

Glinton Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2036

A report to Peterborough City Council

**David Kaiserman BA DipTP MRTPI
Independent Examiner**

November 2020

Executive summary

I was appointed by Peterborough City Council on 23 September 2020, with the agreement of Glinton Parish Council, to carry out the independent examination of the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan.¹

The examination was completed solely on the basis of the written representations received, no public hearing appearing to me to have been necessary. I made an unaccompanied visit to the area covered by the Plan on 18 October 2020.

Glinton is a small rural parish in Cambridgeshire in the low-lying “Fen Edge”, six miles to the north of the city of Peterborough, and containing 692 dwellings at the time of a survey in 2018. In order to guide the future development of the village, the Parish Council began work on the preparation of a neighbourhood plan in September 2013, and it was formally submitted to the City Council on 20 June 2020.

The adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) designates Glinton as a “medium” village, the third in a four-level settlement hierarchy. The Neighbourhood Plan concludes that up to 34 new dwellings would be required to meet local needs over the period 2016-2036, a timeframe which aligns with that of the Local Plan. No specific land allocations are put forward to meet that need, with reliance instead being placed on sites becoming available within the established village envelope and any exceptions to that approach as may be justified by reference to other plan policies. The Plan includes detailed policies designed (in particular) to secure high quality design, protect important local open spaces, conserve and enhance the natural environment, support the local economy and protect important views. Other policies seek to address issues relating to vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements.

Subject to a number of recommendations (principally for changes to the detailed wording of some policies), I have concluded that the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements at this stage of its preparation, and consequently am pleased to recommend that it should proceed to referendum.

¹ Throughout my report I have referred simply to the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan or GNP.

Contents

- Introduction
- Procedural matters
- A brief picture of the Neighbourhood Plan area
- The basic conditions
- Other statutory requirements
- National policy
- The existing Development Plan for the area
- The consultation exercise (Regulation 14)
- General observations about the Plan
- Representations received (Regulation 16)
- The Neighbourhood Plan's approach to housing
- The policies:
 - Policy GNP1: Housing Growth
 - Policy GNP2: Location of New Development
 - Policy GNP3: Design
 - Policy GNP4: Infrastructure Development
 - Policy GNP5: Local Green Space
 - Policy GNP6: The Natural Environment
 - Policy GNP7: Car Parking
 - Policy GNP8: Important Views
 - Policy GNP9: Drainage and Flood Risk
 - Policy GNP10: Traffic
 - Policy GNP11: Footpaths and Cycleways
 - Policy GNP12: The Local Economy
 - Policy GNP13: Clare Lodge
 - Policy GNP14: Recreation Ground and Village Hall
- The Appendices
- Minor points
- Conclusions on the basic conditions
- Formal recommendation
- Appendix: Summary table of recommendations

Introduction

1. This report sets out the findings of my examination of the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan (the GNP), submitted to Peterborough City Council (PCC) by Glinton Parish Council on 20 June 2020. The Neighbourhood Area for these purposes is the same as the Parish boundary.
2. Neighbourhood plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to help local communities shape the development and growth of their area, and this intention was given added weight in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), first published in 2012. The current edition of the NPPF is dated June 2019, and it continues to be the principal element of national planning policy. Detailed advice is provided by national Planning Practice Guidance on neighbourhood planning, first published in March 2014.
3. The main purpose of the independent examination is to assess whether or not the Plan satisfies certain “basic conditions” which must be met before it can proceed to a local referendum, and also whether it is generally legally compliant. In considering the content of the Plan, recommendations may be made concerning changes both to policies and any supporting text.
4. In the present case, my examination concludes with a recommendation that, subject to certain detailed recommendations, the Plan should proceed to referendum. If this results in a positive outcome, the GNP would ultimately become a part of the statutory development plan, and thus a key consideration in the determination of planning applications relating to land lying within the Parish.
5. I am independent of the Parish Council and do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan. I have the necessary qualifications and experience to carry out the examination, having had 30 years’ experience as a local authority planner (including as Acting Director of Planning and Environmental Health for the City of Manchester), followed by over 20 years’ experience providing training in planning to both elected representatives and officers, for most of that time also working as a Planning Inspector. My appointment has been facilitated by the independent examination service provided by Penny O’Shea Consulting (POC).

