

**EXMOOR NATIONAL PARK LOCAL PLAN
INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION**

HEARING SESSIONS - DRAFT PROGRAMME

Between 12th July 2016 and 15th July 2016

VENUE : EXMOOR HOUSE, DULVERTON, SOMERSET, TA22 9HL:

Normal sitting times: Tuesday to Thursday – 9.30 to 13.00 and 14.00 to 17.30

**NB – all references to policy and paragraph numbers below are to those in the
Publication Draft of the Local Plan (SD1)**

*Initials in brackets after a question indicate participant(s)
who have made a representation particularly relevant to it.*

*The timetable and list of participants may be subject to change
Hearing participants are respondents who have requested an oral hearing.
Any participants who no longer wish to take part should contact the Programme Officer as soon as possible.
For further information see the Guidance Note from the Inspector.*

WEEK 1	12-15th JULY	
TUESDAY	<p>Introduction by the Inspector Opening Statement by the Council</p> <p>Session 1: SECTION 4 (Conserving and Enhancing Exmoor) & SECTION 5 (Responding to Climate Change and Managing Resources)</p> <p>ENP Statement No(s): ENPA Statement Session 1</p> <p>AGENDA:</p> <p>1.1 Do policies CE-S1 and CC-S2 provide adequate protection for the undeveloped character of the Heritage Coast? (NT)</p> <p>1.2 Is the protection given by policy CE-S3 to the hierarchy of designated sites, protected species, ancient woodlands and veteran trees fully consistent with national policy?</p> <p>1.3 Is the protection given by policies CE-S4 and CE-D3 to heritage assets and their settings fully consistent with national policy, and are these policies likely to be effective? (NT)</p> <p>1.4 Are the requirements of policy CE-S5 compatible with the objective of preserving the distinctive landscape and heritage of the National Park and with national policy? (CE)</p> <p>1.5 Are the requirements of policy CE-S7, clause 1(f) justified and are they consistent with those of clause 1(b)? (BE)</p> <p>1.6 Is the proposed deletion of policy CE-S8 justified?</p> <p>1.7 Is policy CC-S5 justified in seeking to limit renewable energy development to small-scale</p>	<p>ENP Team: Clare Reid Tessa Saunders Jo Symons / Ruth McArthur</p> <p>Participants: Mr R Briden (ID: 66) Business Exmoor (ID: 58) <i>Mark Sanders</i> National Trust (ID: 44) <i>Michael Calder</i></p> <p>Further Statements: National Trust Session 1</p> <p>No Further Statements: Mr R Briden (ID: 66) Business Exmoor (ID: 58)</p>

	<p>schemes? (BE)</p> <p>1.8 Does policy CC-D3 adequately reflect national policy, in particular the Written Ministerial Statement of 18 June 2015 on wind energy development?</p> <p>1.9 Is there justification for the restrictions that policy CC-S6, clause 6 places on the area from which feedstocks and waste for small-scale anaerobic digestors and waste management facilities may be sourced? (CE)</p> <p>1.10 Is policy CC-D5 fully consistent with what is said in paras 5.127-5.130? For example, would the policy permit use of septic tanks in new development?</p> <p>1.11 Are the policies in these sections of the Plan sound in all other respects, are they effectively drafted to achieve their intended purpose, and do they provide a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal?</p>	
<p>TUESDAY 12th JULY</p> <p>2.00pm</p>	<p>Session 2: SECTION 7 (Achieving a Sustainable Economy)</p> <p>ENP Statement No: ENPA Statement Session 2</p> <p>AGENDA:</p> <p>2.1 Are policies SE-S2 & SE-S3 justified in preferring the conversion of traditional buildings to non-traditional ones? (BE)</p> <p>2.2 Are policy SE-S2 and the proposed change to policy SE-S3 justified in seeking enhancement when redevelopment occurs?</p> <p>2.3 Should parts of paragraph 7.23 of the reasoned justification, and of the new paragraphs that form proposed changes 366 & 368, have policy status?</p> <p>2.4 Should policy SE-S3 allow more opportunities for new business development and change of use in the open countryside? (BE, CE)</p> <p>2.5 Should policy SE-D1 give greater scope for the development of live-work accommodation, including through the conversion of existing non-residential buildings? (CE)</p> <p>2.6 Are the restrictions on extensions imposed by policy SE-D1, clause 1(b) justified? (BE)</p> <p>2.7 Is the reference in paragraph 7.40, lines 2-3 of the reasoned justification to “an enhanced level of employment-generating uses” consistent with the requirements of policy SE-D2 itself?</p> <p>2.8 Are clauses 1(c) & 3 of policy SE-S4 justified in restricting the location of new agricultural</p>	<p>ENP Team:</p> <p>Jo Symons Tessa Saunders Ruth McArthur / David Wyborn</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p>Mr R Briden (ID:66) Business Exmoor (ID:58) <i>Mark Sanders</i></p> <p>No Further Statements:</p> <p>Mr R Briden (ID: 66) Business Exmoor (ID: 58)</p>

