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	Introduction by the Inspector Opening Statement by the Council	ENP Team: Clare Reid Tessa Saunders	
12th JULY 9.30am	Session 1: SECTION 4 (Conserving and Enhancing Exmoor) & SECTION 5 (Responding to Climate Change and Managing Resources)	Jo Symons / Ruth McArthur	
	ENP Statement No(s): ENPA Statement Session 1		
	AGENDA:	Participants:	
	adequate protection for the undeveloped character of the Heritage Coast? (NT) Busines Mark Sa	Mr R Briden (ID: 66)	
		Business Exmoor (ID: 58) Mark Sanders	
	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?	National Trust (ID: 44) Michael Calder	
	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)	Further Statements: National Trust Session 1	
	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)	No Further Statements: Mr R Briden (ID: 66) Business Exmoor (ID: 58)	
	1.5 Are the requirements of policy CE-S7, clause 1(f) justified and are they consistent with those of clause 1(b)? (BE)		
	1.6 Is the proposed deletion of policy CE-S8 justified?		
	1.7 Is policy CC-S5 justified in seeking to limit renewable energy development to small-scale		

DRAFT PROGRAMME: 5 July 2016

schemes? (BE) 1.8 Does policy CC-D3 adequately reflect national policy, in particular the Written Ministerial Statement of 18 June 2015 on wind energy development? 1.9 Is there justification for the restrictions that policy CC-S6, clause 6 places on the area from which feedstocks and waste for smallscale anaerobic digestors and waste management facilities may be sourced? (CE) 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? 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? **ENP Team:** Jo Symons **TUESDAY SECTION 7 (Achieving a Sustainable** Session 2: **Tessa Saunders** 12th JULY Economy) **Ruth McArthur / David Wyborn** ENP Statement No: ENPA Statement Session 2 2.00pm AGENDA: 2.1 Are policies SE-S2 & SE-S3 justified in preferring the conversion of traditional **Participants:** buildings to non-traditional ones? (BE) Mr R Briden (ID:66) Are policy SE-S2 and the proposed change to 2.2 **Business Exmoor (ID:58)** policy SE-S3 justified in seeking enhancement Mark Sanders when redevelopment occurs? 2.3 Should parts of paragraph 7.23 of the reasoned justification, and of the new No Further Statements: paragraphs that form proposed changes 366 Mr R Briden (ID: 66) & 368, have policy status? Business Exmoor (ID: 58) Should policy SE-S3 allow more opportunities 2.4 for new business development and change of use in the open countryside? (BE, CE) 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) 2.6 Are the restrictions on extensions imposed by policy SE-D1, clause 1(b) justified? (BE) 2.7 Is the reference in paragraph 7.40, lines 2-3 of the reasoned justification to "an enhanced of employment-generating consistent with the requirements of policy SE-D2 itself? 2.8 Are clauses 1(c) & 3 of policy SE-S4 justified in restricting the location of new agricultural

	and forestry developm	ent? (BE)		
	2.9 Is policy SE-S4, cla national policy? (BE)	use 2 consistent with		
		sentence of paragraph justification have policy		
	sound in all other resp drafted to achieve thei do they provide a cle	nis section of the Plan ects, are they effectively r intended purpose, and ear indication of how a react to a development		
WEDNESDAY 13th JULY	Session 3: SECTION 6 (Ac Community)	hieving a Thriving	ENP Team: Ruth McArthur Tessa Saunders	
AM &	ENP Statement No(s): ENPA Statement Session 3 AGENDA :		Clare Reid / David Wyborn	
PM Commencing at 9.30am	a sound objective a	es in the Plan based on ssessment of housing Park and in the wider	Participants:	
Continues at	local plans in the provision to meet r	er with other emerging HMA, make adequate market and affordable	Mr Richard Briden (ID:66) Mr David Cook (ID: 07)	
2.00pm following a break for	housing needs across the HMA? (HBF) 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)	Business Exmoor (ID:58) Mark Sanders Exmoor Uprising (ID: 60)		
luncheon		Mrs Molly Groves Geo Ltd (ID: 68)		
	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		James Shorten Further Statements:	
		additional policy in the ost dwellings for local settlements? (FU)	HBF Session 3	
	3.6 Should there be an	additional policy in the npact dwellings or "one	Mr D Cook (ID: 07) Mr R Briden (ID: 66)	
	p133 of the Plan, an treated in the light of judgment in SSCLG v	nts of the "Text Box" on d related policies ¹ , be if the Court of Appeal West Berkshire DC & WCA Civ 441? (HBF, Mr	Business Exmoor (ID: 58) Exmoor Uprising (ID: 60) Geo Ltd (ID: 68)	
	3.8 Should the contents o	f the "Text Box", or any		

.

¹ Including HC-DC2 & HC-D6.

wanta a ana ant fau thana	have LIC		4-40
replacement for them.	nave HC	DOILC	v status?

