

# **SLYNE WITH HEST NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

## **LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL RESPONSE TO REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION**

**FEBRUARY 2022**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Lancaster City Council welcomes the submission of the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan and recognises the significant amount of time, effort and work which have been undertaken by the local community in its production to date, taking a positive and proactive approach to plan-making. The City Council have been fully supportive of the Slyne with Hest's Parish Council's decision to prepare a neighbourhood plan for their area and have provided as much resource and support as possible to aid the group's preparation of the plan.
- 1.2 Through dialogue with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group since the initial designation in 2016, the City Council have been aware of the wide variety of consultation events that have been held with the community to identify issues which are important in the locality, gain consensus and draw conclusions to how such matters can be addressed. It is in this context that the Council seeks to provide constructive comment on how the plan should be refined further to ensure that the basic conditions of neighbourhood planning can be achieved.
- 1.3 For ease of reference, the comments set out in Section 4 of this response are according to the relevant sections of the draft Neighbourhood Plan (referred to as 'the Plan' from this point forward). Some comments which are made, particularly where they relate to a contextual nature, may cover more than one topic or section and should be seen in this context.

## 2. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND NATIONAL POLICY

### Legal Requirements

- 2.1 Before the Plan can proceed to Referendum, it must be first tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the draft plan must meet are as follows:
  - (a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order;
  - (b) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
  - (c) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area); and
  - (d) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.

### National Planning Policy

- 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework<sup>1</sup> (referred to as 'the Framework' from this point forward) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so, it sets out the requirements for preparation of neighbourhood plans and provides communities with the power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver sustainable development that they need and to assist in the overall delivery of strategic housing needs.
- 2.3 At the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For plan-making this means that all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to:

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

meet the development needs of their area, align with growth and infrastructure, improve the environment, mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects. These requirements are also applicable to the preparation of neighbourhood plans.

- 2.4 Paragraph 13 of the Framework makes clear that the application of the presumption has implications for the way communities engage in neighbourhood planning. The Framework states that neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies.
- 2.5 Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, the Plan should also have regard to the core planning principles that underpin plan-making set out in paragraph 16 of the Framework.
- 2.6 The key principles highlight that plans should be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development; be positively prepared (in a way that is aspirational but deliverable); be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees; contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals; be accessible through the use of digital tools to assist public involvement and policy presentations and serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area.
- 2.7 Paragraph 29 of the Framework states, *'Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies'*.
- 2.8 Slyne-with-Hest is encircled by the North Lancashire Green Belt. As set out in paragraph 137, *'The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open: the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'*.
- 2.9 Paragraph 140 states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances have been fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or update of plans. Requiring strategic policies to establish the need for any changes, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term to ensure they endure beyond the plan period. Specific direction is also set out in paragraph 140 in relation to amendments to Green Belt boundaries through Neighbourhood Plans: *'Where a need for changes to Green Belt boundaries has been established through strategic policies, detailed amendments to those boundaries may be made through non-strategic policies, **including neighbourhood plans.**'*
- 2.10 The Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan sets out the evidence and justification to demonstrate exceptional circumstances for the alteration of the Green Belt boundaries in section 4.7.9 of the Neighbourhood Plan, with further detail provided in Appendix 5. The establishment for the need for this change, at a strategic policy level, is set out in paragraphs 3.2 to 3.6 below.

### 3. LANCASTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

#### Adopted Planning Position

- 3.1 Lancaster City Council adopted a new Local Plan for Lancaster District in July 2020. The Plan consists of two key components, THE Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD which sets out a series of strategic policies which will guide future development, in terms of scale, location and growth. The DPD also contains a series of land allocations to identify where future growth needs will be met and land which has been protected for its environmental, social or economic value. The second part is the Development Management DPD which sets out a series of generic planning policies which are used by the Council to determine planning applications. The policies of the DPD are applicable to all development proposals across the entire district (unless the plan directs otherwise).

