



Intelligent Plans
and examinations

Report on Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013 - 2033

An Examination undertaken for Buckinghamshire Council with the support of Stewkley Parish Council on the March 2020 submission version of the Plan.

Independent Examiner: Andrew S Freeman BSc (Hons) DipTP DipEM
FRTPI

Date of Report: 8 July 2021 (v.2)

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118.
VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Contents

Main Findings - Executive Summary	4
1.Introduction and Background	5
Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2033	5
The Independent Examiner	5
The Scope of the Examination	5
The Basic Conditions	6
2.Approach to the Examination	7
Planning Policy Context	7
Submitted Documents	7
Site Visit	8
Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	8
Modifications	8
3.Procedural Compliance and Human Rights	8
Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	8
Plan Period.....	9
Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	9
Development and Use of Land.....	9
Excluded Development	9
Human Rights	10
4.Compliance with the Basic Conditions.....	10
EU Obligations	10
Main Issues.....	10
Introduction	10
Issue 1: Housing	11
Issue 2: Village Character	12
Issue 3: Parking	12
Issue 4: Community Facilities.....	12
Issue 5: Natural Environment and Biodiversity.....	13
Other Matters	14
Conclusion on the Main Issues	14
5. Conclusions	15
Summary.....	15
The Referendum and its Area	15

Overview	15
Appendix: Modifications.....	16

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Stewkley Parish Council;
- The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Area – Figure A on Page 6 of the Plan;
- The Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2013-2033; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

1. Introduction and Background

Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2033

- 1.1 Stewkley is a village and civil Parish in the district of Buckinghamshire, formerly Aylesbury Vale. The village is located mid-way between Milton Keynes to the north and Aylesbury to the south. Leighton Buzzard lies just over 6 km to the east. The Parish includes outlying farms and the settlement of Littlecote. The estimated population is 1,822, based on the mid-year estimate for 2017 (Paragraph 1.16 of the draft Plan).
- 1.2 Stewkley has an attenuated form of no particular depth. The northern half of the village fronts the B4032 High Street North between Winslow and Leighton Buzzard. The southern half of the village mainly fronts High Street South, at the end of which is a turn towards Littlecote along Dunton Road. High Street South becomes Wing Road and continues towards Wing beyond the designated area.
- 1.3 The Parish was designated as a neighbourhood plan area by the former Aylesbury Vale District Council in May 2016. At the outset, a steering group was established together with nine working groups dealing with a variety of subjects. The resultant submission Plan has a vision covering the period up to 2033 together with 14 policies under six different topic headings.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.4 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan by Buckinghamshire Council with the agreement of Stewkley Parish Council.
- 1.5 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with over forty years' experience. I have worked in both the public and the private sectors. I am an independent examiner and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 1.6 As the independent examiner, I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
 - (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
 - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

1.7 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (“the 1990 Act”). The examiner must consider:

- Whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions.
- Whether the plan complies with provisions under Section 38A and Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) (“the 2004 Act”). These are:
 - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
 - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
 - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
 - it does not include provisions and policies for “excluded development”; and
 - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.
- Whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the plan proceed to referendum.
- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) (“the 2012 Regulations”).

1.8 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

1.9 The “Basic Conditions” are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;

- be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations (Note: the existing body of environmental regulation is retained in UK law); and
 - meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.
- 1.10 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (“the 2017 Regulations”). This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

2. Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Buckinghamshire Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, includes the saved policies from the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan 2004. The Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013–2033 as proposed to be modified (further main modifications) is at an advanced stage of examination. I am satisfied that the Parish Council has worked with Buckinghamshire Council to minimise any conflict between the Plan and the emerging Local Plan in accordance with the advice given in the Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID:41-009-20190509).
- 2.2 Planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. A revised NPPF was published on 19 February 2019 and all references in this report are to the February 2019 NPPF and its accompanying PPG.

Submitted Documents

- 2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including:
- the draft Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013–2033, March 2020;
 - a map of the Plan which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates;
 - the Consultation Statement, March 2020;
 - the Basic Conditions Statement, March 2020;
 - the Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013–2033 Strategic Environmental Assessment, March 2020;

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL
 Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118.
 VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

- the Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Final Site Assessment Report, March 2020;
- all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation; and
- the Examiner's questions of 3 June 2021 and responses from the District and Parish Councils dated 8 June 2021, 14 June 2021 and 17 June 2021.

These documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/stewkley-neighbourhood-plan>

Site Visit

- 2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 9 June 2021 to familiarise myself with it and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

- 2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

Modifications

- 2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

- 3.1 The Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by Stewkley Parish Council which is a qualifying body. The Neighbourhood Plan Area was designated by the former Aylesbury Vale District Council on 4 May 2016, replaced by Buckinghamshire Council on 1 April 2020 which carries over the statutory designation.
- 3.2 It is the only neighbourhood plan for Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Area and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2013 to 2033.

