

Recommendation number	Policy /Page	Submission Version text	Examiners recommendation	Modification proposed	Reasons for decision
1	Policy H1.1	<p>HP.1.1: Proposals for small-scale housing developments, including 'infill' on sites in the defined settlement boundary will be supported.</p>	<p>In HP1.1 delete 'small-scale' and 'including infill on sites'</p>	<p>HP.1.1: Proposals for small-scale housing developments, including 'infill' on sites in the defined settlement boundary will be supported.</p>	<p>Policy HP1.1 addresses two separate matters. The first is the general location of new housing development within the settlement boundary and the second is its support for small-scale development. On the latter point small scale is not defined in the Plan. The Parish Council has proposed to define small scale as five dwellings in its response to my Clarification Note.</p> <p>Given the way in which the settlement boundary is drawn it is probable that most new infill developments will be small scale in nature. However, the Core Strategy places no such restrictions on the size of new development in the Coleford part of the District. Any proposal within the neighbourhood plan to introduce a size restriction without any detailed justification would not be in accordance with important strategic policies in the Core Strategy. Plainly the size of individual schemes will be informed by the size of the site concerned and the application of development management policies. I recommend that any reference to small scale is removed. This approach would also be consistent with the second part of the policy which supports the potential of the Berry Hill School for housing purposes should the school relocate.</p>
2	Policy HP1.2	<p>HP.1.2: Should the Berry Hill Primary School choose to relocate to another part of the NDP area then land of approximately 1.7 hectares at the current Berry Hill Primary School site shown in blue on the Plan map may be allocated for around 40 dwellings, subject to any covenants.</p> <p>Consultation with the community in respect of changes to educational sites for 5 - 16 year-</p>	<p>Replace HP1.2 with:</p> <p>'Proposals for the redevelopment of the Berry Hill Primary School as shown on the Policies Map will be supported.'</p>	<p>HP.1.2:</p> <p><u>'Proposals for the redevelopment of the Berry Hill Primary School as shown on the Policies Map will be supported.'</u></p>	<p>The second part of the policy addresses the potential to redevelop the Berry Hill school for residential purposes should it relocate at some point. The Parish Council has clarified the position on this matter as part of the examination. Whilst there is no certainty on the matter this policy will make a positive statement about its potential future use. If developed in this fashion it would have regard to national policy by boosting the supply of housing land in the Plan area. I recommend modifications to bring clarity to the policy. As drafted it touches on civil matters (covenants) and matters to be addressed separately by the education</p>

		olds within our NDP area are strongly encouraged. Provision of such services will be retained within our NDP area.			authority (the delivery of educational facilities in the Plan area).
3	Policy HP1.3	<p>HP1.3: All development must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonise with the current properties. • Have an appropriate mix of housing and green infrastructure including gardens large enough to be productive. • Have no negative impact on existing home owners. 	<p>In HP1.3 replace 'must' with 'should'</p> <p>At the end of the first criterion add 'in the immediate locality of the proposed development; and'</p> <p>Delete the second criterion</p>	<p>HP1.3: All development must <u>should</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonise with the current properties <u>in the immediate locality of the proposed development; and</u> • Have an appropriate mix of housing and green infrastructure including gardens large enough to be productive. • Have no negative impact on existing home owners. 	<p>The third part of the policy touches on design and amenity issues. I recommend modifications to its structure so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF. In particular I recommend the deletion of the second criterion. It would be impractical to implement on a consistent basis both in general terms and for the decision maker to come to a view on the size required for a 'productive' family garden.</p>
4	Policy HP2.1	<p>HP.2.1: Some developments in rural exception sites will be supported to achieve this objective. This will be achieved in part by the approval of developments on some exceptions sites. Exception sites will be monitored by the Forest of Dean District Council in conformance to the policies within this NDP to ensure that local needs are being met.</p>	Delete HP2.1		<p>Housing Policy 2</p> <p>This policy supplements Policy HP1. It addresses current and future demographic trends and the needs of different social groups. It has four parts. HP2.1 addresses rural exception sites. HP2.2 refers to the design standards of open market and social housing. HP2.3 refers to design issues and HP2.4 promotes self-build housing.</p> <p>I sought clarification from the Parish Council on this suite of policies. As submitted some of the policy elements are less than clear and others have the potential to conflict with</p>