	<p>and forestry development? (BE)</p> <p>2.9 Is policy SE-S4, clause 2 consistent with national policy? (BE)</p> <p>2.10 Should the second sentence of paragraph 7.58 of the reasoned justification have policy status?</p> <p>2.11 Are the policies in this section of the Plan sound in all other respects, are they effectively drafted to achieve their intended purpose, and do they provide a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal?</p>	
<p>WEDNESDAY 13th JULY</p> <p>AM & PM Commencing at 9.30am</p> <p>Continues at 2.00pm</p> <p>following a break for luncheon</p>	<p>Session 3: SECTION 6 (Achieving a Thriving Community)</p> <p>ENP Statement No(s): ENPA Statement Session 3</p> <p>AGENDA:</p> <p>3.1 Are the housing policies in the Plan based on a sound objective assessment of housing need in the National Park and in the wider housing market area?</p> <p>3.2 Will the Plan, together with other emerging local plans in the HMA, make adequate provision to meet market and affordable housing needs across the HMA? (HBF)</p> <p>3.3 Is the overall approach to housing provision in the National Park set out in policies HC-S1 and HC-S3 justified, particularly with regard to viability considerations, self-build housing and the needs of local businesses? (CE, BE)</p> <p>3.4 Does the Plan make adequate provision for long-term residents of the National Park to continue to live there in retirement? (Mr & Mrs Cook)</p> <p>3.5 Should there be an additional policy in the Plan permitting low-cost dwellings for local needs outside existing settlements? (EU)</p> <p>3.6 Should there be an additional policy in the Plan permitting low-impact dwellings or “one planet development”? (Geo Ltd)</p> <p>3.7 How should the contents of the “Text Box” on p133 of the Plan, and related policies¹, be treated in the light of the Court of Appeal judgment in SSCLG v West Berkshire DC & Reading BC [2016] EWCA Civ 441? (HBF, Mr Briden)</p> <p>3.8 Should the contents of the “Text Box”, or any</p>	<p>ENP Team: Ruth McArthur Tessa Saunders Clare Reid / David Wyborn</p> <p>Participants: Mr Richard Briden (ID:66) Mr David Cook (ID: 07) Business Exmoor (ID:58) <i>Mark Sanders</i> Exmoor Uprising (ID: 60) <i>Mrs Molly Groves</i> Geo Ltd (ID: 68) <i>James Shorten</i></p> <p>Further Statements: HBF Session 3</p> <p>No Further Statements: Mr D Cook (ID: 07) Mr R Briden (ID: 66) Business Exmoor (ID: 58) Exmoor Uprising (ID: 60) Geo Ltd (ID: 68)</p>

¹ Including HC-DC2 & HC-D6.