#### Principle of Development

- 3.2 Policy SP3 of the Strategic Policies & Land Allocations DPD sets out the development strategy for Lancaster District. The policy aims to meet the development needs of the district by promoting an urban-focussed approach towards development, supplemented with additional large strategic development sites in greenfield locations. The development strategy is further supported by development in 'sustainable settlements' as defined by the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy SP2 of the same DPD.
- 3.3 To supplement the Council's understanding of how development needs could be met via that strategy, the Council undertook the North Lancashire Green Belt Review as part of the plan preparation process. The reasons for the review included the length of time since the original Green Belt designation (no review has been undertaken since its original designation 25 years ago) and the scale of evidenced development needs identified in the plan. The outcomes of the review can be read in full via the Council's website<sup>2</sup>.
- 3.4 Policy EN4 of the Strategic Policies & Land Allocations DPD identifies the extent of the North Lancashire Green Belt, which encircles the settlement of Slyne-with-Hest. Policy EN4 highlights the primarily purpose of the Green Belt, stating *'The North Lancashire Green Belt is identified on the Local Plan Policies Map between Lancaster Morecambe and Carnforth to ensure that future growth does not result in the coalescence between these settlements.'*
- 3.5 Policy SP2 of the Strategic Policies & Land Allocations DPD defines the settlement hierarchy within the district, identifying the key urban areas of the district and a series of sustainable settlements which, due to their accessibility and service provision, provide future opportunities for growth and development outside of the main urban areas of the district. Specifically Policy SP2 states that *'these settlements will provide the focus of growth for Lancaster District outside the main urban areas subject in the AONB's to the constraints of the protected landscapes where a landscape-capacity approach will be taken'*.
- 3.6 Both Slyne and Hest Bank have been established as sustainable settlements for some time, identified under Policy H7 of the 2004 Lancaster District Local Plan, Policy SC3 of the 2008 Lancaster District Core Strategy and Policy DM42 of the 2014 Development Management DPD. Furthermore, policy SP6 sets out the Council's approach towards delivering the housing requirement, and the

---

<sup>2</sup> [Evidence, monitoring and information - Lancaster City Council](#)

opportunities identified to deliver this, acknowledging that additional supply includes neighbourhood plan delivery expectations.

- 3.7 Given this, the City Council consider the settlement of Slyne-with-Hest to be a location where, given its sustainability is, in principle, an appropriate location for future growth in the more rural area of the district and a focus for growth over other, less sustainable locations. Whilst growth is supported in this area the City Council would recognise that growth must be achieved in the context of its surroundings, particularly in relation to the Green Belt designation which surrounds the settlement. This is recognised in Policy SP2 of the Strategic Policies & Land Allocations DPD which states that the Council will support proposals for development *'provided that they are of a nature and scale that is proportionate to the role and function of that settlement.'*

#### Release of land from the Green Belt

- 3.8 As previously referred to, paragraph 140 of the NPPF sets the framework which allows neighbourhood plans the ability to make amendments to Green Belt boundaries. The Local Plan process did consider the role of the strategic plan process to enable the aspirations of the neighbourhood plan growth to be facilitated, specifically around the re-alignment of the Green Belt in the vicinity of Sea View Drive. However, in the context of paragraph 140 and in order for the neighbourhood plan to secure holistic development which supported the ambitions of the group, it was the view of the City Council the proposed re-alignment could be achieved through the neighbourhood plan process.

#### Land at Sea View Drive

- 3.9 The land at Sea View Drive (which has been identified in the neighbourhood plan for removal from the Green Belt and allocation for residential purposes) has been considered for its appropriateness for future development via the Council's Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) process. The assessment considered that the site could be developable subject to policy considerations of Green Belt, local landscape and local green spaces. Whilst the Council's North Lancashire Green Belt Review did not conclude that this area of land made a strong contribution towards the purposes of Green Belt (as set out in national planning policy), it did not seek to amend or re-align the boundaries in this location, suggesting that given the neighbourhood plan designation, this could be achieved through the non-strategic planning process should that be the ambitions of the plan.

