

EXAMINATION OF THE NORTHLEACH WITH EASTINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2018-2031 Submission Plan July 2018

Responses to the examiner's questions from Northleach with Eastington Town Council and Cotswold District Council

Please find below answers to the examination questions, from Northleach with Eastington Town Council (NETC), and Cotswold District Council ('CDC') to question 14. CDC has also provided a view on other questions, directed to the town council, as in many instances these questions relate to points discussed with the town council in their efforts to reach this stage.

Also attached are a number of supporting documents provided by NETC.

Introductory statement from NETC

There is a common thread on the questions posed by the examiner in relation to the balancing of significant environmental constraint with positive social change. As the preamble to the Plan document and its Sustainability Appraisal make clear, for many years those constraints have discouraged change and the town's status has suffered with the loss of services and declining/aging population. The Plan vision is to encourage positive change to ensure that the town does not become less sustainable. The proposals for the school, market place, new car park and Old Prison must be seen in this light. If the Town Council cannot come to a different judgement on the planning balance between competing national and local environmental and social policies, however marginal, to achieve its vision then there will be consequences for the future health of the town.

Policy NE1. Public parking at West End.

Please see separate note on implications of site location within Flood Zone 3.

Q1. *The wording of the policy appears to suggest that there is not, at least as yet, a full justification, that is in terms of robust and proportionate evidence¹, to support the 'allocation' of this site for public parking. In view of the acknowledged environmental sensitivity of this site, which lies within the Conservation Area and the AONB as well as affecting the setting of listed buildings, is there any current evidence (surveys etc.) to demonstrate that additional parking facilities are required for visitors to the town? (In paragraph 11 of Appendix 3 to the Consultation Statement (the report on the Regulation 14 consultation) there is reference to further background information being made available as an appendix to the plan. Where is it?)*

¹ Paragraph 41-040 in the National Planning Policy Guidance refers

Supplementary Q1. Access to proposed car parking area (Policy NE1). Have the Gloucestershire County Council as Local Highway Authority given any indication of their requirements for a visibility splay along West End towards the north-west to ensure safe egress from the car park? If so, what would be the implication for the retention of the trees situated within the highway verge? Reference is made in paragraph 5.10 of the NENP to the 'minimum loss of trees' but what would that mean in reality? Given the situation within the Conservation Area as well as the AONB would the loss of any of the trees be compatible with Local Plan Policy EN7(1a)? *My observation was that, at the position of the existing field gate, clear visibility to the north-west is obtained at only 1 metre back from the carriageway edge.*

NETC response:

There is additional evidence on the need for the car park and the County Council has provided further information on the visibility splay so that the loss of existing trees will be minimal. It is not considered necessary to retain every existing tree to sustain and enhance the character of the conservation area. Local Policy EN7(1A) has not been interpreted to mean that not a single tree in a long line of trees can be lost, as §10.7.2 in support of the policy recognises.

It is also noted that the town council's Site Assessment report concluded that the site does not affect the setting on any listed buildings.

CDC position:

We do not have specific evidence to put forward, but would note that the Local Plan supports in principal parking provision in Northleach (policy S12).

While the loss of trees through the proposed development would be contrary to EN7, we would need to assess any proposal against the Development Plan as a whole, and consider the planning balance.

Q2. *The last paragraph in the policy has been introduced to the submission plan following Regulation 14 consultation. It largely overlaps with criterion i. Would the application of the policy be clearer if criterion i. was omitted but the final paragraph moved forward to read as a pre-requisite for the development?*

NETC response:

This is an oversight and the policy may be modified as proposed.

CDC position:

We agree that this policy could be reworded to remove repetition.

Q3. *The benefits deriving from a redesign of the layout of the Market Place are stated in paragraph 5.20 under Policy NE4. (Examiner's Note: If the Market Place is highways land planning permission may not be required for all of the elements described, for example the relocation of the bus stop and what is termed 'restructuring' the parking layout.)*

- a. To what extent is the justification for additional car parking at West End directly related to the proposals for the Market Place?
- b. What exactly would be the terms of any s106 obligation relating to the development at West End to which reference is made in paragraph 5.9 of the plan text? Is that intended to be a policy requirement? If it is, to what extent would the tests for such an obligation ('old' NPPF para. 204) be met?

NETC response:

As per §5.9 to the policy, the additional car parking is directly related to the proposals to remove cars from market place. The text in §5.9 in relation to S106 is incorrect and may be deleted.