	Policy HP2.2	HP.2.2: The NDP will support design and distribution that does not differentiate between social and non-social housing. Proposals for new housing must deliver a range of house types and mixed tenures. Proposals must clearly demonstrate how the development addresses the needs of current and future households. A proportion of the housing proposed is required to meet standards, so homes are suitable for households whose needs change.	Replace the first sentence of HP2.2 with: 'Proposals that deliver new housing proposals will be supported where their design and distribution do not differentiate between open market and social housing'. Delete the final sentence of HP2.2.	HP.2.2: The NDP will support design and distribution that does not differentiate between social and non-social housing. <u>Proposals that deliver new housing proposals will be supported where their design and distribution do not differentiate between open market and social housing'</u> Proposals for new housing must deliver a range of house types and mixed tenures. Proposals must clearly demonstrate how the development addresses the needs of current and future households. A proportion of the housing proposed is required to meet standards, so homes are suitable for households whose needs change.	the delivery of District-wide local policies. I recommend the deletion of HP2.1. This approach was agreed by the Parish Council. In effect, the policy does not establish what is meant by 'some developments'. In any event rural exception sites can be determined on their merits by FoDDC. I recommend modifications to the other components of the policy to ensure that they have the clarity required by the NPPF. In particular I recommend that HP2.4 makes direct reference to other development plan policies to prevent unintended consequences.
5	Policy HP2.3	HP.2.3: Future developments will be in keeping with the size and type of dwellings already prevalent in the surrounding area except where there is a demonstrable need for an alternative type or size of home and these can be delivered to be in keeping with the surrounding area.	In HP2.3 replace 'will' with 'should' and 'delivered' with 'designed'	HP.2.3: Future developments will <u>should</u> be in keeping with the size and type of dwellings already prevalent in the surrounding area except where there is a demonstrable need for an alternative type or size of home and these can be delivered <u>designed</u> to be in keeping with the surrounding area.	
6	Policy HP2.4	HP.2.4: Self-build opportunities and any new housing style/identity that can embrace modern design and meet the needs of the people of our NDP area will be supported.	In HP2.4 replace 'any with 'other' and 'can embrace' with 'embraces' and 'meets the needs...will be supported' with 'meets the identified housing needs of local people will be supported where they conform with policies in the neighbourhood plan and other development plan policies.'	HP.2.4: Self-build opportunities and any other new housing style/identity that can embrace <u>embraces</u> modern design and meet the needs of the people of our NDP area will be supported. <u>meets the identified housing needs of local people will be supported where they conform with policies in the neighbourhood plan and other development plan policies.</u>	

7	Policy HP3.3	HP.3.3: Properties should meet the needs of first-time buyers and families. (see table 2).	Replace HP3.3 with the following: 'Proposals which deliver houses to meet the needs of first-time buyers and families will be supported where they conform with policies in the neighbourhood plan and other development plan policies.'	HP.3.3: Properties should meet the needs of first-time buyers and families. (see table 2). <u>Proposals which deliver houses to meet the needs of first-time buyers and families will be supported where they conform with policies in the neighbourhood plan and other development plan policies.</u>	This suite of policies sets out to ensure that affordable housing is delivered in the Plan area to meet the needs of local people. The various policy components address general affordable housing numbers and their long-term retention, the needs of first time buyers and families, and the needs of the elderly and disabled. Policy HP3.2 makes specific reference to the Five Acres site. I recommend the deletion of HP3.1 (general affordable housing) and HP3.5 (the retention of affordable housing). They do not add any local distinctiveness to existing development plan policies. I also recommend the deletion of HP3.2. It sits far more comfortably within the wider context of the Five Acres policies later in the Plan.
8	Policy HP3.4	HP.3.4: Properties designed to be suitable for the elderly and disabled (Lifetime Homes standard), should be located close to key facilities.	Replace HP3.4 with the following: 'Proposals which deliver houses to meet the needs of the elderly and persons with disabilities will be supported where they are located close to key facilities.'	HP.3.4: Properties designed to be suitable for the elderly and disabled (Lifetime Homes standard), should be located close to key facilities. <u>Proposals which deliver houses to meet the needs of the elderly and persons with disabilities will be supported where they are located close to key facilities.</u>	The other two policy components are appropriate and are underpinned with relevant information. I recommend modifications so that they have the clarity required by the NPPF.
9	Policy HP4.1	HP.4.1: Proposals for all forms of new development or re-developments must present high quality and inclusive design, at the same time demonstrating they will conserve local distinctiveness and the aesthetic qualities of traditional rural settlements and buildings. Applications proposing unsympathetic designs which fail to respect the connections between people and places, or are inappropriate to its location, or pay inadequate regard to issues of renewable energy technologies, landscape and biodiversity considerations, are not likely to be supported. Developments must conform to: FoDDC Residential Design Guide and the Government Optional Building Regulations and additional standards in relation to (1) efficiency, (2)	In HP4.1 replace 'must' with 'should' and are not likely to' with 'will not' In HP4.1 replace the final sentence with: 'All developments should otherwise conform to the Forest of Dean District Council Residential Design Guide or its equivalent if replaced or updated in the Plan period'	HP.4.1: Proposals for all forms of new development or re-developments <u>must</u> should present high quality and inclusive design, at the same time demonstrating they will conserve local distinctiveness and the aesthetic qualities of traditional rural settlements and buildings. Applications proposing unsympathetic designs which fail to respect the connections between people and places, or are inappropriate to its location, or pay inadequate regard to issues of renewable energy technologies, landscape and biodiversity considerations, are not likely to be supported. <u>Developments must conform to: FoDDC Residential Design Guide and the Government Optional Building Regulations and additional standards in relation to (1)</u>	Housing Policy 4 This policy sets out a series of design expectations for new residential development. It is very distinctive to the Plan area. I sought clarification from the Parish Council on some elements of the policy. I recommend a series of modifications to the policy both to bring the clarity required by the NPPF and to ensure that the Plan has appropriate regard to national policy in general terms and the content of neighbourhood plans in particular. In HP4.1 I recommend the deletion of the references to the Building Regulations. I also recommend the deletion of HP4.3. Whilst many of the developments in the Plan are likely to be undertaken by local builders the focus of the planning system is on the development itself and not the applicant/builder.