#### Role of Neighbourhood Planning

- 3.10 Policy DM55 within the Development Management DPD clearly sets out the City Council's expectations for neighbourhood planning. Policy DM55 states the following:

## **POLICY DM55: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING**

**The Council will support and assist the relevant qualifying organisation to positively prepare a Neighbourhood Plan that delivers new development and facilities for their community. Neighbourhood Plans should seek to achieve the following:**

- I. Identify how they are positively contributing towards the strategic objectives of the local development plan and by in general conformity with its strategic approach and strategic policies;**
- II. Clearly set out how they will promote sustainable development, at the same level or above that which would be delivered through the local development plan; and**
- III. Have due regard to relevant information on local needs for new homes, jobs and facilities for their plan area.**

**The Council will seek to support and assist Neighbourhood Planning groups in meeting the criteria above and the wider basic conditions set out in the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.**

**Once a Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted by the Council it will form part of the Local Plan for the district and will be a material consideration in determining planning applications.**

- 3.11 This is further supported by the policy wording in policy H2, of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD, which states that: *'Within the settlements of...Slyne-with-Hest...the Council expects via the Neighbourhood Plan process, the respective Parish Council's to proactively and positively plan for housing growth within their communities in the context of this DPD.'*

### **Climate Emergency Review of the Local Plan (CELPR)**

- 3.12 The Local Plan was adopted in July 2020, however, following the Council's Climate Emergency declaration on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019, the Council resolved to undertake an immediate review of the Plan upon adoption. Whilst the newly adopted Local Plan does seek to address climate change, it was too far advanced in the plan preparation process to incorporate some of the actions and directions of the climate emergency declaration. The CELPR has a specific remit to amend and add to policies which can influence the Council's response to climate change, such as energy efficiency, renewable energy, water management and sustainable transport. It does not reconsider site allocations, housing numbers or other principles within the adopted Local Plan. It is therefore important to note that this represents a partial review.
- 3.13 The Council are seeking to make swift progress on this partial review of the Local Plan, consultation on the scope of the review was undertaken in Autumn 2020, with the Regulation 18 consultation on a suite of draft policies taking place over the Summer of 2021. The Council published the Local Plan under Regulation 19 for consultation on the 31<sup>st</sup> January, with the intention to submit the Plan later this year, with anticipation of adoption the reviewed Local Plan in 2022.
- 3.14 In advance of Submission, Public Examination and the receipt of an Inspectors Report, the level of weight which should be applied to the content and direction of the Review should be limited and considered in the context of Paragraph 48 of the Framework. However, it is important to bear in mind that this is the emerging local planning policy context for the Lancaster District and the relevant weight (as set out in paragraph 48 of the NPPF).

#### **4. SLYNE WITH HEST NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

- 4.1 This section sets out the comments which the City Council have on the Plan. The Council recognise and welcome some amendments which have been made to the Plan in light of responses made at previous stages.
- 4.2 The Plan sets out a positive approach to development within the Parish given its context as a sustainable settlement and therefore a sustainable location to provide growth for the Lancaster District, whilst at the same time recognising the constraints upon development posed by the Green Belt designation. Therefore, the approach taken in the Neighbourhood Plan is considered to be a realistic and appropriate route towards future growth in the District in the context of national Green Belt planning policy. The Neighbourhood Plan has undertaken site assessment work to identify opportunities for growth in the Neighbourhood Plan area. Whilst the Council would have preferred the methodology to have been the same as that used for the City Council's Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment – SHELAA, there are references within there to the Council's SHELAA findings and the assessments are generally reflective of these findings. It is also recognised that given Slyne-with-Hest's context, surrounded by the North Lancashire Green Belt, that a different approach towards site assessments is required, so the approach is considered appropriate and acceptable.
- 4.3 To accompany the allocation made for housing the Neighbourhood Plan also provides a supportive policy towards future proposals for housing in the context of the Green Belt designation. It is considered that such an approach is within general conformity of strategic policy contained in the Local Plan.