CDC position:

- a) Officers consider that the car park development is likely to cause harm to the natural and historic environment, and will only be made acceptable by an improvement to the market place to mitigate this harm.
- b) A Section 106 agreement would be only one example of a mechanism that could be used to ensure that the town centre improvements come forward in conjunction with the proposed car park.

Q4. *Criterion ii. Coach parking. This provision is somewhat contradicted by the second sentence in paragraph 5.9.*

- a. If there is a need for coach parking to meet growing demands for visitors how is that to be provided?
- b. Is the reasoning behind criterion ii. a concern for the visual impact of coaches on this sensitive site?

NETC response:

This is an oversight dating from a previous proposal. The reference to coaches in §5.9 may be deleted.

CDC position:

- a) To avoid this contradiction, we suggest that 5.9 could reference that the proposed site is only suitable for cars
- b) Certainly, the visual impact is a concern, but so is the infrastructure/engineering necessary to overcome the site constraints to enable coach access.

Q5. Criterion iii. What is the justification for limiting car parking provision to 30? Is there any evidence for this particular figure?

NETC response:

This is an estimate of the number of spaces that may be possible to accommodate a scheme that meets criterion (v) of the policy.

CDC position:

We would highlight that if the site were to be referenced on the Policy map by way of a star, rather than a specific area of land, (as considered below at Q9) an indication of the scale of acceptable development would be welcome.

Q6. Criterion v. What, exactly, is the intention behind the requirement for a 'full landscape and arboricultural protection and mitigation scheme'. If this includes, as stated in paragraph 5.10, that there should be a 'minimum loss of mature trees', should that not be explicitly stated as policy (as it was in the Regulation 14 draft plan)?

NETC response:

The policy may be modified as proposed.

CDC position:

Officers' view is that a full scheme is required, as this would include not only the protection of existing trees, but also ensure that the development would have future planting to better fit its surrounding, and make a contribution to green infrastructure.

Q7. Text. Paragraph 5.8. *This makes reference to the rCOH Site Assessment Study but that was for a larger site (Site A) which included residential development. To what extent is it considered that the conclusions reached in the Site Assessment report remain valid for the car parking area alone?*

NETC response:

The outline proposals assessed in the site assessment report included the car parking element and the report therefore appears valid.

CDC position:

We believe the Town Council is best placed to answer, as requested, and we do not wish to comment further.

Q8. Text. Paragraph 5.10. *This states that (the policy) 'requires any scheme to include a comprehensive car parking strategy to demonstrate how the public benefit of the proposal outweighs the harm to the Northleach Conservation Area and the Cotswolds AONB' BUT that statement is NOT correct. There is no reference in policy to such a balancing exercise needing to be carried out before permission might be granted. In view of national and Local Plan policy on these matters should this not be more explicitly stated? (NB There is no reference here to the issue of location within Flood Zone 3 and the need to satisfy the 'exception test'.)*

NETC response:

The wording of §5.10 is incorrect and the reference to the balancing exercise in the second part of the first sentence may be deleted. The design of any scheme will need to accord with policy NE3 in any event.

It has been assumed that this proposal would be deemed 'minor development' as per old NPPF §104 and footnote 22, hence there is no requirement at this stage for the application of the exception test. Although CDC has not challenged this assumption, it is acknowledged that it has not been made clear in the submission documentation. A planning application for a scheme will be required to include a flood risk assessment. Although it may have been helpful, the provision of such an assessment prior to the principle of the use being secured by the policy was not a cost that the Town Council could bear.

CDC position:

A solution to this could be either to amend the policy, or section 5.10 could simply state; '...in line with national and local policy'.

Q9. *As the Cotswold District Council have pointed out, the policy refers to the land for public parking being shown 'indicatively' on the Policies Map but both that map and, at larger scale, Plan D, show a specific area of land with firm boundaries.*

a. Is it accepted that it would be better to show a general location by means of a star symbol? *(Paragraph 7.2 in the Consultation Statement suggests that it had been intended to make this change to the plan)*

b. What is the intended status of Plan D relative to the Policies Map, especially as it is not mentioned in either policy or text?

NETC response:

The map is a legacy of earlier plan making and may be removed. The Policies Map may be modified as proposed but omitted in error.