		accessibility and (3) space.		efficiency, (2) accessibility and (3) space. All developments should otherwise conform to the <u>Forest of Dean District Council Residential Design Guide or its equivalent if replaced or updated in the Plan period.</u>	
10	Policy HP4.2	HP.4.2: Developments must create safe, accessible environments and secure layouts which minimise conflict between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians, avoid street clutter, accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and services. They must also consider the needs of people with disabilities, including the provision of dropped kerbs to facilitate access into and around Berry Hill, Christchurch and Edge End. They must also provide and encourage footways and cycle paths which facilitate convenient links between Forest, community spaces and developed areas.	In HP4.2 replace the various references to 'must' with should'	HP.4.2: Developments must <u>should</u> create safe, accessible environments and secure layouts which minimise conflict between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians, avoid street clutter, accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and services. They must <u>should</u> also consider the needs of people with disabilities, including the provision of dropped kerbs to facilitate access into and around Berry Hill, Christchurch and Edge End. They must <u>should</u> also provide and encourage footways and cycle paths which facilitate convenient links between Forest, community spaces and developed areas.	
11	Policy HP4.3	HP.4.3: The NDP will support developers who use local employment opportunities, using local building contractors and local materials such as Forest of Dean stone and timber. Potential developers will be expected to demonstrate how their proposed development will encourage local training and employment opportunities whilst using these local materials.	Delete HP4.3		

12	Policy HP4.4	<p>HP.4.4: Developers will demonstrate that all future developments will contain sufficient parking spaces so as not to have a detrimental effect on the highway infrastructure.</p>	<p>Replace HP4.4 with: 'New development proposals should provide off road car parking spaces to development plan standards.'</p>	<p><u>HP4.4 New development proposals should provide off road car parking spaces to development plan standards.'</u></p>	
13	Policy HP5.1	<p>• HP.5.1: Following National Guidance and FoDDC CSP 1 all new development, conversions and extensions, other than minor domestic or commercial extensions, will not be supported without clear evidence provided of there being no flood risk (either to the development site or to other land, especially those sites identified below) arising from the carrying out and use of the development. Any future planning application should be supported by an appropriate risk assessment to demonstrate that there is no adverse risk of pollution of controlled waters including potable domestic water supplies such as wells and boreholes, surface water courses, springs, ponds and field drains, together with appropriate measures such as monitoring where necessary. Unless it can be demonstrated that any of the measures below are unnecessary developers will need to demonstrate that the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are supported by a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of the development, in order to avoid possible flood risk to people and property; as well as setting out measures to manage any residual future risk; • Help mitigate and adapt to climate change and 	Delete HP5.1		<p>Housing Policy 5</p> <p>This policy seeks to ensure that new developments are resilient to the effects of climate change, flooding and that they take account of sustainable water and sewage management. I sought clarification from the Parish Council on the extent to which HP5.1 added any local value to guidance already included in the NPPF and on the structure of HP5.2 which reads as a series of planning conditions rather than as a policy</p> <p>Taking all matters into account, including the representations made to the policy, I recommend that the policy is deleted. Policy HP5.1 adds no local distinctiveness to national policy and HP5.2 addresses issues that are planning conditions and not policies.</p>

		<p>alleviate increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate proportionate and appropriate pollution control measures to prevent adverse impacts on the water environment; • Are in line with Environment Agency practice note GP3 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice'; include Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) as the first method of surface water disposal, with connection to the surface water sewer only used as a last option; and • Where either SUDS is not feasible/appropriate or if the development is of a size and nature that will likely to exacerbate existing drainage issues elsewhere within the Plan area and neighbouring areas, an appropriate payment towards off-site drainage and water run-off management will be required. 			
14	Policy HP5.2	<p>HP.5.2: This policy encourages the consideration of these issues in planning permissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development shall commence until full details of the proposed drainage schemes for surface and foul water (including details of their routing, design, and subsequent management and maintenance) should be submitted to and approved by the Forest of Dean District Council planning authority; • Effective water drainage, 	Delete HP5.2		