##### **General Context**

- 4.4 Section 2, 'Our Slyne with Hest' provides a useful overview of the context and characteristics of the parish of Slyne-with-Hest. However, the City Council would suggest that in terms of creating a concise and clear plan, much of the background context should be provided either as an appendix to the document or as a supporting document which forms part of the plan's evidence base.

##### **Meeting the SEA/HRA Requirements**

- 4.5 The Plan is accompanied by an SEA and HRA Screening Opinion. These were prepared by the Council in 2018. At this point it was concluded that given the nature of the plan significant effects could not be ruled out and as such SEA and HRA would be required. The 3 SA bodies (Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency) are noted to have agreed.
- 4.6 An SA and HRA was subsequently undertaken by AECOM on behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan Group (April 2019). It is understood that these have informed the content of the submission Plan. As far as the City Council is aware no further SA or HRA work has been undertaken.
- 4.7 The City Council has raised concerns with the Neighbourhood Plan Group that this work has not been updated. Given that some of the policies of the plan have changed quite significantly since the draft plan, the Council would have expected the submitted Plan to have been accompanied by an updated SEA and HRA assessment.
- 4.8 It is understood that the Neighbourhood Plan Group do not consider there to be significant changes which make material differences to the plan as submitted for Regulation 14 and on this basis do not

believe that further assessment is necessary. However, for the purposes of clarity and consistency the City Council believe that the views of the three SA bodies should have been sought in relation to this issue prior to the submission of the final version of the Plan under Regulation 15. The City Council therefore recommend that the views of the three SA bodies should be sought in relation to this issue.

### **Vision and Objectives**

- 4.9 The City Council supports the objectives of the Plan which are consistent with the spatial strategy for the district. The objectives support development to meet local need, promote the enhancement of facilities and infrastructure for the community and sustainable design, safer walking and cycling opportunities, supports business development, and promotes the protection and enhancement of the natural environment and local heritage assets.

### **Policy HRA1: Protection of Ecologically Sensitive Sites**

- 4.10 The policy wording should be strengthened to remove the reference to recommends. This is a requirement for development proposals.

### **Policy HE1: Housing Need**

- 4.11 Bullet point 2 reads as though it may exceed the requirements within policy DM3 in the adopted local plan by requiring delivery of the maximum viable amount of affordable housing. Whilst unlikely, there may be schemes where it could be viable to provide affordable housing numbers in excess of the percentages required by policy DM3. As it is not necessary to repeat policies in the Local Plan it is recommended that this bullet point is removed. If the NP Group wish to retain reference to the Local Plan affordable housing policies, it is recommended that the bullet point is revised as follows:

*‘Affordable housing must be provided in line with the requirements in the Local Plan.’*

- 4.12 The wording of Bullet point 4 appears to provide flexibility for the delivery of affordable homes on alternative sites or as commuted sums not available within the Local Plan policy. We note that the aim is to ensure delivery on site given the limited opportunities for development in the Parish. It is recommended that reference to alternative sites or commuted sums is removed to ensure that the policy emphasises on site delivery in accordance with the Local Plan.

### **Policy HE2: Site for New Development**

- 4.13 In the first paragraph it is recommended that the paragraph is amended to refer to ‘allocated for up to 35 dwellings’.
- 4.14 With regards to bullet point 3, please refer to the comments made in respect of policy HE1 bullet point 2, in respect of the first sentence. It is recommended that this sentence is removed.
- 4.15 In bullet point 5 the requirement for above ground Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) providing multi-functional benefits is supported. It is not however, clear whether storage in the area proposed and connection to the canal is feasible. It is recommended that the policy is reworded to remove specific requirements but enhance the requirement for above ground multifunctional SuDS, draft policy DM34 of the CELPR can be used to provide guidance for re-drafting.
- 4.16 Also with regard to bullet point 5, the advisory note referred to out of date and Local Plan policies and advise with regard to flood risk and sustainable drainage systems is evolving through the CELPR



and draft Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage SPD. As these documents are not adopted it would be premature to refer to them in the policy, however, on adoption any proposal within the Parish will need to comply with the revised requirements and there is no need to reiterate the policy and SPD references in the Neighbourhood Plan.