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

- 3.4 Details of plan preparation and consultation are set out in the Consultation Statement dated March 2020. Application for designation as a neighbourhood area was made in March 2016. Following statutory publicity, the neighbourhood area was approved by the former Aylesbury Vale District Council on 4 May 2016 (as noted in paragraph 3.1 above).
- 3.5 Prior to designation, a public consultation event was held to discuss the prospect of a neighbourhood plan. This was followed by the formation of a steering group and the distribution of a questionnaire to all households designed to gain some basis statistics and aspirational insights. There followed a series of open meetings, a call-for-sites exercise and a Parish survey (see the Consultation Statement, Dateline of Main Events, Pages 4-6).
- 3.6 Formal pre-submission consultation took place between 17 June 2019 and 28 July 2019. The Consultation Statement records a total of 127 individual comments with details and responses in a separate spreadsheet (see Appendix 10).
- 3.7 Regulation 16 consultation was carried out between 9 November 2020 and 20 December 2020. Nine formal representations were made. One of these was from a development company, three were from local residents, four were from statutory consultees, and Buckinghamshire Council.
- 3.8 I confirm that the legal requirements have been met by the consultation process. In addition, there has been regard to the advice in PPG on plan preparation and engagement.

Development and Use of Land

- 3.9 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with Section 38A of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

- 3.10 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for “excluded development”.

Human Rights

- 3.11 Stewkley Parish Council is satisfied that the Plan does not breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998). From my independent assessment, I see no reason to disagree.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

EU Obligations

- 4.1 The Neighbourhood Plan was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by the former Aylesbury Vale District Council. There was felt to be some potential to have some significant environmental effects. As such, SEA was carried out by the Parish Council. The SEA concluded that there should be no significant environmental effects. Having read the assessment, I support this conclusion.
- 4.2 In preparing the SEA, necessary information was collated to conclude that the policies within the Plan will not have any significant effects on a European site under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and will not result in any adverse environmental effects (see Paragraph 1.9 of the Plan).
- 4.3 The Neighbourhood Plan Area is not in close proximity to a European designated nature site. Natural England has not indicated that HRA would be required. From my independent assessment of this matter, I have no reason to disagree. However, proposed modification **PM1** is required to update the reference to the 2010 Regulations in Paragraph 1.9, which should be to the 2017 Regulations.

Main Issues

- 4.4 Having regard for the Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan, the consultation responses and other evidence, and the site visit, I consider that there are five main issues relating to the Basic Conditions for this examination. These concern:
- Housing;
 - Village Character;
 - Parking;
 - Community Facilities; and
 - Natural Environment and Biodiversity.

Introduction

- 4.5 Before I deal with the main issues, I have a few observations to make with regard to the representations and comments. First, the Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan should be seen in the context of the wider planning

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118.
VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

system. This includes the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013–2033 as well as the NPPF and PPG. It is not necessary, and it would be inappropriate, to repeat in the Neighbourhood Plan matters that are quite adequately dealt with elsewhere (see NPPF, Paragraph 16 f).

- 4.6 Secondly, the Neighbourhood Plan does not have to deal with each and every topic raised through the consultation. In this regard, the content of the Neighbourhood Plan and the scope of the policies is largely at the discretion of the qualifying body, albeit informed by the consultation process and the requirements set by the Basic Conditions.
- 4.7 Thirdly, my central task is to judge whether the Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the Basic Conditions. Many of the representations do not demonstrate or indicate a failure to meet those conditions or other legal requirements. Similarly, many of the suggested additions and improvements are not necessary when judged against the Basic Conditions.
- 4.8 The following section of my report sets out modifications that are necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions. Some of the proposed modifications are factual corrections (modifications for the purpose of correcting errors is provided for in Paragraph 10(3)(e) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act). Others are necessary in order to have closer regard to national policies and advice. In particular, plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous (NPPF, Paragraphs 15 and 16). In addition, the policies should be supported by appropriate evidence (PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).

Issue 1: Housing

- 4.9 Policy STK1 includes reference to the conversion of barns which *may* be acceptable in principle. This phrasing gives rise to uncertainty. An applicant would have no clear idea of whether conversion would be acceptable or not. For clarity, the policy should state that barn conversions *will* be acceptable in principle. Reference to “in principle” suggests that there may be detailed and/or site-specific reasons why a particular conversion would not be supported. Proposed modification **PM2** refers.
- 4.10 Policy STK3 addresses the allocation of two housing sites, on opposite sides of Wing Road, as shown on the Policies Map (incorrectly cross-referenced to Policy STK2). For both sites, there is a requirement that a single vehicle service road shall be created at the northern end of the site. This is to minimise the loss of the roadside hedgerows. However, there is no evidence to suggest that this would be the safest solution. Given that the hedgerows could be safeguarded in other ways, a more flexible form of wording should be used.

