

DERBYSHIRE DALES LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

INSPECTOR'S PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS, CLARIFICATION AND COMMENTS RELATING TO SOUNDNESS (Implementation and Monitoring – Chapter 9 and Appendices)

Introduction

1. The purpose of this note is to seek clarification from the Council on a number of matters relating to Chapter 9 of the Local Plan and the Appendices. These matters have emerged from my preparation so far, including assessing representations.

Implementation and Monitoring

2. Paragraph 9.2 implies that there will be further development plan documents but the assumption was that this document is the sole local plan for the district. If the reference is intended to refer to reviews of the Plan then this should be made clear.
3. The column titles in Table 7 are not consistent. It is assumed that those included on the 1st page of the table should be carried through to the remaining pages. The table will need to be adjusted to take into account any Modifications to policies.
4. In terms of Table 8 indicators and targets should be specific and measurable. Are the Council satisfied that this is the case?
5. I have some detailed comments on Table 8 at this stage but more comments are likely to arise as the examination proceeds:
 - a. The target for Policy S3 does not appear to be challenging in that significantly more development should take place in higher tier settlements.
 - b. The indicators and targets for Policies S8, S9 and S10 do not line up.
 - c. The indicator for Policy PD5 should refer to PD5 not PD1.
 - d. The indicator for PD9 should refer to pollution and unstable land not flooding and water quality.
 - e. The targets for Policies HC3, HC12, HC17, HC18, EC5 and EC10 remain 'to be determined'.
 - f. The target for Policy EC2 needs to be updated to refer to the 2013-2033 plan period.
 - g. The indicator for Policy EC9 should refer to Policy EC9 not EC10.

Appendices

6. Should the Glossary refer to LEP and S106 obligations?
7. The definition of major development needs to be updated to reflect the 2015 Development Management Procedure Order.

8. The definition of Rural Exception Sites is not consistent with Policy HC5 which enables open market housing in exceptional circumstances.
9. Comments on, and questions about, the Housing Trajectory (Appendix 3) were made in Preliminary Questions (1) dated 7 February.
10. The font sizes for 'Accessible Settlements with Minimal Facilities' are not consistent in the Key Diagram at Appendix 4.

Response

11. It would be helpful to have a response from the Council on matters raised above by 2 March if possible. If the Council consider that any of the above comments and questions need to be addressed by Main Modifications (MMs) then please let me know. In this respect as advised in the Initial Questions a Schedule of MMs should be produced at an appropriate stage in advance of the hearings.
12. I am not inviting comments from other parties at this stage. I want to clarify the Council's position first. This will help me set out pre-hearing questions in due course on which all parties with relevant representations will have the opportunity to respond.

Mark Dakeyne

INSPECTOR

15 February 2017