- 4.17 In relation to bullet point 10, the aim is supported but it is not clear how this will be considered at planning application stage. It is recommended that reference is made to meeting the requirements for energy efficiency in the emerging CELPR.
- 4.18 Finally, in bullet point 11 there is no need to reiterate the standards within the Local Plan. It is recommended that the first 2 sentences are removed.

### **Policy HE3: Future Housing Development**

- 4.19 The Council have no further observations in relation to this policy.

### **Policy BE1: Design**

- 4.20 Whilst the policy is supported it is not clear what is meant by 'accessibility features the access routes through the site' in criterion one of this policy. This would benefit from additional clarity.
- 4.21 Criteria 9 of the policy would benefit from additional amendments to distinguish expectations for residential/non-residential developments. The following wording is suggested:

*'Applications for **non-residential** development are encouraged to demonstrate accordance with the appropriate BREEAM standards in use at the time of submission. Encouragement is also given to **both residential and non-residential** schemes that meet Passivhaus standards. Housebuilders are encouraged to register for assessment under the Home Quality Mark. This should show how resource efficiencies and climate change adaptation measures will be incorporated through aspects **of the development**, such as the layout of the proposed development, orientation, massing, landscaping and building materials.'*

- 4.22 Criteria 2 of the policy would also benefit from a slight amendment to ensure the wording better aligns with legislation (Section 72 of the Planning Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990), and so the following wording is suggested:

*'Development in or within the setting of the Slyne Conservation Area **should preserve or enhance** the character **and appearance** of the Conservation Area and its setting, responding positively to key qualities, expressed in terms of scale, height, materials, and detailing. Density of housing in the Conservation Area is High relative to the rest of the Village. See Rationale Point 2 (Conservation Area).'*

- 4.23 In Section 4.10, 'Rationale and Further Explanation for Policy BE1 Design', it is recommended that the following phrase under point 4 is amended to '**embodied** carbon' for consistency with the policy wording.

### **Policy B1: Business Development**

- 4.24 With regard to the first paragraph of Policy B1, whilst the Council have no objections to its content and direction, it does believe that the wording should be amended to provide greater clarity to the readers and users of the document. The following wording is recommended:

***‘Support will be given to development proposals for sustainable rural tourism and business development that provide local benefits both visitors and the community. Proposals will be supported where they respect the character of their rural surroundings in regard of their design, construction and operation. Proposals located within the Green Belt should have due regard to necessary national and local planning policy.’***

- 4.25 With regard to the second paragraph, the Council welcome the reference to the ability for homeworking, particularly in light of changing working habits arising from the COVID Pandemic. However, the current wording of the policy does not seem to provide any greater clarity than the current policy basis in the Local Plan, within the Plan extensions to residential dwellings are permitted subject to meeting the necessary policy requirements and the reference in the Neighbourhood Plan to support this does not advance the issue further. Additionally, the suggestion that extensions to residential property for home-working only (i.e. it performs an ancillary use) would be challenging to enforce. It is recommended that this paragraph is removed from the Neighbourhood Plan and emphasis is reverted to the content and direction of the Local Plan.
- 4.26 In relation to the fifth paragraph, requirements for development to adhere to national planning policy (in relation to Green Belt matters) is already referred to in paragraph one, as are references to local character. There is no need for it to be repeated. Furthermore, it is not clear why a distinction has been made to specific use-classes in this section. It is recommended that this paragraph is deleted.
- 4.27 The second sentence of paragraph 4.11.9 in the supporting text is a repeat of paragraph 4.11.4 and it is recommended that this is deleted.

