

Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Plan Representation Summary

Knightsford Parish Council submitted the final version of the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan (2024) to Dorset Council for independent examination in October 2024. People were given eight weeks from Monday 2 December 2024 until the end of Monday 27 January 2027 to comment on the content of the plan or how it was produced. At the close of the public consultation twelve representations were received.

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
1	Avison Young on behalf of National Gas Transmission	<p>Introduction</p> <p>National Gas Transmission owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.</p> <p>Allocations</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission's assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure. National Gas Transmission has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>
2	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission	<p>Introduction</p> <p>National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses.</p> <p>National Grid no longer owns or operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. This is the responsibility of National Gas Transmission, which is a separate entity and must be consulted independently.</p> <p>National Grid Ventures (NGV) develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States. NGV is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. Please also consult with NGV separately from NGET.</p> <p>Allocations</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to NGET assets which include high voltage electricity assets and other electricity infrastructure. NGET has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>
3	Dorset Council –	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Dorset Council on the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan (October 2024). This consultation response is primarily from the Community Planning Team with an additional point added by the Transport Planning Team under policy 13 and Emergency Planning Team under Policy 16.</p>

Spatial Planning	<p>Revised NPPF (December 2024)</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework was revised on 12 December 2024 to reflect the Governments proposed reforms to the Planning system. Paragraph 239 explains that the revised framework will apply for purposes of preparing neighbourhood plans from 12 March 2025 unless the neighbourhood plan has been submitted to the local planning authority under Regulation 15 on or before this date. As this Plan was submitted on 10 October 2024 and updated 18 November 2024 the Plan can be assessed against the December 2023 NPPF. Consequently all references in this response are to the December 2023 version of the NPPF.</p> <p>Designating the Neighbourhood Plan Area</p> <p>Knightsford Group Parish Council covers the four parishes of Tincleton, West Knighton, West Stafford & Woodsford and the Plan often refers to each parish’s unique identity, such as at Appendix 3.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.2.2 explains the Knightsford Neighbourhood area was originally designated on 15 June 2021 however due to changes to the parish boundary at West Knighton in April 2024, the Parish Council requested to have the area redesignated based on the new boundary. The Knightsford Neighbourhood area was re-designated on the 24 July 2024 now including Oakwood but excluding 17a, 19 and 19a West Knighton and land to the west of the A352.</p> <p>Details can be found on our website at: Decision - To amend the Knightsford Neighbourhood Area (comprising of Tincleton, West Knighton, West Stafford and Woodsford) to reflect changes made to the parish boundary in April 2024 arising from a Community Governance Review. - Dorset Council</p> <p>How long the Plan will last</p> <p>The front cover confirms the Plan period is expected to cover the period 2023 – 2033, a ten-year time horizon.</p> <p>Implementation and monitoring of the plan</p> <p>It is noted that the need for a review will be considered following the adoption of the new Dorset Council Local Plan. It may also need to be reviewed sooner, if there are significant changes in national policy or legislation, or local issues that arise that need to be covered.</p> <p>Policy 1 Development set in rural landscapes</p> <p>Policy 1 sets out requirements for development in rural landscapes. The criterion draws on the Design Code guidance in section DC02.4 Development set in rural landscape. The relevant Local Plan policy is COM7, and section 9 of the NPPF. No concerns are raised.</p> <p>Policy 2 Wildlife corridors and biodiversity</p> <p>No concerns are raised.</p>
------------------	--

[Knightsford Design Code](#)

The Neighbourhood Plan is supported by an area-wide design guidance and codes document (April 2023) prepared by AECOM. It is noted that the design codes are 103 pages in length and for brevity a description of the four parish areas is summarised in Appendix 3.

The Neighbourhood Plan has translated much of the design code into design policies (Policies 1-9, 12 & 14) however without a specific reference to the Design Code in the Policy text there is a risk that some of the design guidance will not receive development plan weight in decision making. Any information required for decision making or the preparation of a planning application should be within the Neighbourhood Plan document.