CDC position:

Our preference is for an approach that shows the indicative location of the proposed car park, but not the extent

Policy NE2. Primary School Expansion.

Q10. *It appears that unlike in the earlier (Regulation 14) draft plan, Policy NE2 no longer allocates a specific area of land for school expansion nor is any site shown on the submission Policies Map. Instead, the policy provides support for proposals 'at or adjacent to' the existing educational facilities.*

- a. Contrary to the indication in paragraph 12 the Regulation 14 report, reference to cardinal points has been retained in the policy. Is this an error? If not, does the retention of such references in criterion (v) of the policy reduce the flexibility necessary to ensure that any development would accord with national and Local Plan policies for the conservation and enhancement of the landscape within an AONB ('old' NPPF para. 115, CLP Policy EN5) and/or to avoid harm to the setting of the Conservation Area ('old' NPPF para. 132, CLP Policy EN10)?
- b. Would the clarity of the policy be improved by the omission of all references to cardinal points?
- c. In criterion (vi) are there any feasible alternatives for a pedestrian access other than north-south?

NETC response:

The policy is intended to encourage the expansion of the established education facilities in the town. All of the town lies in the AONB and much of it is designated a conservation area. It is therefore not possible for the policy to avoid any effect on the landscape or setting to the conservation area. The policy seeks to moderate the balance between these environmental constraints and the very significant social value of the continued successful operations of the school for the town.

This necessarily means using land in the vicinity of the existing facilities, as it is not good practice to separate school and nursery functions on sites that are not well connected. The policy is also aimed at using expansion proposals to alleviate the existing problem of unmanaged on-street parking at peak times.

The Town Council originally wished the policy to be site specific and commissioned professional advice to demonstrate that it is possible to achieve a scheme within the constraints. It also secured the support of the site owner. However, it was persuaded by CDC that it should not do so, and rather rely on a criteria-based policy as it is possible that the policy objectives may be met from different land parcels in the vicinity of the school. With that in mind, the criteria may be modified to acknowledge that they may only be relevant to specific rather than all proposals. Modifying the policy to remove all references to the cardinal points would not be welcomed as it will render the policy worthless.

CDC position:

- a) In our view, the reference does reduce flexibility
- b) In our view, yes
- c) Yes, east-west from St Georges Field

Q11. *Criterion (v) seeks to **minimise** any visual impact on the AONB and the setting of the Conservation Area. However, does that approach pay sufficient regard to national and Local Plan policy (as referenced in Q10)? Is it considered that a more appropriate test would be the degree to which any proposal might conserve and enhance those natural or heritage assets, rather than that any harm should be minimised? Might it not be the case that even if any particular design has 'minimised' (however that may be judged) the visual impact it might still fail to conserve and/or enhance the asset?*

NETC response:

As above, the policy wording has been used to strike the correct balance between different national and local planning policy objectives. Here, the Town Council places the greatest weight on old NPPF §72 and considers that is possible for proposals to come forward that would not harm the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB (per §115) or cause substantial harm to the setting of the conservation area (in which case §134 is engaged in weighing the less than substantial harm against the public benefit promoted by §72). The evidence report assessed the landscape and heritage effects and concluded that in relation to one specific site option, it is possible for the balance to be struck. The policy wording may be modified to make the landscape and heritage tests clearer with this balance in mind.

CDC position:

We would agree that a positively phrased approach would be preferable, in light of national and local policy.

Policy NE3. Design of the built and natural environment.

Q12. *In their Regulation 14 representations the CDC suggested that two policies be combined and put forward a revised wording for Policy NE3 which appears to have been accepted in its totality by the Town Council. However, there remains no reference in the plan to the existence of a conservation area for Eastington village even though the Policies Map shows the extent of the area with green diagonal lines and indicates that Policy NE3 applies. Local Plan Policy EN11, mentioned in NENP paragraph 5.15, applies to all conservation areas and not just to their settings as indicated in that paragraph.*

- a. Would the NETC wish to amend the wording of paragraph 5.15 to correct this?
- b. For completeness, should it be made clear that the policy also relates to the Eastington Conservation Area?

NETC response:

This is an oversight as the focus on the Plan has been on the main town. §5.14 may be modified to make clear the first sentence of the policy refers to all proposals in the designated area, including the Eastington Conservation Area. The second sentence of §5.15 may be modified to add a reference to the Eastington Conservation Area in the first parentheses.