#### **Policy NE1: Flooding**

- 4.28 There is no need to reiterate the NPPF, it is recommended that the first two sentences are removed from the first paragraph. The policies aims could be strengthened by removing, ‘wherever possible’.
- 4.29 In relation to bullet point 3, the SFRA provides information at a point in time and will date. It is important that the most up to date sources are used, including the Environment Agency Flood Maps for rivers and seas, surface water, ground water and reservoirs flood risk.
- 4.30 The last two bullet points are equally relevant to sites which are not at flood risk. It is recommended that bullet points follow a separate paragraph relating to Sustainable Drainage Systems for all development.
- 4.31 The last bullet point misses the opportunity to require multi-functional sustainable drainage systems which provide multiple benefits. The PAN referred is dated and will be superseded through the CELPR process, it is recommended that this reference is removed. The word ‘Urban’ is no longer used within the term and should be removed so that the policy states, Sustainable Drainage Systems. It is recommended that draft policy DM34 of the CELPR is referred to for guidance on rewording the policy to encourage above ground multi-functional SuDS. Although as this policy has not yet been through the appropriate processes it is not recommended that the policy itself is referred to specifically in the Neighbourhood Plan. Further advice on the drafting can be given out with this formal response.

### **Policy NE2: Views**

- 4.32 The policy identifies 20 viewpoints for protection. Whilst justification for the inclusion of these viewpoints is provided in table 6 the Council would expect this to be supported by additional evidence demonstrating why these particular views are important and so should be protected.

### **Policy NE3: The Coastline and Development**

- 4.33 This policy would benefit from some rewording for clarity. For example, the opening sentence states 'The Plan advises that new development...', but then later in the same sentence says 'will be permitted only when it can be clearly demonstrated that'. The two phrases contradict one another.
- 4.34 It would also help to add clarity to the policy if it was more clearly linked to the areas identified in Figure 21. It is acknowledged that the title of this Figure states that these areas are to be protected by Policy NE3, but this should be clearly referenced within the policy wording.
- 4.35 As stated in Section 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan, Morecambe Bay is also designated as an SPA, SAC and Ramsar site, which are internationally designated sites, yet these are not identified on the map in Figure 21. Area B is also designated as Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace under policy SC3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD.
- 4.36 Paragraph 4.20.3 makes reference to the 'Lancaster City Council Multi-Agency Flooding Plan 2016'. This has been updated. The paragraph should therefore be amended to reflect the most recent plan:

*'Areas identified at high risk of flooding in the **Lancaster Resilience Forum Multi Agency Flood Plan Site Specific Plan for: Lancaster District 2021** include the coastal areas TL 23 Hest Bank and TL 24 Bolton le Sands and covers the functionally linked agricultural land and part of the coastal road along the seafront at Hest Bank.'*

### **Policy COM1: Community Facilities**

- 4.37 With regard to the fourth paragraph, the Council have yet to establish a CIL for the district and, at this point in time, there is no expectation for CIL to be adopted in the area. Whilst the City Council welcome an NP which looks to be future proofed, it is recommended that more flexible wording is provided to ensure a more adaptable policy. The following wording is suggested:

***'Proposals that help improve the quality of community facilities in the Parish will be supported. Developer Contributions, either by s106, CIL or any other form of developer tariff should be directed toward the improvement of the following facilities:'***

### **Policy COM2: Green Spaces**

- 4.38 The policy identifies 16 areas as valued sites of open space and green space, which are to be protected and improved to ensure that residents of all ages have access to green space and outdoor activities that benefit their health and well-being. Figure 24 contains a map to accompany this policy, and spatially identifies the extent of the green spaces within Slyne-with-Hest, however, only 11 of the 16 spaces are included within this map. The following sites are not mapped:
- Land to rear of Rushley Way/Lonsdale Road leading to towpath,
  - Reanes Wood,
  - Bottomdale Wood,
  - Lancaster Canal, towpath, and watercourse from bridge 116 to bridge 119