Procedural matters

6. I am required to recommend that the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan either
 - be submitted to a local referendum; or
 - that it should proceed to referendum, but as modified in the light of my recommendations; or
 - that it not be permitted to proceed to referendum, on the grounds that it does not meet the requirements referred to in paragraph 3 above.
7. In carrying out my assessment, I have had regard to the following principal documents:
 - the submitted GNP
 - the Consultation Statement (February 2020)
 - the Basic Conditions Statement (February 2020)
 - the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion (March 2019)
 - the representations made in relation to the GNP under Regulation 16
 - selected policies of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan
 - relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework
 - relevant paragraphs of national Planning Policy Guidance.

8. It is expected that the examination of a draft neighbourhood plan will not include a public hearing, and that the examiner should reach a view by considering written representations². In the present case, I have concluded that no hearing was necessary. The recommendations in my report are therefore based on consideration of the representations, supplemented by my visit to the village and the area around it.
9. My unaccompanied visit took place on 18 October 2020, when I looked at the overall character and appearance of the Parish, together with its setting in the wider landscape, those areas affected by specific policies in the Plan, and the locations referred to in the representations. I refer to my visit as necessary elsewhere in this report.

A brief picture of the Neighbourhood Plan area

10. Glinton is a rural village in the north of Cambridgeshire, about six miles north of the city of Peterborough. Its setting is dominated by the flat and low-lying “Fen Edge” landscape, punctuated by belts of trees and hedgerows, and criss-crossed by drainage dykes and embankments. The village has ancient roots (evidence of which is recorded from time to time in the Plan), and views both of and within it are dominated by the impressive “needle” spire of St Benedict Parish Church. There are many listed buildings, especially in the village core, which is a designated conservation area. The Parish has seen steady growth in recent years. From my observations, not all the post-war housing development has fully respected the denser character of the older settlement, this being especially true in the culs-de-sac which extend towards the north-west and south-east of the village core. Nonetheless, there is a clear distinction between the compact built-up area of the village and the surrounding countryside, a feature which the Neighbourhood Plan properly seeks to preserve.
11. In addition to the church, the village has a surgery and a chemist, three care homes, a primary school, a pub (the Plan says there used to be five), a Village College and a combined post office and convenience store. There are several small to medium businesses, in addition to farm-holdings. Clare Lodge is a nationally significant provider of secure accommodation for vulnerable young women. Perhaps rather unusually for a modestly sized rural village, according to the Plan document, residents are generally satisfied with the quality of service provided by the local bus operators.

The basic conditions

12. I am not required to come to a view about the ‘soundness’ of the plan (in the way which applies to the examination of local plans). Instead, I must principally address whether or not it is appropriate to make it, having regard to certain “basic conditions”, as listed at paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The requirements are also set out in paragraph 065 of Planning Practice Guidance. I deal with each of these conditions below in the context of the GNP’s policies but, in brief, all neighbourhood plans must:
 - have regard to national policy and guidance (Condition a);
 - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (Condition d);
 - be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area (Condition e);
 - not breach, and otherwise be compatible with, EU obligations, including human rights requirements (Condition f);

² Paragraph 9(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017; and
 - comply with any other prescribed matters.
13. The Basic Conditions Statement (BCS) prepared on behalf of the Parish Council is a well laid out document which explains how the GNP meets the basic legal requirements of a neighbourhood plan, before taking each policy in turn and assessing its relationship with the national and strategic local planning context. It also includes a summary of the sustainability assessments (economic, social and environmental) carried out as part of its preparation. I will refer to specific elements of this document as necessary when considering the detailed provisions of the Plan.