CDC position:

- a) No comment, given this is a direct question for the town council.
- b) Clarity on this issue would be welcome.

Q13. a. Rather than stating that proposals for new development should accord with 'relevant policies' in the Local Plan would it not add clarity to refer specifically to LP Policies EN2 and EN11 (as in the text)? Are any others of relevance?

b. As the Local Plan policies apply anyway why is it considered necessary to refer to them in this policy? (*See next question about the status of the Cotswold Design Code*)

NETC response:

As with many other made Neighbourhood Plans, the intention is to allow the LPA to determine which policies are relevant for the determination of a planning proposal. This approach also allows for the policy to remain up-to-date in the event that Local Plan policies change during the lifetime of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the policy may be modified in this way if considered necessary.

CDC position:

- a) One option could be; 'in accordance with the Local Plan' but reference these two most relevant policies in the reasoned justification, perhaps: 'in accordance with EN11 and EN2 and all other relevant policies in the Local and Neighbourhood Plan'.
- b) We agree that it is not necessary, but in line with Paragraph 16 on the NPPF, it does aid the decision-maker in understanding the context, and arguably, provides guidance to a non-planning professional reading this document.

As the wording of Policy NE3 was suggested by the CDC I consider it more appropriate for them to answer the next question although the Town Council may wish to respond to the part c. of the question.

Q14. The LPA have not identified the policies in section 10 of the Local Plan, including Policy EN2, as being 'strategic'. In the circumstances, should the NENP be 'made', Policy NE3 would supersede the LP policy for the purposes of development management decisions. It requires proposals for new development to 'accord with ... the Cotswold Design Code' and thus goes further than the LP policy. The status of the Code is clarified in the last sentence in paragraph D3 (Appendix D) of the Local Plan which states that (the Code) 'is a material consideration in planning decisions and, set within the context of the Local Plan, carries considerable weight.'

- a. Does the LPA accept that the Design Code is in the nature of Supplementary Planning Guidance, which is a material consideration, rather than part of the statutory development plan for the purpose of decision-making²?
- b. Is it correct to state, as in NENP paragraph 5.15, that LP Policy EN2 'applies' the Design Code?
- c. Is there any particular justification in the context of Northleach for requiring proposals to accord with the Code?

CDC response:

- a) No. The Design Code is an integral part of the Local Plan. Cotswold District is a unique landscape, where the natural, built and historic environment entwine. The Design Code helps conserve and enhance this landscape, and is fundamental to the delivery of sustainable development. Cotswold District Council welcomes NDP policy that adds detail to this approach.
- b) Not strictly speaking – we would suggest a rephrasing, to pick up the second sentence of EN2; that 'Proposals should be of design quality that respects the character and distinctive appearance of the locality.'

² By reason of s38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

- c) There is no particular justification for Northleach; EN2 covers the whole of Cotswold District.

NETC position:

Policy EN2 has been assumed to be a strategic policy and therefore the Neighbourhood Plan policy has been designed to fit with it. It is not considered that the Neighbourhood Plan policy goes further than Policy EN2. All of the designated area lies within the Cotswold AONB. Although the Design Code relates to the whole of the district it is especially relevant to the countryside and settlements within the AONB, which, like Northleach and Eastington, display all of the essential characteristics of the 'Cotswold style'.

Policy NE4. Town Centre

Q15. *Planning Practice Guidance*³ states that: *A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.*

The main part of this policy, although not the last paragraph (see below), is clearly intended as a development management policy to be read alongside Local Plan Policy EC8 which it duplicates in part.

- a. How are the terms 'support' and 'resist' to be interpreted for the purpose of decision-making by the Local Planning Authority, other than as 'permitted' and 'refused' respectively?
- b. In the circumstances is it considered that the policy would be more clearly expressed if those more precise words were used?

NETC response:

There are very many made Neighbourhood Plans (and Local Plans) that use this precise language to make clear the intent of a policy. However, if the LPA would prefer that the plan uses language used in the new Local Plan then this and other policies may be modified as proposed.

CDC position:

Such a change would make the wording more consistent with other policies in the Development Plan.