- The shoreline of Morecambe Bay: land adjacent to including the footpath along the shore and within the parish boundary, part of Lancashire Coastal Way

4.39 For consistency it would be beneficial to spatially identify these spaces as well, to ensure the policy applies equally to all sites. It is worthwhile noting that a number of these green spaces are also designated under policy SC3 'Open Space, Recreation and Leisure' within the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD, but it is recognised that policy COM2 refers to parish specific open space matters and does state that applications which may affect these areas should be in accordance with policy DM27 'Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities' of the Development Management DPD. However, careful consideration should be given to the approach towards the green spaces which have been identified at a Local Plan level but have not been identified through the Neighbourhood Plan, and it is suggested that the following wording is added for clarity:

***'This represents a list of sites identified by the Neighbourhood Plan; however, this list is not exhaustive, and the sites identified in the Slyne-with-Hest Parish within the Local Plan via policy SC3, or its successor policy, remain a material planning consideration'.***

4.40 Paragraph 4.22.6, within the supporting text, makes reference to the Council not currently having a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) but that this is being investigated. Lancaster City Council has decided not to pursue CIL at this time. It is recommended that the paragraph is amended as follows:

***'Lancaster City Council does not currently have a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and has decided not to pursue CIL at this time. If this position changes in the life of this Neighbourhood Plan, COM1, COM2 and the Community Aspirations & Projects will be addressed as to how such funds can be utilised. See Appendix 3 page 17.J.'***

### **Projects**

4.41 Section 6 sets out four projects which identify the aspirations of parishioners and other matters of local importance for future developments within the Parish. The Council welcomes the approach to set these aspirations out as projects, rather than policies, because they are not directly planning related matters, but the inclusion of these projects highlights locally important issues that are to be considered as part of the design of a development but are not a planning policy requirement. The purpose and benefits of each project are set out in the supporting text.

4.42 Project CC2 does state 'this policy aims to improve and resolve...'. As this is not a policy, it would be more appropriate to refer to this as a project or aspiration. However, Project CC2 then goes on to highlight a number of aspirations of the Parish Council to improve road safety.

4.43 Project CC3 recognises that it is not necessary to repeat the planning policy approach set out within the Local Plan to protect and enhance heritage assets. It should be noted that the Local Plan has now been adopted. The Council's Conservation Team welcomes the support of the Parish Council in identifying the unique non-designated heritage assets within Slyne with Hest.

### **Monitoring Framework**

4.44 The inclusion of guidance on how the Neighbourhood Plan will be monitored is welcomed. It is recommended that the monitoring report be prepared annually for consideration by the Parish Council. This would ensure that the Group was aware of the effectiveness of policies with

opportunity for action should this be required. A triennial monitoring report is not considered sufficient.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

- 5.1 The City Council recognise the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. The City Council have welcomed the opportunity to discuss the evolution of the plan with regard to the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan Area and recognise the significant effort which has been put into its preparation by the local community.
- 5.2 Notwithstanding this, the City Council considers that there are some outstanding issues that have been highlighted within this response that need to be addressed and revisited. In order to meet these requirements, the City Council have suggested a number of modifications and points for clarity to the Plan for the Examiner and Steering Group's consideration. On the whole the City Council supports the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan and considers that they are in conformity with national planning policy, the adopted Local Plan and emerging Climate Emergency Local Plan Review, subject to the recommended changes being made. However, the City Council does recommend that the view of the three SA bodies should be sought in relation to the issues raised with regards to the SEA/HRA. The Council would also recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan is accompanied by a Proposals/Policies Map which highlights allocations/designations within the whole area, rather than on individual maps within the Plan.
- 5.3 Should the examiner require further information, evidence or discussion on any of the matters raised in this response the City Council will be happy to assist in this matter.