broomfield Lane junction, plus a 2.0m wide footway along the frontage of the site, connecting to the 0.9m footway provided by planning application 15/01441/FUL.*
- *Policy 15 (Site NP14) consultation response recommended that :*
 - *".. the Breck Lane carriageway is widened to a minimum of 5.5m and a 2.0m wide footway is provided from the site's southern boundary up to and including the junction with Broomfield Lane.", plus*
 - *Visibility splays to be maintained/improved, plus*
 - *Street lighting to be extended to the south of the development, plus*
 - *Village speed limit signs to be relocated to the south of the development.*

Is there any reason to presume that this requirement could not be delivered by the development?

QB Response: *There are no known reasons to presume the requirements could not be delivered, particularly given that:*

- *Breck Lane has been resurfaced recently and widened to 4.3m from south of the stream to the junction with B6045 road to Ranskill. Breck Lane now has a minimum 4.3m width along its entire length from Broomfield Lane and running along the site and onwards to the B6045.*

- *The hedge on the opposite side of Breck Lane from the proposed site is setback from the road by a minimum 1.5m wide grass verge. The land is owned by NCC highways, therefore the road could be widened to accommodate highways requirement.*
- *The frontage of the site is also owned by the site landowner and the boundary could be setback as required to incorporate a footway to the site entrance as part of a planning proposal.*
- *The entrance to the site is expected to be via the same site entrance as per the 16/00505/OUT approved outline planning proposal.*

The site has an area of 1.95 hectares although the indicative number of houses to be developed is given at only 11 which would result in very low density housing. There is no restriction on the number of dwellings to be developed on the site in the policy. I have two concerns:

If the site were to be developed at an average density of say 25 – 30 dwellings to the hectare (similar to the bungalows off Bader Rise) this could potentially result in 50 – 60 dwellings. Would you comment on the implications of this number in terms of the proposed cap on development in the parish in the emerging Local Plan of 60 dwellings.

QB Response: *It is believed that an assumption of 25-30 dwellings per hectare would be rejected by the community should it get to referendum, but it is also deemed to be undesirable and unachievable for the following reasons:*

- *Housing mix mismatch : Bader Rise development consists of high-density 2-bed detached / semi-detached bungalows with small plot sizes, serving a retirement age population, whereas the proposed site would be expected to provide a broader housing mix to attract young and growing families, plus provide dwellings for retired people looking to downsize. The landowner has indicated willingness to work closely with the community to provide affordable housing for families plus single-storey dwellings for the increasingly elderly population, in accordance with Policy 5.*
- *Conflict with NPPF : Paras 68 & 69 guidelines which require no more than 10% of housing supply to be on sites greater than 1 hectare, which would set a ceiling of no more than 32 dwellings for this site, but only if there were no other development within the plan, whereas 45 are proposed within the submitted plan of which only 11 refer to this site.*
- *Unachievable : The submitted NP sites already contain the potential for 45 additional dwellings, which could deliver 13.7% growth on a housing base of 329 dwellings (as per the Feb-2017 Housing Need Assessment report, page 28, paras 82 & 83), which would only allow the scope for a further 15 additional dwellings to be added without breaching BDC's Local plan 20% growth cap of 60 additional dwellings for Mattersey parish.*

If the site were to be developed for 11 low density dwellings this would not support the delivery of NP Policy 5 which is seeking smaller market housing of 2 to 3 bedrooms. Would you comment on this potential conflict.

QB Response: *In April 2017, our second community event presented documentation for this site, showing options of a 11 low-density, or 21 high-density dwellings and asked them to express their views via feedback forms. As a result 45 out of 76, ie 59% were in favour of the high-density housing option of 21 houses for this site. However, at the time, the landowner's preference was for low-density housing which consequently reduced the deliverable quantity to 11 dwellings, which were then input to the plan.*

If the number of dwellings on this site is to be limited to about 11, it is suggested that the site area could be reduced and amended to an area to the north of the stream / hedgerow and the depth of the farm buildings to the north. An alternative approach would be to include a maximum number of dwellings in the policy, although this may be difficult to justify and implement.

I would welcome your comments on how you wish to address these concerns and proceed with this site and policy.

QB Response: *The NPSG would wish to amend the plan as follows :*

- *For Policy 15, we propose to increase the number of dwellings to 21, in accordance with the community feedback from April-2017. The landowner has indicated agreement to this as part of a commitment to work with the community in delivery of policy 5.*
- *There is also a need to recognise that the submitted plan numbers may need to change to reflect known and likely changes to plan policies :*

	<u>Dwellings</u>
NP Submitted plan total for All sites	45
1. Removal of Policy 12 (NP05) as recommended by examiner	- 3
2. Possible removal of Policy 14 (NP18) to resolve conflict with Policy 1a	- 7
3. Increase Policy 15 (NP14) to 21 dwellings to meet the high-density option	+10
NP Revised Plan total for All sites	45