Other statutory requirements

14. A number of other statutory requirements apply to the preparation of neighbourhood plans, all of which I consider have been met in this case. These are:
- that the Parish Council is the appropriate qualifying body (Localism Act 2011) able to lead preparation of a neighbourhood plan;
 - that what has been prepared is a Neighbourhood Development Plan, as formally defined by the Localism Act; that the plan area does not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area; and that there are no other neighbourhood plans in place within the area covered by the plan;
 - that the plan period must be stated (which in the case of Ginton is 2016-2036); and
 - that no “excluded development” is involved (this primarily relates to development involving minerals and waste and nationally significant infrastructure projects).
15. I have also borne in mind the particular duty, under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to pay special attention to the desirability of “preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of any conservation area.
16. A screening report is required in order to determine whether a neighbourhood plan needs to be accompanied by a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), under the terms of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. It is the qualifying body’s responsibility to undertake any necessary environmental assessments, but it is the Local Planning Authority’s responsibility to engage with the statutory consultees.
17. In March 2019, the Parish Council submitted the draft GNP to PCC for a screening assessment under the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations. The subsequent report was sent to the relevant statutory bodies (Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency) for their observations. The result of this process was that PCC concluded that it was unlikely that significant environmental effects would arise from implementation of the GNP, and therefore that an SEA was not required. Having considered all the responses referred to, I have no reason to question the conclusion reached.
18. It is a requirement under the Planning Acts that policies in neighbourhood plans must relate to “the development and use of land”, whether within the Plan area as a whole or in some specified part(s) of it. I am satisfied that that requirement is met (subject to a recommendation in relation to Policy GNP4).

National policy

19. National policy is set out primarily in the NPPF, a key theme being the need to achieve sustainable development. The NPPF is supported by Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), an online

resource which is continually updated by Government. I have borne particularly in mind the advice in the PPG that a policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous, concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.

The existing Development Plan for the area

20. Basic Condition (e) requires neighbourhood plans to be “in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area”. For Glington, the principal element of this is the Peterborough Local Plan (PLP), adopted 24 July 2019. I refer to policies within the PLP as necessary at appropriate points in my report.

The consultation exercise (Regulation 14)

21. This regulation requires the Parish Council to publicise details of their proposals “in a way that is likely to bring [them] to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the area”, and to provide details of how representations about them can be made. Regulation 15 requires the submission to the Local Planning Authority of a statement setting out the details of what was done in this respect, and how the qualifying body responded to any matters which arose as a result of the consultation process.
22. In line with the relevant Regulations, the GNP Consultation Statement sets out details of who was consulted about the Plan; the processes involved; the issues that were raised; and how such issues were considered and, where relevant, addressed. The exercise began as far back as 2013, when a view was taken that an earlier expression of local needs and priorities (the Glington Village and Neighbourhood Investment Plan, supplemented by a local design guide) should be replaced with a statutory neighbourhood plan. Residents at large were first consulted on the way ahead in January 2014.
23. There is no need here for me to describe in detail the subsequent stages of community involvement: these are set out in the BCS, which records the fact that the vision and basic objectives of the Plan were the subject of consultation in the summer of 2017, with the Regulation 14 “Pre-submission” consultation process taking place during July-September 2019. The BCS sets out in detail how each of these exercises was handled, and I am satisfied that the work done by the Parish Council’s team fully meets the requirements of the Regulations.

General observations about the Plan

24. The following points may be helpful in understanding the way I have approached my report on the Plan and the observations and recommendations which I make upon it:
 - the recommendations I make concentrate on the policies themselves, since that is what the basic conditions relate to;
 - I have addressed the policies in the order that they appear in the submitted plan;
 - my recommendations for changes to the policies and any associated or free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are highlighted in ***bold italic print***.
25. The document itself begins with a summary of the background to neighbourhood plans and a tabular description of the community consultations which took place. This records the fact that, after taking advice from PCC, the helpful decision was taken to align the GNP’s end date with that of the PLP (i.e. 2036). A description of the principal physical and socio-economic characteristics of the Parish leads into a summary of the Plan’s main objectives:
 - to complement wider initiatives to mitigate the effects of climate change;