- 4.11 Another key provision is to create, through the developments, a new village gateway. It is envisaged that each scheme would incorporate part of the gateway complementing and *designed and built* with the development opposite. Whilst the objective is laudable, I consider it unlikely that the two schemes would be brought forward and built at the same time. A more likely outcome is that one scheme would proceed the other. The policy needs to be amended to recognise these circumstances as in proposed modification **PM3**.
- 4.12 Proposed modification PM3 also corrects the policy statement that materials are to be approved by the Parish Council. It is the local planning authority that would approve materials, albeit in consultation with the Parish Council.
- 4.13 Clarity would be added to the housing policies and the evidence recognised under the proposed modifications. There would be regard to national policy and, in addition, errors would be corrected.

Issue 2: Village Character

- 4.14 Policy STK4 (Village Character) offers support for development proposals that sustain *and* enhance the distinctiveness of the village. However, the evidence does not indicate that both would be necessary. For example, the character of the village could be respected if sustained, without enhancement. Appropriate regard to national guidance would be met through proposed modification **PM4**.

Issue 3: Parking

- 4.15 Policy STK6 deals with the issue of car parking. Amongst other things, all new residential uses of two or more dwellings are to provide 0.5 car parking space for visitor parking. This is over and above local authority requirements. Representors have indicated in their evidence that this level of provision is excessive and unnecessary.
- 4.16 I can understand the desire to avoid parking in close proximity to site entrances, road junctions and on the road in general. However, the standard could lead to loss of village character through schemes dominated by car parking. An adjustment of the policy wording (proposed modification **PM5**) could ensure that visitor parking is taken into account without the need for provision in all cases. The policy would thus reflect the evidence in line with national guidance.

Issue 4: Community Facilities

- 4.17 STK8 (Community Assets) links the loss of identified facilities to the matter of viability “as defined by the VALP”. However, adoption of this emerging Local Plan and its final wording cannot be taken as a certainty. As such, reference should be made to “the development plan”. This will cover both the Aylesbury

Vale District Local Plan 2004 and the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013–2033, as and when this is adopted.

- 4.18 The policy also includes provisions that relate to community facilities in general. Proposals for new or replacement community facilities, or for their improvement, “will only be supported” in the stated circumstances. However, such provisions should be expressed in positive terms (NPPF, Paragraphs 11a) and 16b)). Regard to national policy and general conformity with the strategic Development Plan would be achieved through proposed modification **PM6**.

Issue 5: Natural Environment and Biodiversity

- 4.19 Under Policy STK9, Local Green Spaces are proposed for designation. However, there are a number of matters that need to be dealt with.
- 4.20 Criteria for the designation of Local Green Spaces are set out in Paragraph 100 of the NPPF. An appraisal against these criteria is contained in Section 10 of the Parish Council’s “Key Open and Green Spaces Report”. Supporting information is to be found in other sections of the report. However, there are two spaces for which there is no appropriate evidence. These are “Moat at Tythe House” (Heritage Space) and “Chapel Square Island”. As such, these should be deleted from the list of sites proposed for designation.
- 4.21 With regard to ownership, national guidance advises that the qualifying body should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space (PPG Reference ID: 37-019-20140306). In the Stewkley case, there are several sites (mainly Heritage Spaces) in private ownership where early contact has not taken place. To accord with the guidance, and to avoid prejudice, the spaces should be omitted from the policy. This action includes the case of St Michael’s Churchyard where referral to the Diocese of Oxford as owner is uncertain (see Parish Council’s response to the Examiner’s questions) and application of Green Belt policy could frustrate possible improvements (see Regulation 16 representations of Geoffrey Ring).
- 4.22 In terms of the wording of the policy, proposals for the development of the spaces will be refused “unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated”. However, the NPPF states that policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with Green Belt policy (Paragraph 101). This would allow development that is “not inappropriate”. To ensure regard for national policy and to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, the wording needs to be changed.
- 4.23 I note that the Local Green Spaces, as shown on the Policies Map and Insets (incorrectly shown as “Inserts” on the page title) are shown at too small a scale. Contrary to national policy, a decision maker would not be able to

discern the extent of the spaces consistently and with confidence. Larger scale plans and referencing of the respective spaces will be necessary.