[Policies 3-9](#)

No concerns are raised with policies 3-9.

Policy	Design Code (2023)	Local Plan (2015)	NPPF (2023)
Policy 3 Plot formation, building set-back, orientation and boundary treatments	DC02.7 and DC03.10	ENV10, ENV11 and ENV12	Chapter 12
Policy 4 Incorporating the car in developments – parking guidelines	DC03.12	ENV10 and COM9	Chapter 12
Policy 5 Density, building heights and rooflines	DC03.9	ENV10, ENV11 and ENV12	Chapter 12
Policy 6 Building mix	DC03.9	ENV10 and ENV12	Chapter 12
Policy 7 Materials and architectural detail	DC03.8	ENV10 and ENV12	Chapter 12
Policy 8 Extensions and conversions – general principals	DC03.11	ENV10, ENV11 and ENV12	Chapter 12
Policy 9 Sustainability in design	DC03.13, DC03.18 and DC01.3	ENV12	Chapter 12

	<p><u>Policy 10 Local Green Spaces</u></p> <p>Policy 10 seeks to protect local green spaces from inappropriate development that would harm their character and reason for designation. Four local green spaces are described, mapped, and justified in Table 1.</p> <p>NPPF (Dec 2023), paragraphs 104 to 107 explain that policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts.</p> <p>We do not have any concerns with the proposed West Knighton Village Green and Playpark, West Stafford Play Area & The Green, West Stafford as Local Green Spaces. Each site is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; demonstrably special to a local community, local in character and are not extensive tracts of land.</p> <p>Land To East of Wynd Close, West Stafford has a longer planning history and has therefore been considered in more detail. The proposed Local Green Space wraps around the recently built development known as Shepards Walk and has been promoted for further housing development through the Dorset Council 2024 ‘call for sites’, reference: LA/WSTA/001. In addition a planning application P/OUT/2022/00153 for 14 dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping was submitted in January 2022 but refused on 26 August 2022. A subsequent appeal APP/D1265/W/23/3317274 was dismissed on 15 October 2024.</p> <p>Planning practice guidance, regarding Local Green Spaces, Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 37-008-20140306 states “Local Green Space designation will rarely be appropriate where the land has planning permission for development.” Although the site has been promoted for development it does not have planning permission at the current time (January 2025), consequently no objection is raised, subject to the space being demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance.</p> <p><u>Policy 11 Important local views and landmarks</u></p> <p>No concerns are raised.</p> <p><u>Policy 12 Development in proximity to heritage assets</u></p> <p>No concerns are raised.</p> <p><u>Policy 13 Village roads and Quiet, Low Traffic Routes</u></p> <p>The policy team are content the distinction between the status of the rural network as ‘Quiet, Low Traffic Routes’ and the possible future status of the roads as ‘Quiet Lanes’ is clear. The blurred definition of the two terms was an earlier concern at the regulation 14 stage.</p> <p><u>Quiet Lanes</u></p> <p>Project 2 sets out the Parish Councils intention to request Dorset Council as the Highways Authority to formally designate the network of Quiet, Low Traffic Routes as shown on Map 4 as Quiet Lanes, and manage these accordingly.</p>
--	--