- to encourage new, sympathetically designed development which meets the needs of the area;
 - to protect and enhance the area’s valuable natural and physical attributes;
 - to create an attractive public realm, and support local services and economic activity;
 - to address issues relating to vehicular and pedestrian access.
26. These objectives are then followed by 14 individual policies, set out in coloured boxes which clearly differentiate them from the supporting text. The document as a whole, with several clear maps and a range of photographs, is very easy to navigate. It is written in plain English, which contributes to its overall user-friendly character. A number of appendices appropriately provide further background material. ***I recommend that, in order to help readers refer to its various sections, the Plan document be further improved by adopting a simple numbering system for the paragraphs which support the policies. Similarly, the list of policies on the Contents page should include their reference numbers.***

Representations received (Regulation 16)

27. Six representations were made in response to the submitted Plan. No concerns were raised by the Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England or the National Grid. Several detailed observations were made by PCC, which I will come back to under the relevant policy heading. There was one objection from the owner of land lying to the east of Lincoln Road, to which I refer below.

The Neighbourhood Plan’s approach to housing

28. Policy LP2 of the PLP (adopted in July 2019) sets out the spatial strategy for the area. It states that the settlement hierarchy consists of the City itself, followed by two large villages, eight “medium” villages (including Glinton) and a larger number of smaller settlements. Policy LP3 expands on this in relation specifically to housing, with the focus for new development being firmly on Peterborough (including planned urban extensions), with only 5% of the housing requirement being met across all the villages. Some villages have been given specific small allocations for development, while in the other locations any new housing will be limited to infill or redevelopment within the settlement boundaries (which are defined on the Local Plan’s Proposals Map). There is a strong presumption against any new housing outside the settlement boundaries, other than on “rural exception” sites and development permitted by Policy LP11 of the PLP (Development in the Countryside).
29. The GNP does not allocate any land within Glinton for development. The full reasons for this are set out in Policies GNP1 and GNP2.
30. Ms Sarah Champion is the owner of land to the east of Lincoln Road that adjoins, but lies outside of, the village envelope to the north of the village. Her representations are contained in a statement sent to PCC in an email dated 28 September 2020, supplemented by a promotional document for the development of the land prepared by consultants Icení (dated April 2019). The statement (which bears the title “Sustainable Glinton”) sets out Ms Champion’s reasons for believing that the development of her land should be supported.
31. While it is clear that Ms Champion objects to the failure of the GNP to allocate the land east of Lincoln Road for housing, at no point does she suggest that it thereby fails any of the statutory tests which neighbourhood plans are required to satisfy, nor does she make any comments about the appropriateness of Policies GNP1 and GNP2 in principle. She considers that:
- her proposals would constitute a sustainable extension to the village, providing a range of housing and local amenities which her survey work suggests would be welcomed locally;

- the value placed on the land as an example of a “ridge and furrow” field pattern has been exaggerated (see below);
 - the development of the site could be carried out with the highest environmental and social objectives in mind, across a wide range of related elements.
32. I am satisfied that it is not necessary for me to make any specific observations about Ms Champion’s vision for the land since there is a clear and firm presumption against its development in principle, deriving from the existing strategic planning framework for the area. I would add, however, that my visit to Glington showed me that the site is wholly detached from the built-up area of the village and satisfied me that its development would appear as a prominent and anomalous feature in the landscape. I also note that, in any event, the promotional document prepared by Icenii states that the site “has potential for development in the longer term through the review of the Local Plan, or should land supply drop in the future”, with no suggestion that it would comply with current planning strategy. On this basis it is unnecessary for me to make any further observations on its contents.
33. Ms Champion also makes a number of complaints about what she sees as the failure of the Parish Council to engage constructively with her on her ideas during the preparation of the Plan. These are matters which are not within my brief to consider, and I make no further comment about them, beyond saying that there are formal mechanisms for investigating her more significant allegations should she wish to pursue them.

The policies

NOTE: Unless stated otherwise, I have concluded that all of the policies satisfy the basic conditions as they are presently worded, in particular that they are in general accordance with relevant policies of the Peterborough Local Plan, and that appropriate regard has been had to national policy and guidance.