³ Paragraph 041, Reference ID: 41-041-20140306

Q16. *The policy refers to the 'defined Town Centre boundary'. This begs the question, for a plan user not fully familiar with the area, where is it defined? As eluded to in paragraph 5.16, the reference is to the Local Plan. However, the town centre boundary is shown on the Policies Map for the Cotswold District, Inset 11 (Northleach) as reproduced on page 80 of the Local Plan. (Examiner's Note: In statutory terms the Policies Map is not part of the Development Plan. It is a separate 'Local Development Document' which shows the geographical extent of the areas to which development plan policies apply, whether they be in the Local Plan, Neighbourhood Plans or County Minerals and/or Waste Plans. There is only one such map for any LPA area.) For clarity, and ease of application, is it accepted that the geographical extent of Northleach Town Centre might be shown on the 'Policies Map' at the end of the Neighbourhood Plan with the wording of Policy NE4 amended to state that fact?*

NETC response:

The policy and policies map may be modified in these ways.

CDC position:

Cotswold District Council prepared the submission version of the NDP 'Policies map' on the town council's behalf, and would be happy to make this amendment.

Q17. Planning Practice Guidance⁴ states that: Neighbourhood planning can inspire local people and businesses to consider other ways to improve their neighbourhood than through the development and use of land. They may identify specific action or policies to deliver these improvements. Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non land use matters should be clearly identifiable. For example, set out in a companion document or annex.

See my note in Question 3 in relation to Policy NE1. Although the desired physical improvements to the Market Place may involve the development and the use of land, it is not clear to what extent, if at all, they will require planning permission and thus be an appropriate matter for a neighbourhood plan policy. The re-arrangement of the parking spaces within the highway and re-configuring the bus stop may not involve either development or a change of use of land.

- a. Should the last paragraph of Policy NE4 be treated differently from the rest of the policy, identified as a 'community aspiration'?
- b. Is 'the defined area' referred to in criterion iv. the same as the 'defined Town Centre' or is it some other area (the Market Place only)?
- c. Is it correct to continue the numbering of the criteria (iv. to vii.) in the last paragraph of the policy as these appear to be unrelated to criteria (i. to iii) in the second part of the policy.

NETC response:

It is possible that some of the improvements may require planning consent in due course. There is no firm proposal at present but the inclusion of the wording in this part of the policy is intended to encourage proposals to be made. On that basis it is considered that the matter should not be pre-judged by relocating this part of the policy to section six of the plan.

Part (iv) may be modified to read "... restructuring the existing public car parking spaces in market place to create ..."

The criteria may be modified to read as bullet points to distinguish them from the first part of the policy.

CDC position:

- a) It is currently unclear whether elements of this proposal would require planning permission, but it is possible. We suggest the addition of 'development proposals' (either in addition to, or in place or, 'improvements') to the last paragraph would provide direction, should such a circumstance arise.
- b) Clarity would be welcome.
- c) No comment.

⁴ Paragraph 004, Reference ID: 41-004-20170728

Policy NE5. Tourism Development.

Q18. *The second part of the policy indicates that proposals which enhance (my emphasis) the Old Prison will be 'supported' subject to certain criteria but the text in paragraph 5.22 indicates that the policy encourages further tourism and employment development at the site. a. Which is correct? ('Enhancement' need not involve 'development' and conversely, 'development' may not 'enhance' but merely result in 'less than substantial harm' – 'old' NPPF para. 134)*

b. Should the second part of the policy refer to 'Development proposals ...' so as not to confuse with listed building consent procedures which are subject to separate legislation?

NETC response:

The second part of the policy may be modified as proposed to aid its clarity (as intended in §5.22)

CDC position:

- a) No comment
- b) We welcome this suggestion.

Policy NE6. Local Green Space.

Q19. *The primary intention of this policy appears to be to identify three areas considered to be of value to the local community and thus justify 'designation' as Local Green Space in accordance with 'old' NPPF paragraphs 77 and 78 and Local Plan Policy EN3. (See also my note under Q15 above about the use of the word 'resisted'.) Why use different words in NENP Policy NE6 than in Local Plan Policy EN3? Will that not cause uncertainty in decision-making contrary to PPG guidance? Is it necessary to do other than to state that LP Policy EN3 will apply to the areas of Local Green Space identified in the NENP, Plan H, I and J and on the Policies Map?*

NETC response:

It is not considered that the wording used in the policy will cause uncertainty in decision making. The policy wording accords with §78 (and by association §87) of the NPPF. However, it may be modified as proposed if considered necessary.

CDC position:

CDC is very supportive of Local Green Space designation through NDPs (and has also designated sites within the district at communities' request through the Local Plan), and values the certainty given by consistent application of EN3, rather than unnecessary local variations.