		<p>all parking places and driveways associated with new developments will be designed to incorporate features connected with sustainable design (e.g. sustainable drainage and porous/ permeable surfacing for drives);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No building shall be occupied until the drainage and sewage schemes have been implemented in accordance with the approved details. 			
15	Supporting text for policy 5	<p>JUSTIFICATION, EVIDENCE, PLANS, DOCUMENTS AND STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT HOUSING POLICY 5:</p> <p>This policy aims to reduce surface water run-off and contribute to flood reduction measures. The Plan will encourage new ways of reducing flood risk and water management throughout the area.</p> <p>According to the local flood map from the Environment Agency our NDP area, there are no flood hazards from either rivers or seas.</p> <p>Although not a major problem for most of our NDP area there are a few sites where local surface flooding is an issue in bad weather, for example at the bottom of Joyford Hill and Beechwell Lane. Regular maintenance of drains and ditches will be needed. However any further developments will</p>	<i>Delete the supporting text</i>		

		<p>add pressure to the Coleford sewage works, where sewage and waste water is dealt with for most of our area, which may exacerbate the problems already existing for Coleford.</p> <p>The A4136 is a busy routeway which needs to be maintained in all weather and cars must be able to travel through there without causing problems. SUDS will be supported as the way to address surface drainage issues.</p> <p>Facilities, access (including roads and paving), drainage arrangements, layout and design should meet the requirements of the policies in this Plan and of the Core Strategy by supporting the integrated County Council flood risk assessment.</p> <p>All developments must conform to relevant standards applicable to ancient mining areas and to standards imposed by district, county and mine, quarry and geological surveys, including radon.</p>			
16	Policy TR1.1 Policy TR1.3		Reposition TR1.1 and TR1.3 to a separate part of the Plan addressing non-land use proposals		<p>Transport Policy 1</p> <p>This policy addresses a series of matters with the intention of providing good traffic management and promoting road safety.</p> <p>Policy TR1.1 is not in itself a land use policy. Rather it is a proposal for the Parish Council</p>

17	Policy TR1.2	<p>TR.1.2: Where development would add to traffic congestion in the villages or inappropriate traffic on rural lanes, the developer must submit proposals to mitigate any traffic impact or contribute funding towards local transport schemes</p>	<p>In TR1.2 add the following at the start Proposals for new development should be designed to ensure that they can be satisfactorily located within the highway network.</p> <p>Insert 'significantly and unacceptably' between 'add' and 'to' and replace 'must' with 'should'</p>	<p>TR.1.2: <u>Proposals for new development should be designed to ensure that they can be satisfactorily located within the highway network</u> Where development would add <u>significantly and unacceptably</u> to traffic congestion in the villages or inappropriate traffic on rural lanes, the developer must <u>should</u> submit proposals to mitigate any traffic impact or contribute funding towards local transport schemes</p>	<p>to work with Gloucestershire County Council to promote a series traffic and transport initiatives in the Plan area. National policy anticipates that proposals of this nature may arise as part of the preparation of a neighbourhood plan. However, it comments that such policies should be located in a discreet part of the Plan and which would not form part of the development plan. Plainly these circumstances apply here and I recommend accordingly.</p> <p>Policy TR1.2 seeks to ensure that developers mitigate the effects of inappropriate traffic on rural lanes. It has attracted a representation from the highways authority referring the national policy. I recommend modifications to address this matter. I also recommend a modification so that the policy adopts a positive rather than a negative approach. As submitted the policy seeks to address potential problem areas rather than to identify what is required to avoid such problems in the first instance. This modified approach will generate the clarity required by the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy TR1.3 promotes specific examples of traffic calming measures as those generally identified in TR1.1. I recommend a modification as that recommended for TR1.1</p>
18	Transport Policy 2	<p>TR.2.1: The NDP will support any development which will maximise opportunities to walk and/or cycle within easy distance to bus stops, the schools, a community health, well-being and fitness centre, shops and other community facilities.</p> <p>Developments will be required to take into account the need to improve accessibility for the whole community both within and adjacent to the development sites, by creating safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle routes to the edge of the villages</p>	<p>Transport Policy 2</p> <p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>'Proposals that would maximise the opportunity for local residents to walk or cycle between new development and bus stops, schools, shops and other community facilities will be supported where they otherwise comply with policies in this Plan and with other development plan policies'.</p>	<p>TR.2.1: The NDP will support any development which will maximise opportunities to walk and/or cycle within easy distance to bus stops, the schools, a community health, well-being and fitness centre, shops and other community facilities.</p> <p>Developments will be required to take into account the need to improve accessibility for the whole community both within and adjacent to the development sites, by creating safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle routes to the edge of the villages</p>	<p>Transport Policy 2</p> <p>This policy sets out the Plan's support for development which would maximise the opportunities for walking and cycling from the development concerned to shops and the wider range of community facilities in the Plan area. It has sustainable development at its core. I sought clarification on the intent of the policy and possible unintended consequences. This clarification also sought to address the representation made by the County Council.</p> <p>It is on this basis that I recommend a series of modifications to the policy. They bring about a stronger relationship with development plan policies and delete the part of the policy</p>