Policy GNP1: Housing Growth

34. The preamble to this policy records the steady growth of the Parish since 2001 (expressed by the number of dwellings rather than population). It explains that there was a total of 674 dwellings in 2018, with the proportion of three, four- or five-bedroom accommodation being significantly higher than the average for the wider Peterborough area. It points out that recent developments have tended to continue this pattern, something which the Plan seeks to address.
35. There is local support for the principle of sustainable growth in the village, so long as it is of an appropriate type and quality. The intention is to manage the growth of housing such that it amounts to a roughly 5% increase in the stock between 2018 and 2036. This equates to a maximum of 34 dwellings, a figure which could be exceeded if there is clear local community support for a particular scheme. The policy expresses in very general terms the need for proposals to “contribute positively to providing a mix of housing types, styles and sizes”, especially where the scheme consists of five or more dwellings. Support is given for smaller dwellings generally.

Policy GNP2: Location of New Development

36. The Plan emphasises the importance of maintaining the existing village envelope. This concentration of built form helps to define and preserve the character of the village itself but also to reinforce its setting in the wider landscape. A “core objective” of this policy, therefore,

is to maintain the gaps between Glington and nearby settlements (especially Peakirk³ and Etton). It supports, in principle, new development within the village envelope; land outside this defined area is considered to be “open countryside”, where new building will only be permitted in very limited circumstances, reflecting policies in the Local Plan.

37. Policy GNP2 also states that development will not be supported where there is relevant opposition from the Health and Safety Executive (this relates to a number of major hazard sites and pipelines which are located within the Parish).

Policy GNP3: Design

38. This policy contains 14 criteria against which development proposals will be measured. Given the absence of any adverse representations to them, I have no need to go into them in any detail. They cover a wide range of considerations which are said to be important components of good design. While some are more specific than others, the policy as a whole is not expressed in an over-prescriptive way, thus leaving room for appropriate discussion and negotiation in response to specific applications. There is nevertheless a strong desire to exceed current minimum aspirations in some respects (especially at national level), an approach which seems to me appropriate in a neighbourhood plan. I note in addition that some aspects of the policy would reflect supplementary planning advice prepared by PCC for selected villages (including Glington).

Policy GNP4: Infrastructure Development

39. This is a somewhat vague policy that simply encourages continued engagement with the Parish Council by the appropriate bodies “where development is proposed for infrastructure purposes” (not defined). This is clearly a sensible approach for many reasons, but it does not constitute a land-use policy in the terms required for a neighbourhood plan. ***I therefore recommend the deletion of Policy GNP4. The aspiration could be retained under a separate heading (such as “Matters outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan”) placed towards the end of the document.***

Policy GNP5: Local Green Space

40. This policy takes into account NPPF paragraph 99: “*The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them..... Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.*” Paragraph 100 goes on to say that “*the Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is: a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.*”
41. I have not been given evidence of any specific exercise carried out by the Parish Council to support the selection of the three sites within the core of the village for protection under this

³ I had cause to comment in some detail about the importance of the gap between Glington and Peakirk when considering Policy PK1 of the Peakirk Neighbourhood Plan, for which I was also the examiner (2017).

policy, but no objections have been raised to their inclusion in the list, and following my visit to the village, and having considered Policy GNP5 in the light of NPPF paragraphs 99 and 100, I have no reasons of my own to question the appropriateness of their proposed designation. I readily understand the comment in the preamble to the policy that there are, in fact, very few green spaces within the village proper.