		<p>The Transport Planning Team responded: Project 2, Table 3 and Map 4 refer to designating a network of Quiet Lanes throughout the Neighbourhood Plan area. The 'Quiet Lanes' initiative was popular several years ago but there are no formally designated quiet lanes in the county. Whilst Dorset Council is committed to encouraging more walking and cycling, we don't have a Quiet Lanes policy and there is some way to go for us to be convinced that doing so would result in a significant change in travel choice or driver behaviours. However, as part of the work to develop a new joint Local Transport Plan for the whole of Dorset we are likely to look again at this policy area so it could feature as part of our future strategy.</p> <p>Policy 14 Prioritising walking, cycling and horse riding</p> <p>No concerns are raised.</p> <p>Policy 15 Supporting community facilities</p> <p>The first two parts of Policy 15 seek to prevent the unnecessary closure of listed community facilities and supports proposals that would allow such facilities to modernise and adapt to future needs and long term viability. This policy is in general conformity with adopted Local Plan policies COM2 and COM3 and can be supported.</p> <p>The third part of Policy 15 supports new small-scale facilities that can help meet local needs provided they are accessible from built up areas and subject to environmental, road safety and amenity concerns.</p> <p>Dorset Council is supportive of paragraph 6.1.4 which reflects the latest evidence and clarifies "As a guide, the reference in the policy to 'small-scale' should therefore be interpreted as below 280m² gross floorspace, as this is considered to be of a scale that would not require any sequential or impact assessment (based on the recommendations of the 2022 update to the Dorset Retail & Leisure Study) and therefore appropriate to a rural area."</p> <p>Housing Requirement</p> <p>Paragraphs 7.1.1 through to 7.1.3 helpfully summarises the adopted West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) spatial strategy and the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan (2021) expectations for the delivery of future housing in the Knightsford area, by its components. Given the Plan period is anticipated to run from 2023-2033 the table after paragraph 7.1.2 correctly lists 1 completion/commitment and a windfall allowance of 5 dwellings. There are no large sites within the settlement boundary or strategic site allocations.</p> <p>This figure should be viewed as a minimum requirement and, therefore, can be exceeded however, the scope of a neighbourhood plan is up to a neighbourhood planning body. There is no requirement for neighbourhood plans to allocate sites or identify any additional land to meet the overall Local Plan housing need figure.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan group commissioned additional research into the needs of their community with the conclusions set out in paragraphs 7.1.5-6 as additional background.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Site options and assessment</p> <p>Paragraph 7.1.9 reflects that whilst this Neighbourhood Plan does not include site allocations, there are other opportunities for housing to come forward as established through the Local Plan. Dorset Council has no concerns with this conclusion.</p> <p>Policy 16 Meeting local housing needs in the Plan area</p> <p>Policy 16 states that the housing target for Knightsford is 6 dwellings over the plan period which will be met through infill development within the defined development boundary of West Knighton, small-scale affordable housing exception sites, sensitive conversion, replacement or sub-division of existing rural buildings and the provision of rural workers dwellings.</p> <p>West Knighton is the only settlement with a defined development boundary in the neighbourhood plan area and the remaining criteria listed in Policy 16 reflect the exceptions listed in Policy SUS3 criterion iii) and can be supported.</p> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>The second part of Policy 16 lists the mix of dwelling types new development should seek to deliver including affordable homes for rent, first and shared-ownership and open market homes, primarily for smaller 1-2 bedrooms.</p> <p>The need for primarily smaller, one or two bedroom properties reflects the recommendations in the supporting Housing Needs Assessment prepared by AECOM. For example, Table 5-11 shows a greater need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties.</p> <p>Local connection, tenure blind & secure arrangement</p> <p>The third part of Policy 16 refers to the need to prioritise allocations on the basis of the local connection criteria in the Dorset Housing Allocation Policy (which should read Dorset Council Housing Allocation Policy). Affordable housing delivered should also be tenure blind and mechanisms should be in place for affordable housing to remain so in perpetuity.</p> <p>Supporting paragraph 5.2.10 of Local Plan policy HOUS1 explains “Future occupancy will also be prioritised for people with a local connection”.</p> <p>Policy HOUS1 criterion v) states “The type, size and mix of affordable housing will be expected to address the identified and prioritised housing needs of the area and should be proportionate to the scale and mix of market housing, resulting in a balanced community of housing and / or flats that are ‘tenure blind’.”</p> <p>Policy HOUS2 criterion i), in the Local Plan, reads “there are secure arrangements to ensure that the benefits of affordable housing will be enjoyed by subsequent as well as initial occupiers.”</p> <p>The third part of Policy 16 is therefore considered to be in general conformity with Local Plan Policies HOUS1 and HOUS2.</p> <p>ONR consultation zone</p> <p>Thank you for contacting Emergency Planning. As per the mentioned guidance “<i>Under the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations (REPPiR) 2019, local authorities are responsible for setting Detailed Emergency Planning Zones (DEPZ) for nuclear sites where there could be a radiation emergency with off-site consequences and preparing detailed plans for responding to such an emergency, within the DEPZ area. The off-site plans are put in place to</i></p>
--	--