		and to all employment and development areas.		and to all employment and development areas. TR2.1 <u>Proposals that would maximise the opportunity for local residents to walk or cycle between new development and bus stops, schools, shops and other community facilities will be supported where they otherwise comply with policies in this Plan and with other development plan policies</u> .	that would otherwise have placed an unreasonable burden on developers. I also recommend a modification to the title of the Transport section of the Plan to reflect the retention of some of the submitted policies (as addressed and modified in this report) and the relocation of the traffic management elements to a separate part of the Plan.
19	Transport and Traffic Management		Modify the section title from 'Transport and Traffic Management' to 'Transport and New Development'.	Transport and Traffic Management <u>Transport and New Development.</u>	
20	Policy CE1.1 Policy CE1.2	CE.1.1: Protect and enhance the villages' open spaces by: Where it is possible, the provision of associated natural landscaping, including native trees, hedgerows, wetland areas and the retention or incorporation of habitats for species of small mammals, bats, birds and insects, will be required. CE.1.2: Development proposals are expected to maintain or enhance the natural features, to provide nature conservation value and a biodiversity action plan for species and habitat, mature trees, hedgerows, existing Forest areas and Forest Waste. Wildlife corridors between wildlife areas and other green spaces will be maintained and encouraged within any development.	Replace CE1.1 and CE1.2 with the following: 'Proposals for new development should safeguard and where possible enhance the natural environment in the Plan area. Particular attention should be given in the design of development proposals to the retention of native trees, hedgerows, wetland areas and wildlife corridors. Proposals which would detract from the conservation and natural wildlife value of the Plan area will not be supported'.	<u>CE1.1 Proposals for new development should safeguard and where possible enhance the natural environment in the Plan area. Particular attention should be given in the design of development proposals to the retention of native trees, hedgerows, wetland areas and wildlife corridors. Proposals which would detract from the conservation and natural wildlife value of the Plan area will not be supported</u> '	Countryside and Environment Policy 1 This policy sets out the Plan's approach towards open spaces and natural features in the Plan area. It has a degree of overlap with Policy CE2 which has a particular focus on the designation of local green spaces. Some of my recommended modifications overlap with CE2 and have been informed by the Parish Council's very helpful response to my Clarification Note. The thrust of these two policies respects the setting of the Plan area within the wider Forest of Dean. There are a variety of open spaces, some of which are designated as Forest Waste. Policy CE1.1 sets out a general expectation for the provision of new natural landscaping within developments. CE1.2 identifies that development proposals are expected to maintain or enhance the natural features in the Plan area in general, and in relation to wildlife corridors in particular. Whilst the approach adopted in both policies stems