42. Of a separate character to the incidental urban green sites just mentioned is a fourth open area to be designated under the policy. This is the location of mediaeval “ridge and furrow” fields north of the village, east of Lincoln Road (incorporating the area owned by Ms Campion, but extending to roughly twice the size of that land). The preamble to the policy includes an extract from an assessment of the considerable significance of this site carried out by a Cambridge University academic, which he concludes makes it of local and regional importance. Further detail is provided in Appendix 3 to the Plan.
43. Policy GNP5 crisply states that, other than in very special circumstances, no development may take place which would harm the enjoyment or undermine the importance of these designated areas of open land.
44. There are no difficulties with the policy so far as the basic conditions are concerned: however, I agree with PCC that the reference in the supporting material to “the grassed triangle to the west of the A15/Old Lincoln Road” is confusing as it stands. I accept that this area, which I assume to have been laid out as part of the highway scheme, contributes to the character of the village as part of its southern “gateway”, but it is clearly incapable of development and so is unlikely to be lost as an asset. ***I recommend that this reference be reworded along the following lines: “The grassed triangle to the west of the A15/Old Lincoln Road roundabout is populated with a large number of immature trees and provides a significant green gateway into the village. While it does not fully meet the criteria for designation of Local Green Spaces and so has not been included within the list of sites in Policy GNP5, it is not considered to be capable of development due to its character and location”.***
45. PCC make a separate point in relation to this policy, in the light of a recent legal judgement⁴ that examined whether a neighbourhood plan had *sufficiently demonstrated* that a designated Local Green Space met the NPPF tests. PCC consider it prudent for the GNP to strengthen the supporting text to Policy GNP5 such that it can be said that the Plan “clearly and explicitly” sets out how each Local Green Space meet the four tests. Given, in particular, Ms Campion’s objection, ***I recommend that PCC’s suggestion be acted upon.*** This would not be an onerous modification to make.
46. In addition, PCC suggest that the numbering of section 5.2 should be split to reflect the fact that there are two sites involved (subject to any additional modification required to deal with the previous point); and that the references to the maps in the first paragraph of the preamble to the policy should also include map 7. ***I recommend the adoption of these modifications.***

Policy GNP6: The Natural Environment

47. This policy sets out the objective of protecting and, wherever possible, enhancing existing natural assets such as hedgerows, trees, water features and wildlife habitats. Where the loss of a feature is unavoidable, mitigation measures will be required which would at least result in a neutral impact on wildlife. Specific and detailed guidance is given in relation to replacement trees. At the

⁴ Lochailort judgement 2 October 2020: [2020 EWCA Civ 1259]

same time, the intention is for a net overall gain in biodiversity.

48. While I have no concerns about the broad objectives here, it seems to me that there is some lack of clarity which needs to be resolved. The first paragraph reads: *“Development proposals should protect existing natural features and deliver enhancements to the natural environment of Glington wherever possible by...”* [my emphases], whereas the penultimate paragraph states: *“Overall a net gain in biodiversity should be achieved, demonstrated by appropriate evidence prepared by a suitably qualified person on behalf of the applicant”*. On a straight reading, the requirement for a net gain in biodiversity is an absolute, applicable in all circumstances, which conflicts with the more nuanced expression of the first paragraph. ***I recommend that, to allow proper consideration to be given to matters of practicality and viability, the penultimate paragraph should read: “Overall, wherever practicable, a net gain in biodiversity should be achieved, demonstrated where applicable by appropriate evidence.....”***
49. The policy as it stands includes elements which I consider should be separated out in order to be of maximum value in development management terms. ***I make the following recommendations:***
- ***the part of the policy dealing with protected trees and woodland, which expands upon a specific policy in the Local Plan (LP29), should be placed at the end of the policy “box”, with a sub-heading reading “Protected trees”; and***
 - ***the reference to the desire to create a nature recovery area within the Parish should be deleted and relocated within the Plan document as a community aspiration (which is how it is described), since its land-use implications are not specified.***

Policy GNP7: Car Parking

50. Policy GNP7 acknowledges the difficulties in dealing with on-street parking problems. It requires development proposals to meet parking standards set out in the Local Plan (Policy 13 / Appendix C) as a minimum. Housing schemes must usually provide parking on site, and broad criteria are set for ensuring that this relates well to its physical context. Development will be required to provide electric plug-in vehicle charging points.