Thames Water Representation

Q20. *Thames Water seek the inclusion of informative text relating to water supply, waste water and sewerage. These considerations appear to be of general applicability not restricted to this Neighbourhood Plan area. Is it considered that Local Plan Policy INF8 is sufficient to cover Thames Water's concerns?*

NETC response:

Yes – this is the basis on which the majority of made Neighbourhood Plans deal with this type of matter.

CDC position:

No comment.

Supplementary Q2. Local Green Space at East End (Policy NE6i.) In view of recent development at the western end of this area adjacent to the Westwoods Centre what is the function of the land lying west of the stone wall which marks the end of pasture fields on the northern side of the stream (lying between the stream and the new Westwoods development)? Is it considered that the western area continues to meet the NPPF criteria for designation as Local Green Space? Does the extent of the LGS as shown on page 28 of the NENP (Plan I) remain correct? Can it reasonably be stated (as in paragraph 5.25 of the plan) that the western area is 'popular with walkers and well used'? Is there any reasonable prospect of access along the northern side of the stream to The Meadows as suggested in paragraph 5.25?

I observed on my visit that the Westwoods housing development (Freeman Homes) is nearing completion. On the eastern side of Bassett Road just before the turn towards the surgery there are gates leading to Freeman Homes' sales office which is marked 'Private Road'. The gates appeared to be lockable with key code access. The land to the south and south-east of the sales office has been landscaped and fenced with gravel turning space. It appears to be in totally private ownership with no right of access to it or across it. It is also at a distinctly higher level than the pasture field to the south and east of the stone wall. Also on the eastern side of the Westwoods Centre, at a lower level, is a small parking and turning area and an enclosed recycling compound. There is no access from there to the land further east.

NETC response:

The vast majority of the green space indicated is open and regularly walked. It is accessed via a public footpath from East End leading South into the area of proposed green space. Slightly to the East of the field line between the new

development and the open field retained by GCC is a stepping stone access over the river into the field to the South of the river. Turning West, an unofficial route then joins with the Eastington Road and a field gate into the next section of proposed green space. The far Western end of the green space is not presently accessible and is now in the ownership of the developer but could be cleared to provide a path. In any event, it can be enjoyed by walkers passing to the southern side of the River Leach as a feature of the open valley landscape and would not appear to be capable of future development.

CDC position:

We have no objection to the designation of the area proposed.

Addendum To Supplementary Question 2

Since sending my supplementary questions yesterday I have undertaken some research online into the background to the planning permission granted for the development by Freeman Homes off Bassett Road. This was with a view to establishing the planning status of the lower part of the site within what might be described as a 'dog leg' located east of the recycling facility by the Westwoods Centre and forming the southernmost part of the development area. It appears that the relevant outline planning permission reference is 14/04274/OUT and the reserved matters approval reference is 16/03403/REM. There are very many approved plans but the area to which I refer is located due south of Plot 29 on the layout plan(s). It is shown as a landscaped area containing a 'SUDS' pond and tree planting in the lower section. From the road I could see a gravelled drive or turning area as well.

I confirm that it is that part of the proposed Local Green Space which lies within the area covered by these permissions for which I am seeking further comment. Paragraph 77 of the 'old' NPPF is written in the present tense and consequently it needs to be established to what extent any piece of land meets the required criteria in its present state. It would appear that the area in question has only very recently been landscaped as part of the approved development scheme. Furthermore, the area is shown on plans forming part of the Design and Access Statement as 'Public Open Space' but I have been unable to find any further reference to that in the permissions granted or by way of any legal agreement. Is there any information on the intended future ownership of the land in question or any management arrangements? Will there be public access to any part of it?

Please treat this email as an addendum to my supplementary question 2. I am looking to the Local Planning Authority to comment on any factual matters relating to the planning status of the land in question.

CDC position:

The western part of the proposed green space area would appear to extend across the south western part of the Freeman Homes development, the outline permission for which is 14/04274/OUT. The implemented reserved matters approval is 17/00700/REM. The aforementioned reserved matters approval includes a landscaping plan ([here](#)). The applicant is required to retain the landscaping for at least 5 years. Our understanding is that the management is currently being undertaken by the developers, until final occupation, when a management company will take on the management of the landscaped areas around the edge of the site. The area in question accommodates an infiltration pond and underground LPG tanks.