					<p>from the supporting text the policies themselves are unclear in terms of their obligations on developers. They read as generalised expectations rather than as development plan policies.</p> <p>Within the context of the Plan area I can see the appropriateness of the approach intended. I recommend that the policies are combined into a single policy which provides clarity both to the decision maker and to the developer.</p> <p>CE.1.3 sets out the policy implications for designated local green spaces. On this basis, I recommend that it is deleted from this policy and is incorporated into a wider package of recommended modifications associated with Policy CE2.</p>
21	Policy CE1.3	<p>CE.1.3: Good management to maintain or enhance the contributions these spaces make to the area will be encouraged. The areas will be safeguarded from inappropriate development or development nearby which will negatively affect the character and purpose of a Local Green Space (LGS – see figures 14a and 14b).</p>	Delete CE1.3		
22	<p>Policy CE2.1 Policy CE2.2 Policy CE2.3</p>	<p>POLICY</p> <p>CE.2.1: The following land identified below will be designated as Local Green Space (LGS) due to its mixture of community, recreational, historical or environmental value: All Statutory Forest and Forest Waste. Forest waste is a unique and historic attribute, and special conservation is required for this land. Land opposite the Christchurch Church (LGS 1) The Ready Penny (LGS 2) Berry Hill Community Orchard (LGS 5)</p> <p>CE.2.2: The following are recreational spaces within our NDP area and will be designated as essential, LGSs for community use:</p>	<p>Replace CE2.1/2.2/2.3 as follows:</p> <p>‘The following parcels of land as shown on the Policies Map are designated as local green space: [List LGS1-5 and EE LGS1-2 (both reference and titles)] New development will not be supported on land designated as Local Green Space except in very special circumstances’.</p> <p>‘The following parcels of land as shown on the Policies Map are identified as open space areas [List OGS6-10 (both reference and titles)] Proposals for development on the open spaces areas will not be supported unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it can be demonstrated that the open space concerned is surplus to requirements; or 	<p><u>CE2.1 The following parcels of land as shown on the Policies Map are designated as local green space:</u></p> <p><u>Land opposite the Christchurch Church (LGS 1)</u> <u>The Ready Penny (LGS 2)</u> <u>Berry Hill Playground (LGS 3)</u> <u>Playing Fields on the Lakers and the Gloscol sites (LGS 4)</u> <u>Berry Hill Community Orchard (LGS 5)</u> <u>Edge End Recreation Ground (EE LGS 1)</u> <u>Edge End (EE LGS 2)</u></p> <p><u>New development will not be supported on land designated as Local Green Space except in very special circumstances’.</u></p> <p><u>The following parcels of land as shown on the Policies Map are identified as open space areas</u></p> <p><u>Kells Meend (OGS 6)</u></p>	<p>Countryside and Environment Policy 2</p> <p>The policy sets out the Plan’s approach to the identification and designation of local green spaces and other open spaces. It does so in a very comprehensive way.</p> <p>Within this overall context the presentation of the Plan is unclear in two important areas. In the first instance, it fails to make a clear distinction between local green spaces and other open spaces. Plainly all are important locally. However, for the purposes of planning policy local green spaces have to be assessed against specific criteria in the NPPF. In simple terms, they should have more important characteristics than other open spaces. In the second instance, the identification of local green spaces in the Plan makes the distinction between those which are Forest Waste and those which are not. In the context of the Plan area this approach is understood. Nevertheless, for planning policy purposes it is irrelevant.</p> <p>In neither the case of local green spaces nor of other open spaces do the policies identify the policy implications of these designations.</p>

		<p>Berry Hill Playground (LGS 3) Playing Fields on the Lakers and the Gloscol sites (LGS 4) Edge End Recreation Ground (EE LGS 1) Edge End (EE LGS 2)</p> <p>CE.2.3: The following have been highlighted as other open space areas within the NDP area used by local residents.</p> <p>Kells Meend (OGS 6) Tudor Walk (OGS 7) Glencarn Place (OGS 8) Nine Wells A (OGS 9) Nine Wells B (OGS 10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by an equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or the proposed development itself is for alternative recreational provision and which would serve the local community in an equivalent or enhanced fashion.' 	<p><u>Tudor Walk (OGS 7)</u> <u>Glencarn Place (OGS 8)</u> <u>Nine Wells A (OGS 9)</u> <u>Nine Wells B (OGS 10)</u></p> <p><u>Proposals for development on the open spaces areas will not be supported unless:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>it can be demonstrated that the open space concerned is surplus to requirements; or</u> <u>the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by an equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or</u> <u>the proposed development itself is for alternative recreational provision and which would serve the local community in an equivalent or enhanced fashion.</u> 	<p>I recommend a modification to address this matter. In part, it relocates the deleted part of CE1.3 into this policy.</p> <p>On the matter of local green spaces I am satisfied that they all meet the criteria identified in paragraph 77 of the NPPF. The Plan's assessment of the matter is very helpfully set out in Table 4. I saw the various sites on my visit to the Plan area. In their different ways, they are obvious contenders for such designation.</p>
23	Policy CE3.2	<p>CE.3.2: Increase landscape and habitat connectivity within the NDP area by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting joint multi-agency involvement to work on green infrastructure provision associated with any planned or permitted large- scale development. Maintaining the gardens and varied boundaries of houses and developments. This ensures natural 	Delete CE3.2		<p>Countryside and Environment Policy 3</p> <p>This policy addresses landscape issues, planting and the need to safeguard local character. It is a distinctive policy which reflects the Plan area.</p> <p>CE3.1 sets out a policy on planting issues. It meets the basic conditions</p> <p>CE3.2 sets out proposals for multi-agency landscape and habitat connectivity work. In its response to my clarification note the Parish Council agrees that the policy is not land use based and should be deleted. I recommend accordingly.</p>