	<p><i>minimise and mitigate the health consequences of any significant radiological release that might occur as a result of radiation emergencies at nuclear sites.”.</i></p> <p>The only REPPIR site within the boundaries of Dorset Council, for which the Local Authority has to set a DEPZ and prepare an off-site plan, is the MoD Operational Berth at Portland Port.</p> <p>We can confirm that the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan does not have any impact upon, or pose an external hazard to this site.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</p> <p>A SEA Screening Opinion carried out in February 2023 concluded that “whilst the development may be small scale, there is a potential for significant adverse impacts to the environment, in the absence of assessment and clarity on mitigation. In order to fully assess the potential impacts of the proposals, a full Strategic Environmental Assessment is required.”</p> <p>In response, a full Environmental Report (November 2024) prepared by AECOM has been submitted alongside the submission version of the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan (KNP).</p> <p>The Environmental Report has concluded that “Overall, no significant negative effects are considered likely in the implementation of the KNP. The spatial strategy supports infill development and small-scale affordable housing exception sites, as well as conversion, replacement or subdivision of existing rural buildings; this level of growth will support resident needs without impacting upon the rural nature of the neighbourhood area. Minor positive effects are therefore considered likely with regards to community wellbeing.”</p> <p>The report continues “Broadly neutral to minor positive effects are predicted in relation to the rest of the SEA objectives. This reflects the wider policy provisions which embed landscape and design considerations, protect and enhance green infrastructure, protect key views and local landmarks, and improve pedestrian safety.”</p> <p>Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)</p> <p>A Screening Report regarding the Habitats Regulations was prepared in February 2023 and concluded that given the report’s findings in relation to the internationally important wildlife sites, it follows that an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations is likely to be required. Dorset Council agreed with this conclusion at that time.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Planning group responded by commissioning AECOM to prepare a Habitats Regulation Assessment (February 2024) which has been submitted alongside this Plan.</p> <p>This HRA undertook a Test of Likely Significant Effects (ToLSEs) screening of the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan March 2023 Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) version.</p> <p>Following ToLSEs screening, it was concluded that one policy, Policy 17 Land north of Yoah Cottage, had the potential to cause a likely significant effect to designated sites and was discussed with regards to recreational pressures, air quality and water pollution.</p>
--	---

		<p>It has been concluded that the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan will not affect the integrity of European sites in relation to recreational pressure due to the overarching provisions in the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Adopted Local Plan (2015) and the Local Plan Review (Preferred Options Stage, 2018) with which all new housing in the Neighbourhood Plan will need to comply.</p> <p>It is recommended that a policy is included within the Neighbourhood Plan which supports the Local Plan policies for the protection of European sites such as <i>"Any development brought forward must ensure that it can be implemented without any adverse effect upon the integrity of the European sites. Proposals that will adversely affect the integrity of European sites will not be supported."</i></p> <p>As highlighted by the nutrient budget and the legal framework set by the overarching adopted Local Plan, mitigation for water quality impacts on Poole Harbour SPA will be required to allow the six dwellings allocated in the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan to come forward. A broad range of measures are available to mitigate potential adverse effects of nutrients in treated sewage effluent, both within development sites and off-site. The details of mitigation will need to be identified for each application. However, it is recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan includes text flagging the nutrient neutrality requirement that exists for the Poole Harbour SPA.</p> <p>As the final version of the neighbourhood plan has been updated with the suggested wording (Policy 16 and paragraph 7.1.10 has been updated to refer to the Poole Harbour SPA) it can be concluded that the Plan document will not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of any European sites either alone or in combination.</p>
4	Dorset Ramblers	<p>Policy 14 and Project 3</p> <p>The Ramblers fully supports and warmly welcomes the strong support for the prioritisation of walking, cycling and horse riding which is set out in Policy 14, and the commitment to improvements to the network which is set out in Project 3 since these reflect our own charitable objectives.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.3.4,</p> <p>There is mention 'footpaths' in developments, we think this should read 'footways' (i.e. pavements). Footways are not the same as footpaths.</p> <p>Our remaining comments all relate to Table 3.</p> <p>Tincton to Moreton Station:</p> <p>1: Ramblers supports this idea. The new footpath being offered as part of the new quarry application is to be welcomed as it fills a gap in the network. We Have suggested (in our comments on the application) that it should be made a bridleway which would allow for its use by horse riders and cyclists as well as pedestrians, subject to suitable width and surfacing. However, we suggest that the question of the treatment of public rights of way within the existing quarry at Woodsford should be mention, with a view to securing improvements.</p>