	<p>replacement for them, have HC policy status?</p> <p>3.9 Is there justification for the dwelling size limitations set out in policy HC-S2 and related policies ²? (BE, Mr Briden)</p> <p>3.10 Is the proposed use, in policy HC-S2 and related policies ³, of the nationally-described space standards and Building Regulations Requirement M4(2) justified in respect of need, viability and timing ⁴? (HBF)</p> <p>3.11 Are policies HC-S4 and HC-D1 consistent with national policy in respect of Principal Residence conditions and change of use, and are they deliverable? (BE, Mr Briden)</p> <p>3.12 Should policy HC-D2 also allow for new-build dwellings that meet a local business need? (BE)</p> <p>3.13 Are the provisions of policy HC-D3 justified and are they consistent with those of policy HC-S2?</p> <p>3.14 Is policy HC-D4 consistent with national policy? (BE)</p> <p>3.15 Is policy HC-D5 justified in requiring that self- and custom-build housing must meet local affordable need? (CE, Mr Briden)</p> <p>3.16 Is there justification for the definition of rural communities in paragraph 6.132?</p> <p>3.17 Is there justification for the Council's proposal to delete policy HC-D6?</p> <p>3.18 Should policy HC-D7 also allow for conversions to market housing and/or live-work units? (BE, CE)</p> <p>3.19 Is there justification for including a financial viability test in policy HC-D9 and Appendix 2? (BE)</p> <p>3.20 Should policy HC-D10 also allow conversion of other buildings on the farmstead to market housing, in the interests of viability? (CE)</p> <p>3.21 Is there justification for the 35% ceiling on extensions in policy HC-D15, for the Council's proposed deletion of clause 2(a), and for the policy's approach to dwellings immune from enforcement? (BE)</p> <p>3.22 Are the policies in these sections of the Plan sound in all other respects, are they effectively drafted to achieve their intended purpose, and do they provide a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal?</p>	
--	--	--

² Including HC-D2, HC-D4, HC-D5, HC-D6, HC-D7, HC-D8, HC-D9, HC-D10 & HC-D17.

³ Including HC-D1, HC-D2, HC-D3, HC-D5, HC-D6, HC-D9 & HC-D17.

⁴ See PPG Ref ID: 56-020-20150327 and 56-007-20150327.