Policy GNP8: Important Views

51. The short preamble to this policy refers firstly to the importance of views of the open countryside around the village, especially from rural footpaths. Neither the policy nor the supporting material identifies the location of particularly significant views in this respect (in fact, the policy itself makes no reference to countryside views at all). There is a separate focus on the importance of views of St Benedict Parish Church, which can be appreciated from many points around the village: Map 8 locates four of them. The policy itself is not cross-referenced to the map, and I have taken this to mean, as with the views out of the village into the countryside, that no “hierarchy” of views of the church has been identified for the purposes of the Plan.
52. I consider that there is a need to clarify the intended scope of this policy, and ***I recommend as follows:***
- ***it should include reference to the importance of views out of the village into the surrounding countryside, with an indication (both in the wording of the policy and on the map accompanying it) of the most significant locations which require protection;***
 - ***it should be clearer than it is now whether the four viewpoints shown on Map 8 are merely examples or are considered to be of particular significance in terms of the public appreciation of the Parish Church. The clarification is required both in***

the caption to the map and the text of the policy;

- *the wording of the policy should also be amended by clarifying the requirement that development proposals “should not obstruct” views (whether of the Church or, as I have suggested, of the surrounding countryside). As it stands, even minor interventions would conflict with the policy. This can be done by simply inserting the word “significantly” before “obstruct”;*
- *as a separate, but related, point, the map could usefully show the boundaries of the village conservation area.*

Policy GNP9: Drainage and Flood Risk

53. The preamble to this policy provides a brief account of the need for careful consideration to be given to the impact of new development on the surface and foul water systems of the Parish, given a history of drainage and flooding problems. On my reading, the policy adds little to the more detailed requirements set out in recently adopted Local Plan Policy LP32, and on this basis there is a case for saying that GNP9 is superfluous. However, given the significance of the issue locally, I have not recommended that it be deleted. PCC suggest that the policy make clear that compliance is also required with the City Council’s Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document, ***and I recommend that this amendment be made.***

Policy GNP10: Traffic

54. The supporting material for this policy summarises the relationship between through traffic using the A15 (which bypassed Glinton in the 1980s) and the local road network, pointing out the familiar pressures such as the daily school run. Additional issues arise from access to the Arthur Meadows Village College, on the south-western edge of the village. Policy GNP10 sets out a reasonable intention to ensure that the potential impacts of any new access points proposed on to the principal routes in the village will be adequately addressed. It is not clear to what extent this broadly expressed objective would in practice lead to additional, or different, scrutiny of planning applications by PCC’s planning and highways teams, but the policy is, in principle, an understandable one in its context.

Policy GNP11: Footpaths and Cycleways

55. Policy GNP11 contains a series of requirements to ensure that development proposals are designed to protect and, where appropriate, enhance, the existing network of pedestrian and cycle routes and the access to them, both in terms of connectivity and physical appearance. Map 11 indicates the location of existing rights of way and permissive footpaths, although the Plan does not identify any specific locations where improvements will be sought.

Policy GNP12: The Local Economy

56. Subject to appropriate safeguards in relation to their environmental and amenity impact, development of what might be summarised as “high street” and office-type uses (including by conversion or expansion) is supported under this policy. However, the GNP has been overtaken by events in that the categories of land-use set out in Policy GNP12 are those relevant to the old version of the Use Classes Order. A new and greatly simplified Order came into effect on 1 September 2020, as a result of which the references in the policy need to be changed.
57. ***I recommend that the opening sentence of the policy (“Development in categories A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional), A3 (restaurants and cafes) and B1”) be replaced with: “Development in Use Class E (commercial, business and service uses)....”***

Policy GNP13: Clare Lodge

58. Clare Lodge is a facility owned and operated by PCC and located at the extreme southern edge of the village, close to the A15. The preamble to Policy GNP13 explains its unique national role in providing secure, all-female accommodation for up to 20 vulnerable young women. Due to its particular requirements, privacy and security are of paramount importance to the running of the home, and the policy recognises this by stating that any development proposals which might compromise its operation in these respects will not be supported.

Policy GNP14: Recreation Ground and Village Hall

59. This policy is designed to protect the recreation ground (a significant open area on the eastern side of Lincoln Road close to the southern entrance to the village) from any development other than that which would be directly related to its open space use. At the same time, allowance is made for the possibility that part of the land might at some time be taken for a replacement Village Hall. The preamble to the policy explains that both areas presently lie within the ownership of the Parish Council.