		wildlife corridors and adds to the rich biodiversity of the area.			CE3.3 refers to local landscape character. I recommend modifications so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF by ensuring direct reference to the submitted character assessments in the Plan.
24	Policy CE3.3	CE.3.3: Development must adequately assimilate into the local landscape character (as referenced by our character and site assessments) and maintain access to the Forest.	Replace CE3.3 with the following: 'Development proposals should be designed so that they are assimilated into the character of its immediate locality as set out in the Plan's character assessments. Development proposals should maintain any access from the site into the Forest.'	CE.3.3: Development must adequately assimilate into the local landscape character (as referenced by our character and site assessments) and maintain access to the Forest. <u>Development proposals should be designed so that they are assimilated into the character of its immediate locality as set out in the Plan's character assessments.</u> <u>Development proposals should maintain any access from the site into the Forest.</u>	
25	Policy CE4.1 Policy CE4.2	CE.4.1: Great weight will be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty, and the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage. CE.4.2: Heritage assets within the NDP area must be protected, conserved and enhanced when development proposals are brought forward.	Delete CE4.1/CE4.2 Delete supporting text		Countryside and Environment Policy 4 CE4.1 addresses landscape and scenic beauty and CE4.2 addresses heritage assets. I recommend that both of these policies are deleted. They add no value to national policy. The Parish Council has advised that CE4.2 addresses non-designated assets. Whilst I acknowledge this point such buildings are covered elsewhere in the Plan (in CO1.1).
26	Policy CE5.1	CE.5.1: Any building or change of use on land, including agricultural land, in the area should not have a negative visual impact on the landscape of the area. Solar or wind farms, polytunnels and glasshouses will be subject to special scrutiny to	Delete CE5.1		Countryside and Environment Policy 5 Policy CE5.1 provides commentary on the visual impact of development in the countryside. It comments that solar or windfarms will be subject to special scrutiny. However, the approach adopted is one of narrative rather than policy. In any event the issue is already addressed in national policy.

		ensure conformance.			On this basis, I recommend that the policy is deleted. CE5.2 sets out robust policy guidance for renewable or low-carbon energy resources. It is underpinned by a series of well-constructed criteria. It meets the basic conditions.
27	Policy CE6.1 Policy CE6.2 Policy CE6.3	CE.6.1: To locate developments to minimise increased pollution from traffic activity. CE.6.2: To support all relevant bodies in their efforts to discourage and eradicate fly-tipping and littering. CE.6.3: To oppose any proposals for the underground disposal or storage of waste.	Delete CE6.1/6.2/6.3		Countryside and Environment Policy 6 This suite of policies addresses general amenity issues including lighting, noise and privacy issues. CE6.1-6.3 are objectives rather than policies. On this basis, I recommend that they are deleted. CE6.3 refers to the underground disposal or storage of waste. These are 'excluded' matters which cannot be included in a neighbourhood plan. CE6.4 refers to external lighting schemes. It sets out robust policy guidance on this matter. It is underpinned by well-constructed criteria. It meets the basic conditions.
28	Policy EC1.1	EC1.1 New retail/business start-ups or the expansion of existing businesses will be supported, provided they can be shown to be viable, sustainable and benefit the local economy and the wellbeing of our NDP area. They will be sensitive to the local setting and the surrounding environment.	EC1.1 Replace 'provided' with 'where'. Delete 'can be shown.... NDP area. They'	EC.1.1: New retail/business start-ups or the expansion of existing businesses will be supported, provided where they can be shown to be viable, sustainable and benefit the local economy and the wellbeing of our NDP area. They will be sensitive to the local setting and the surrounding environment.	Economy Policy 1 This policy provides general support for new retail and business start-ups and the expansion of existing businesses. This policy (and the following two policies) respond in a sympathetic and distinctive way to the circumstances in the Plan area. Its economy is based on local businesses, many of which are small in scale. It also reflects a desire for a more sustainable community. At present many local residents need to travel elsewhere to work.
29	Policy EC1.2	EC1.2 Proposals to upgrade or extend existing employment sites will be supported provided that the impact on the amenities of the surrounding properties is acceptable.	EC1.2 Replace 'provided' with 'where'	EC1.2 Proposals to upgrade or extend existing employment sites will be supported provided that where the impact on the amenities of the surrounding properties is acceptable.	The policy is arranged in four parts. EC1.1 provides general support for new businesses. EC1.2 refers to proposals on existing employment sites. EC1.3 supports tourism related development. EC1.4 refers to home working. Whilst the four elements of