		<p>1.1: Ramblers supports the designation of Watery Lane as a quiet road but we think that the Neighbourhood Plan should also draw attention the fact that there are definitive footpaths to the west of that lane which are not currently available to the public: they cannot be located on the ground and include a missing footbridge over the Frome. We strongly recommend that the fact that these paths cannot be used should be mentioned in the plan and that Dorset Council should be encouraged to resolve the situation.</p> <p>4: West Knighton to Crossways</p> <p>We assume that the “re-opened footpath” is FP S51/8 which had been closed without lawful authority for some considerable time. We agree that it should be upgraded to bridleway status, subject to the provision of a suitable width and surfacing to permit safe shared-use. (At present it is narrow and very muddy, verging on unusable unless wearing boots.) We believe that it was part of the Silverlakes’ plan for such a link to be made: we have a plan of the final layout of paths for the site (dated 2012) which indicated that a linking bridleway was to be provided at this location and think that a landownership issue may have prevented it happening so far.</p> <p>5: Broadmayne, West Knighton to West Stafford</p> <p>We fully support the provision of a shared-use route between Broadmayne and West Knighton/West Stafford and then on to Dorchester. What is needed alongside designating D21314 and D21321 as quiet lanes is an improved crossing of the West Stafford bypass (signage to warn drivers of walkers / horse riders / cyclists crossing and/or a Pegasus crossing).</p>
5	Resident	<p>Spatial strategy and housing need</p> <p>Supports housing in Tincleton</p>
6	Historic England	<p>Land north of Yeoh Cottage (Previously Policy 17)</p> <p>In our Regulation 14 consultation response to the community we encouraged liaison with your authority’s heritage team to ensure the allocation of housing under Policy 17 demonstrated conformity with overarching national and local policy for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. We note now that Policy 17 has been deleted from the Plan and there are no other site allocations which it proposes. I can therefore confirm that there are no issues associated with the Plan upon which we wish to comment.</p> <p>The Historic England Regulation 14 response (26 April 2024) was attached.</p>
7	National Highways	<p>Introduction</p> <p>We understand that the plan area covers the four parishes of Tincleton, West Knighton, West Stafford and Woodsford.</p> <p>As you are aware, National Highways is a statutory consultee in the planning process and is the strategic highway authority responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN). In this location the SRN comprises the A35 trunk road which passes to the north and west of the plan area, with connections via the local road network primarily to the A352 Max Gate and Stinsford junctions. It is acknowledged that the A35 junctions around Dorchester currently</p>