The Appendices

60. The Plan document concludes with eight appendices, several of which contain useful electronic links to other resources:
1. a glossary of abbreviations and terms used;
 2. further detailed guidance, beyond policies GNP3 and GNP6, about how steps might be taken locally to combat climate change;
 3. details of two sites of historic significance: the “ridge and furrow” fields to the north of the village, referred to earlier; and the somewhat mysterious Car Dyke, which passes through the Parish on its route from Peterborough to Lincoln;
 4. information about the National Grid’s gas compressor station and high-pressure pipelines in the area, especially in relation to their health and safety implications;
 5. a summary of the 2016 questionnaire sent to all 690 households in the Parish, and the responses received;
 6. detailed advice about how to make a hedge for wildlife;
 7. a list of sites providing national advice about housing design; and
 8. links to sites dealing with the issue of light pollution.
61. Most of this is likely to provide useful supplementary information and comment for users of the Plan, but there is scope for some uncertainty about its intended relevance in development management terms. For this reason, ***I recommend that an introductory paragraph be included along the following lines: “The appendices which follow provide useful background to some aspects of the Plan, but do not themselves constitute policies.”***
62. I do, however, query whether Appendix 8 might be treated differently. Given the link between light pollution and the decline in insect biomass to which it refers, and the ability of the planning system to address the issue directly through the development management process, it would seem logical for the Plan to introduce a simple policy dealing with it. This is something that many neighbourhood plans have successfully done. To be clear, I do not say that the GNP needs to be amended in this way in order to satisfy any of the basic conditions, and so it is not the subject of a

formal recommendation.

Minor points

63. In their response to the submitted Plan, PCC draw attention to a small number of typographical or factual errors of which I have assumed the Parish Council will have taken note, and for that reason make no further reference to them.

Conclusions on the basic conditions

64. I am satisfied that the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan makes appropriate provision for sustainable development. I conclude that in this and in all other material respects, subject to my recommended modifications, it has appropriate regard to national policy. Similarly, and again subject to my recommended modifications, I conclude that the Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the Plan is not compatible with EU obligations, including human rights requirements.

Formal recommendation

65. I have concluded that, provided that the recommendations set out above are followed, the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan would meet the basic conditions, and I therefore recommend that, as modified, it should proceed to a referendum. Finally, I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Neighbourhood Plan Area, but I have been given no reason to think this is necessary.

David Kaiserman

David Kaiserman BA DipTP MRTPI
Independent Examiner

16 November 2020

APPENDIX – SUMMARY TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Examiner's report paragraph	NP reference	Recommendation
26	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a simple numbering system for the paragraphs which support the policies.
26	Contents page	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of policies should include their reference numbers.
39	GNP4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete policy GNP4. • Consider retaining its contents as a community aspiration under a separate section towards the end of the document.
44	GNP5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reword reference to the grassed triangle to the west of the A15/Old Lincoln Road as suggested.
45	GNP5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the supporting text to this policy to show “clearly and explicitly” how each Local Green Space meets the four tests.
46	GNP5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split section 5.2 to reflect that there are two sites. • Refer to Map 7 in the first paragraph of the preamble to the policy.
48	GNP6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reword penultimate paragraph as suggested.
49	GNP6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The part of the policy dealing with protected trees and woodland should be placed at the end of the policy “box”, with a sub-heading reading “Protected trees”. • Delete reference to the desire to create a nature recovery area and relocate it elsewhere as a community aspiration.
52	GNP8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include reference to the important views out of the village into the countryside and indicate the most significant locations which require protection. • Clarify whether the four viewpoints on Map 8 are merely examples or are of particular significance. • Insert “significantly” before “obstruct” in the first sentence of the policy. • Include the boundaries of the village conservation area in Map 8.
53	GNP9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend the policy to make it clear that compliance is also required with PCC's Flood and Water Management SPD.
57	GNP12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reword the opening sentence of the policy as suggested.
61	Appendices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include an introductory paragraph outlining the role and purpose of the appendices.