<p>THURSDAY 14th JULY</p> <p>9.30am</p>	<p>Session 4: SECTION 1 (Introduction), SECTION 2 (Vision, Objectives and Strategic Priorities), SECTION 3 (General Policies), SECTION 10 (Exmoor's Settlements), SECTION 11 (Monitoring and Implementation) & the Plan as a whole</p> <p>ENP Statement No: ENPA Statement Session 4</p> <p>AGENDA:</p> <p>4.1 Do section 1 and policy GP1 give adequate emphasis to the remoteness, wildness and tranquility of the National Park? (RW)</p> <p>4.2 Should the strategic priorities in section 2 include a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and provision of permanent and temporary housing for people working in the National Park? (BE)</p> <p>4.3 What is the purpose of paragraph 3.20, and what is its relationship to policy GP1?</p> <p>4.4 Is the policy approach to major development set out in policy GP2, supported by paragraphs 3.23-3.27, justified and consistent with national policy? (BE, NT)</p> <p>4.5 Is there justification for the allocation of settlements to the categories in Table 3.1? (CE, RW)</p> <p>4.6 Should any other settlements be added to Table 3.1? (CE)</p> <p>4.7 Should paragraph 3.44 have policy status, and should it also include self-build housing? (CE)</p> <p>4.8 Should policy GP3 specifically express support for the growth of businesses, and should the words "rural land-based" be deleted from policy GP3, clause 3(d)? (BE)</p> <p>4.9 As currently worded, is policy GP4, clause 1 effective?</p> <p>4.10 Will policy GP5 be effective in securing necessary infrastructure provision without compromising the viability of development? (CE, HBF)</p> <p>4.11 Are the provisions of policy ES-S2 consistent with relevant legislation and national policy? (HBF)</p> <p>4.12 Does the Plan make it sufficiently clear what are the policy implications of the "historic settlement core" shown on each of the settlement inset maps?</p> <p>4.13 Is the "historic settlement core" for Dulverton defined appropriately? (RW)</p> <p>4.14 Has the duty to co-operate in preparing the</p>	<p>ENP Team: Tessa Saunders Clare Reid David Wyborn / Ruth McArthur / Jo Symons</p> <p>Participants: (15)</p> <p>Mr Roger Watts (ID:71)</p> <p>Business Exmoor (ID:58) <i>Mark Sanders</i></p> <p>Geo Ltd (ID: 68) <i>James Shorten</i></p> <p>Further Statements: HBF Session 4</p> <p>No Further Statements: Mr Roger Watts (ID: 71) Business Exmoor (ID: 58) Geo Ltd (ID: 68)</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Plan been met?</p> <p>4.15 Are the provisions for monitoring and implementing the Plan appropriate and effective?</p> <p>4.16 Should the Plan as a whole contain fewer references to “small-scale” development, and fewer cross-references? (BE, CE)</p> <p>4.17 Should the Plan make explicit provision for a review? (RW)</p> <p>4.18 Are the policies in these sections of the Plan sound in all other respects, are they effectively drafted to achieve their intended purpose, and do they provide a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal?</p>	
<p>THURSDAY 14th JULY</p> <p>2.30pm</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE START TIME</p>	<p>Session 5: SECTION 8 (Achieving Enjoyment for All) & SECTION 9 (Achieving Accessibility for All)</p> <p>ENP Statement No: ENPA Statement Session 5</p> <p>AGENDA:</p> <p>5.1 Should the references in policy RT-S1 to “quiet enjoyment” and “experience of tranquillity” be better defined in order to avoid unduly restricting recreational activities? (CE)</p> <p>5.2 Are the restrictions that policy RT-D3 places on changes of use of owner-occupied guest-houses and bed-and-breakfast establishments reasonable? (RB)</p> <p>5.3 Is there justification for policy RT-D4, clause 2(b)?</p> <p>5.4 Is there justification for the provisions in policies RT-D13 and RT-S2 regarding the reinstatement of the Lynton & Barnstaple railway? (DG, LG, WG, LH)</p> <p>5.5 Do paragraphs 9.20-9.22 of the reasoned justification and Map 9.1, with the Authority’s proposed changes, properly reflect the categorisation and functions of roads in the National Park?</p> <p>5.6 Are policy AC-D3 and the associated parking standards in Table 9.1 consistent with national policy? (HBF)</p> <p>5.7 Are policies AC-S4 and AC-D6 consistent with relevant legislation and with national policy?</p> <p>5.8 Are the policies in these sections of the Plan sound in all other respects, are they effectively drafted to achieve their intended purpose, and do they provide a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal?</p>	<p>ENP Team: Tessa Saunders David Wyborn Clare Reid / Ruth McArthur</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p>Mr Richard Briden (ID:66) Mr David Grob (ID: 16) Mrs Louise Grob (ID: 18) Mr William Grob (ID: 41) Mr Roger Watts (ID: 71)</p> <p>The Lynton & Barnstaple Railway Trust (ID:21) <i>James Shorten: Geo Ltd</i> <i>Ian Cowling: L&B Railway Trust</i></p> <p>Further Statements:</p> <p>HBF Session 5 L&BRT Session 5 L&BRT Session 5 Annex 1</p> <p>No Further Statements:</p> <p>Mr Richard Briden (ID:66) Mr David Grob (ID: 16) Mrs Louise Grob (ID: 18) Mr William Grob (ID: 41) Mr Roger Watts (ID: 71)</p>

<p>FRIDAY 15h JULY</p> <p>9.30pm</p>	<p>REVIEW SESSION & RESERVE SESSION in case any of the previous sessions over-run.</p> <p><i>In the Review session the Inspector will review the outcome of all the previous sessions and discuss the next steps in the examination with the ENPA. No other participants are invited to the Review session, but anyone may attend to observe.</i></p> <p><i>This session will also provide additional time in the event that any of the previous sessions that cannot be completed in the allotted time. Invited participants to all the previous sessions should therefore ensure that they are also available for this session, should that prove necessary.</i></p> <p>AGENDA:</p> <p>6.1 tba</p>	<p>ENP Team:</p> <p>Ruth McArthur Clare Reid Tessa Saunders Jo Symons David Wyborn</p>
---	--	--

CHRISTINE SELF, Programme Officer
 HOMEFIELD HOUSE, HOMEFIELD ROAD, SALTFORD, BRISTOL BS31 3EG
 Home Telephone: 01225 872654
Mobile telephone ONLY during Hearings 077 79 49 79 34
 Email ac.self@blueyonder.co.uk

NOTE: THIS IS A DRAFT PROGRAMME AND WILL PROBABLY CHANGE.