- 3.9 Is there justification for the dwelling size limitations set out in policy HC-S2 and related policies ²? (BE, Mr Briden)
- 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)
- 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)
- 3.12 Should policy HC-D2 also allow for new-build dwellings that meet a local business need? (BE)
- 3.13 Are the provisions of policy HC-D3 justified and are they consistent with those of policy HC-S2?
- 3.14 Is policy HC-D4 consistent with national policy? (BE)
- 3.15 Is policy HC-D5 justified in requiring that selfand custom-build housing must meet local affordable need? (CE, Mr Briden)
- 3.16 Is there justification for the definition of rural communities in paragraph 6.132?
- 3.17 Is there justification for the Council's proposal to delete policy HC-D6?
- 3.18 Should policy HC-D7 also allow for conversions to market housing and/or livework units? (BE, CE)
- 3.19 Is there justification for including a financial viability test in policy HC-D9 and Appendix 2? (BE)
- 3.20 Should policy HC-D10 also allow conversion of other buildings on the farmstead to market housing, in the interests of viability? (CE)
- 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)
- 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?

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.

THURSDAY 14th JULY

9.30am

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

ENP Statement No: ENPA Statement Session 4 AGENDA:

- 4.1 Do section 1 and policy GP1 give adequate emphasis to the remoteness, wildness and tranquillity of the National Park? (RW)
- 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)
- 4.3 What is the purpose of paragraph 3.20, and what is its relationship to policy GP1?
- 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)
- 4.5 Is there justification for the allocation of settlements to the categories in Table 3.1? (CE, RW)
- 4.6 Should any other settlements be added to Table 3.1? (CE)
- 4.7 Should paragraph 3.44 have policy status, and should it also include self-build housing? (CE)
- 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)
- 4.9 As currently worded, is policy GP4, clause 1 effective?
- 4.10 Will policy GP5 be effective in securing necessary infrastructure provision without compromising the viability of development? (CE, HBF)
- 4.11 Are the provisions of policy ES-S2 consistent with relevant legislation and national policy? (HBF)
- 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?
- 4.13 Is the "historic settlement core" for Dulverton defined appropriately? (RW)
- 4.14 Has the duty to co-operate in preparing the

ENP Team: Tessa Saunders
Clare Reid
David Wyborn / Ruth McArthur /

Jo Symons

Participants: (15)

Mr Roger Watts (ID:71)

Business Exmoor (ID:58)

Mark Sanders

Geo Ltd (ID: 68)
James Shorten

Further Statements:

HBF Session 4

No Further Statements:

Mr Roger Watts (ID: 71)

Business Exmoor (ID: 58)

Geo Ltd (ID: 68)

	Plan been met?		
	4.15 Are the provisions for monitoring and implementing the Plan appropriate and effective?		
	4.16 Should the Plan as a whole contain fewer references to "small-scale" development, and fewer cross-references? (BE, CE)		
	4.17 Should the Plan make explicit provision for a review? (RW)		
	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?		
THURSDAY 14th JULY	Session 5: SECTION 8 (Achieving Enjoyment for All) & SECTION 9 (Achieving Accessibility for All)	ENP Team: Tessa Saunders David Wyborn	
2.30pm	ENP Statement No: ENPA Statement Session 5	Clare Reid / Ruth McArthur	
PLEASE	AGENDA:		
NOTE	5.1 Should the references in policy RT-S1 to	Posticinostes	
START TIME	"quiet enjoyment" and "experience of tranquillity" be better defined in order to avoid unduly restricting recreational activities? (CE)	Participants:	
		Mr Richard Briden (ID:66) Mr David Grob (ID: 16)	
	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)	Mrs Louise Grob (ID: 18)	
		Mr William Grob (ID: 41)	
		Mr Roger Watts (ID: 71)	
	5.3 Is there justification for policy RT-D4, clause 2(b)?	The Lynton & Barnstable Railway Trust (ID:21) James Shorten: Geo Ltd lan Cowling: L&B Railway Trust	
	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)		
	5.5 Do paragraphs 9.20-9.22 of the reasoned	Further Statements:	
	justification and Map 9.1, with the Authority's proposed changes, properly reflect the categorisation and functions of roads in the National Park?	HBF Session 5	
		L&BRT Session 5	
		L&BRT Session 5 Annex 1	
	5.6 Are policy AC-D3 and the associated parking standards in Table 9.1 consistent with national policy? (HBF)	No Further Statements:	
	5.7 Are policies AC-S4 and AC-D6 consistent with relevant legislation and with national policy?	Mr Richard Briden (ID:66)	
		Mr David Grob (ID: 16)	
	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	Mrs Louise Grob (ID: 18)	
		Mr William Grob (ID: 41)	
	do they provide a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal?	Mr Roger Watts (ID: 71)	

FRIDAY 15h JULY

9.30pm

REVIEW SESSION & RESERVE SESSION in case any of the previous sessions over-run.

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.

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.

AGENDA:

- 6.1 Any further evidence needed
- 6.2 Need for main modifications
- 6.3 Process for drafting main modifications
- 6.4 Next steps and timetable

ENP Team:

Ruth McArthur Clare Reid Tessa Saunders Jo Symons David Wyborn

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.

DRAFT PROGRAMME: 5 July 2016