		<p>experience congestion and delay, particularly during network peak periods, and the Max Gate junction has already been identified as requiring works to mitigate for the impact of committed development at Warmwell.</p> <p>Having reviewed the draft plan we consider that in general terms the plan's proposed policies are unlikely in themselves to result in a scale of development which will adversely impact the SRN, and policies 13 and 14 are noted. However, given the proximity of the plan area to the A35 and associated junctions, any large scale development that may come forward in the plan area will need to be supported by an appropriate assessment of traffic impacts which should consider the operation of the SRN in line with national planning practice guidance and DfT Circular 01/2022 <i>The strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development</i>. Where proposals would result in a severe congestion or unacceptable safety impact, mitigation will be required in line with current policy. We therefore also look forward to continuing to work with Dorset Council in the preparation of their transport evidence base for the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Please note that these comments do not prejudice any responses National Highways may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.</p>
8	Natural England	<p>Habitats Sites</p> <p>It is Natural England's advice, on the basis of the material supplied with the consultation, that significant effects on Habitats Sites are unlikely.</p> <p>The proposed neighbourhood plan is unlikely to significantly affect any Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection areas (SPA), Ramsar wetland or sites in the process of becoming SACs or SPAs ('candidate SACs', 'possible SACs', 'potential SPAs') or a Ramsar wetland.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan has produced a Strategic Environmental Assessment which has identified there is going to be no significant environmental effects.</p> <p>Natural England agree with the recommendations within the HRA to include policies and wording relating to the policies that are in place to protect the SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.</p> <p>Natural England support the proposed additional safeguards set out in the conclusions of the report in Section 7, the proposed modifications will allow the Council to be certain that the Neighbourhood Plan will not have any significant effects on the habitats and International sites scoped in for consideration.</p>
9	Nexus on behalf of Woodsford Farms	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Woodsford Farms is a significant landowner within the Civil Parish of Woodsford.</p> <p>Evidence base</p> <p>From the information provided as part of the Regulation 16 consultation, there does not appear to be any evidence base documentation prepared to support the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph 31 of the Framework requires all policies</p>

	<p>(including policies within Neighbourhood Plans) to be underpinned by relevant, up-to-date evidence. As there is no evidence provided to support the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, it is not possible to undertake a robust assessment of its policies.</p> <p>Vision (under paragraph 3.1.1)</p> <p>To ensure conformity with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 (as amended), the Vision should be amended as follows: <i>“West Knighton, West Stafford, Tincleton and Woodsford parishes will continue to be thriving communities. They will be rural, tranquil, friendly, attractive and safe. Development opportunities will be sustainable and in line with the needs and wishes of the parishes, respecting the area’s historic and rural character.”</i></p> <p>Policy 11 – Important local views and landmarks</p> <p>The list of viewpoints within Table 2, which are subject to the requirements of Policy 11, are not supported by evidence and, in the case of viewpoint ref. W-V2, is inaccurately described. Such an approach is inconsistent with paragraph 31 of the Framework,</p> <p>Earlier representations from Woodsford Farms highlighted that Woodsford Castle (viewpoint W-V2) does not stand in ‘splendid isolation’. There is a converted grain store, a substantial old stone building and various other former dairy buildings located almost immediately to the west and very close to the W-V2 viewpoint, and a number of dwellings beyond that. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan has amended the description of Woodsford Castle as standing in ‘relative isolation’ but no evidence has been provided to justify this description.</p> <p>Accordingly, the use of the term ‘isolation’ to describe Woodsford Castle is not accurate, regardless of any caveats introduced. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan’s description of Woodsford Castle (viewpoint W-V2) is not supported by any evidence and is inaccurate. On this basis, it is inconsistent with paragraph 31 of the Framework.</p> <p>Policy 12 – Development in proximity to heritage assets</p> <p>Policy 12 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan outlines requirements with respect to development in proximity to heritage assets. The opening paragraph of the policy identifies that development proposals should seek to minimise the impact on the significance of heritage assets in accordance with the Framework. In this context, it is important to note the provisions of paragraph 16f of the Framework which states: development plan documents should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant).”</p> <p>Given that Policy 12 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan defers to the Framework with respect to decision making in relation to the impact on the significance of heritage assets, there is no clear purpose for this aspect of the policy as it duplicates requirements already set out in the Framework. Accordingly, Policy 12 is inconsistent with paragraph 16f of the Framework.</p> <p>Policy 12 also references a requirement to “where feasible and appropriate, raise awareness of that asset” with a number of factors subsequently listed that are required to be considered. The wording of the opening paragraph of Policy 12 is not clear whether the factors listed are de-coupled from the initial requirement to minimise harm to the significance of heritage assets</p>
--	--