- 4.24 I also note that, on the Policies Map and the insets, there is a mix-up in the notation between the Local Green Spaces and Local Amenity Land. For example, the Recreation Ground and Football Field are shown as Local Amenity Land, not Local Green Space as identified in Policy STK9. Such errors need to be corrected.
- 4.25 In order to correct errors and to have appropriate regard to national policies and advice, several amendments to Policy STK9 and the Policies Map and Insets are necessary. These are detailed in proposed modification **PM7**.
- 4.26 Related modifications are necessary to Policy STK10 (Local Amenity Land). These concern the scale at which the land is shown on the Policies Map and Insets; also, correction of the notation to ensure that the designated Local Amenity Land is accurately referenced to Policy STK10. The amendments are set out in proposed modification **PM8**.
- 4.27 Policy STK12 addresses biodiversity. Under the policy, development proposals would have to demonstrate that they would have no significant adverse effect on biodiversity and would deliver a biodiversity gain. However, this provision would apply to *all* developments, including householder applications. This would not be proportionate and may be contrary to the achievement of sustainable development. Amendment is necessary as in proposed modification **PM9**.

Other Matters

- 4.28 There remain six policies that have not been the subject of discussion in the above report. They concern housing type (Policy STK2), buildings of local historic interest (Policy STK5), cyclists and pedestrians (Policy STK7), important views (Policy STK11), local employment (Policy STK13) and broadband (Policy STK14).
- 4.29 To a greater or lesser extent, these topics are covered by NPPF Sections 5 (Delivering a sufficient supply of homes), 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy), 9 (Promoting sustainable transport), 10 (Supporting high quality communications) and 12 (Achieving well-designed places). I find that there has been regard to national policy and the Basic Conditions have been met.

Conclusion on the Main Issues

- 4.30 With the modifications that I have recommended, the Plan would meet the Basic Conditions. Other non-material changes, including suggestions and corrections set out in the representations and editing of the text to reflect the proposed modifications, can be incorporated into the final version of the Plan.

5. Conclusions

Summary

- 5.1 The Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

The Referendum and its Area

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan as modified has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Overview

- 5.4 It is evident that a considerable amount of time and effort has been devoted to the development and production of this Plan and I congratulate those who have been involved. The Plan should prove to be a useful tool for future planning and change in Stewkley Parish over the coming years.

Andrew S Freeman

Examiner

Appendix: Modifications

PM means Proposed Modification.

Page references are to those in the submitted draft Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

PM1, Page 7

In the second sentence of paragraph 1.9, substitute “2017 (as amended)” for “2010 (as amended by Schedule 2 of the 2012 Regulations)”.

PM2, Page 21

In the final sentence of Policy STK1, substitute “will” for “may”.

PM3, Pages 23 and 43

For both allocated sites in Policy STK3, substitute the following for the provision relating to the vehicle service road: “a new (single) vehicle service road and pedestrian access/egress shall be created off Wing Road in a way that minimises the loss of the existing hedge for sight lines. Any loss of hedgerow shall be offset through new planting along the back edge of the visibility splay”. (Page 23)

For both allocated sites, substitute the following for the provision relating to the new village gateway: “On the south of the site, a new village gateway that is in keeping with this part of the village shall be created utilising the new houses and landscaping”. (Page 23)

For both allocated sites, and in relation to the palette of building materials, insert “Buckinghamshire Council in consultation with” before “the Parish Council”. (Page 23)

In relation to Policy STK3, amend the key of the Policies Map Inset 1 by substituting “STK3” for “STK2”. (Page 43)

PM4, Page 25

In the opening sentence of Policy STK4, substitute “or” for “and”.

PM5, Page 27

In Policy STK6, insert “and visitors” after “occupants”. Delete the last sentence of the policy.

PM6, Page 30

In Policy STK8, replace “VALP” with “development plan”.

Amend the second paragraph of the policy to read “Proposals to improve community facilities...”. Delete “only”.

In the third paragraph of the policy, delete “only”.

PM7, Page 33 and Pages 41-43

In Policy STK9, delete “All Heritage spaces” and “Chapel Square Island”. Add “Stewkley War Memorial”. (Page 33)

In the second paragraph, substitute “shall be consistent with Green Belt policy” for “will be refused unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated”. (Page 33)

With regard to the Policies Map and Insets, show the Local Green Spaces at a scale large enough for the extent of the spaces to be readily discerned. Name the Local Green Spaces. (Pages 41-43)

Ensure that, in the key to the Policies Map/Inset Maps, the Local Green Spaces are accurately cross-referenced to Policy STK9. (Pages 41-43)

PM8, Pages 41-43

With regard to the Policies Map and Insets, show the Local Amenity Land (Policy STK10) at a scale large enough for the extent of the spaces to be readily discerned.

Ensure that, in the key to the Policies Map/Inset Maps, the Local Amenity Land is accurately cross-referenced to Policy STK10.

PM9, Page 34

At the beginning of Policy STK12, insert “With the exception of householder applications,”.