		<p>in accordance with the Framework. Based on the current wording, the policy requirements are ambiguous, which is inconsistent with the requirements of paragraph 16d of the Framework</p> <p>If the policy purposefully does not de-couple the requirements to minimise harm to the significance of heritage assets and requires a consideration of how heritage assets would be experienced in their wider landscape, it would be inconsistent with the Framework.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraph 200 of the Framework requires applicants to describe the setting of any heritage assets affected by the proposed development, including any contribution made by their setting. 2. The definition of ‘Setting of a heritage asset’ and ‘Significance (for heritage policy)’ at Annex 2 of the Framework are quoted. <p>On this basis, in accordance with the Framework, it cannot be concluded that the wider landscape (identified by Policy 12 as being separate from the setting) contributes towards its significance.</p> <p>If Policy 12 was to set a requirement to consider the role of a heritage asset in its wider landscape (beyond the immediate setting) as part of assessing the impact on the significance of said heritage asset, this would be inconsistent with paragraph 200 of the Framework. It would assume, by definition, that the wider landscape would impact the significance of all heritage assets and would prejudice the undertaking of a ‘proportionate’ assessment of the significance of heritage assets to consider the impact of development proposals.</p> <p>It is also notable that the definition of ‘Setting of a heritage asset’ at Annex 2 of the Framework states that the setting of a heritage asset would change as its surroundings evolve. Accordingly, the requirement under the first bullet point of Policy 12 to have regard to how a heritage asset “would have been experienced” is inconsistent with the Framework.</p> <p>If the policy is to be retained, it should be restructured (wording supplied) to rectify any ambiguity and ensure that the Policy 12 is consistent with the Framework.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Without amendments to address the above matters, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan would conflict with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) (as amended) and would be inconsistent with the Framework. Consequently, it would not satisfy the Basic Conditions.</p>
10	Office for Nuclear Regulation	<p><u>Introduction</u></p> <p>Please note that ONR’s land use planning processes published at http://www.onr.org.uk/land-use-planning.htm may apply to some of the developments within the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan 2023 - 2033.</p> <p>If you are a Local Authority or neighbourhood with areas that are within an ONR consultation zone please be aware that in order for ONR to have no objections to such developments we will require:</p>

Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – January 2025

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> confirmation from relevant Council emergency planners that developments can be accommodated within any emergency plan required under the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019; and that the developments do not pose an external hazard to the site.
11	Stinsford Parish Council	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Stinsford Parish Council would like to congratulate Knightsford Parish Council on completing its neighbourhood plan and would welcome the opportunity to work together on issues that affect the two parishes where there is synergy between the two neighbourhood plans.</p>
12	Will Ellwood	<p>Introduction</p> <p>The plan is a result of a lot of hard work from many individuals and is well presented with good, evidenced content.</p> <p>Spatial Strategy and housing need</p> <p>My only point to raise is that it appears to hinder generic development as opposed to controlling development opportunities within a specified boundary, based on each individual planning application. The survey outcomes are weighted towards the majority, however it doesn't mention that a reasonable number of Tinkleton residents are pro development as the village remains stagnant with no opportunity to diversify, attract a younger demographic and use infill land sensibly. It also doesn't account for those residents that didn't want to engage and publicise their future development plans. A development boundary needs to be established around the existing village boundary of residential houses/gardens, and any applications made within that area assessed on their own merit. A blanket 'no development' for Tinkleton and 1 site for the entire Parish doesn't reflect the purpose of a Development Plan and is well below national requirements. Development is the main factor the plan can influence and in an ever increasing population and housing crisis, it needs to offer its fair share of development opportunity for a sustainable future and for future residents. Development should be controlled, not banned.</p>