30	Policy EC1.3	EC1.3: The NDP supports development that encourages tourism activities and other related economic and employment benefits.	EC1.3 Replace the policy with: 'Proposals that would stimulate tourism activity will be supported'	EC1.3 The NDP supports development that encourages tourism activities and other related economic and employment benefits. <u>Proposals that would stimulate tourism activity will be supported.</u>	the policy overlap to some extent I am satisfied that they are appropriate to the Plan area and tackle in their own way a series of employment-related issues.
31	Policy EC1.4	EC1.4 In some instances planning permission for development that enables home working and self-employment will be supported if the development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in keeping with the scale, form and character of its surroundings. • Does not significantly adversely affect the amenities of residents in the area. • Does not significantly increase vehicular traffic flow. • Has safe and suitable access to the site for all people. 	EC1.4 Replace the opening part of the policy with the following: 'Insofar as planning permission is required proposals for home working will be supported where the development is.' In the third criterion replace 'significantly' with 'unacceptably'.	EC1.4 In some instances planning permission for development that enables home working and self-employment will be supported if the development. <u>Insofar as planning permission is required proposals for home working will be supported where the development is:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in keeping with the scale, form and character of its surroundings. • Does not significantly adversely affect the amenities of residents in the area. • Does not significantly <u>unacceptably</u> increase vehicular traffic flow. • Has safe and suitable access to the site for all people. 	Nevertheless, I recommend a series of modifications so that the policy components have the clarity required by the NPPF. This will allow them to be applied in a clear and consistent fashion by FoDDC throughout the Plan period. In particular I recommend the deletion of elements of EC1.1 that refer to viability and sustainability. Paragraph 21 of the NPPF is very clear about reducing planning burdens on business growth and development. In any event it would be impractical for start-up businesses to demonstrate their effectiveness on the 'wellbeing of the neighbourhood area'.
32	Policy EC2.1	EC.2.1: The sustainable expansion of tourism and tourist attractions are supported where they <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand or improve existing tourist facilities. • Provide innovative offers which would widen and enhance the tourism of the area. • Involve the appropriate conversion or change of use of a permanent 	EC2.1 Replace the opening part of the policy with the following: 'Proposals for the expansion of tourism-related attractions will be supported where they.' Delete the first criterion	EC.2.1: The sustainable expansion of tourism and tourist attractions are supported where they: <u>Proposals for the expansion of tourism-related attractions will be supported where they</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand or improve existing tourist facilities. • Provide innovative offers which would 	Economy Policy 2 This policy supports the expansion of tourist-related activities subject to five criteria. It overlaps to some extent with Policy EC1.3. The approach adopted has regard to the NPPF. I recommend two modifications to the policy. The first deletes the word 'sustainable' from its initial part. Its application is not defined in the Plan and is likely to lead to disagreements in the operation of the development management process. In any event the supporting text and the various

		<p>and soundly constructed building which sensitively retains any historic interest and character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complement the character and qualities of the site's immediate surroundings. • Do not adversely impact on the wider tranquillity of the area. <p>Development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the River Wye and the Wye Valley Woodlands SACs.</p>		<p>widen and enhance the tourism of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve the appropriate conversion or change of use of a permanent and soundly constructed building which sensitively retains any historic interest and character. • Complement the character and qualities of the site's immediate surroundings. • Do not adversely impact on the wider tranquillity of the area. <p>Development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the River Wye and the Wye Valley Woodlands SACs.</p>	<p>criteria adequately set out the type of development that will and will not be supported. The second deletes the first criterion in the policy which is inherently unnecessary.</p>
33	Policy EC2.2	EC.2.2: To develop the existing Five Acre (Gloscol) site into a tourist attraction and adding new accommodation by creating a hotel, to meet the tourism need, within the current College buildings (For detail see Five Acres section and Pre-feasibility Study, Apppendix 9.)	EC2.2 Delete policy		The submitted Plan includes a second component to the policy (Ec2.2) which refers specifically to the Five Acres site. It adds little if any value to the more comprehensive policy on this site which appears later in the Plan. I sought clarification on this matter from the Parish Council where this point was agreed. On this basis, I recommend the deletion of this part of the policy.
34	Policy EC3.1 Policy EC3.2	EC.3.1: New developments should demonstrate how they will contribute to and be compatible with existing local fibre or internet connectivity. This could be through a 'Connectivity Statement' provided with relevant planning applications and must cover telecommunications, gas, water	Replace EC3.1/3.2 with: 'Proposals for the consolidation, extension or upgrading of the fibre connectivity and internet access will be supported'.	<u>Proposals for the consolidation, extension or upgrading of the fibre connectivity and internet access will be supported.</u>	<p>Economy Policy 3</p> <p>This policy seeks to encourage and support the improvement of electronic connectivity in the Plan area. The policy sets out a specific significance for connectivity with the existing local fibre system or wider internet connectivity.</p> <p>There is a degree of disjoint between the policy itself and the supporting text. The</p>

		<p>and electricity issues.</p> <p>Such statements could consider such aspects as:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intended land use and the anticipated connectivity requirements of the development. • Existing or proposed data networks and their anticipated speed (fixed copper, 3G, 4G, fibre and future developments). • Realistic assessments of connection potential or contribution to any such networks. <p>EC.3.2: New developments should aim to have internet connectivity with the best available speed and with realistic future proof upgrade capability. Subject to viability, suitable ducting that can accept fibre should be provided either to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nearest access point to existing internet providers • A local access network. • Another location that can be justified through the Connectivity Statement. • Major infrastructure development should provide ducting that is available for community-owned local access network or fibre-optic cable 			<p>former places specific requirements on developers to ensure connectivity into existing systems. The latter highlights the strategic importance of electronic connectivity in the Plan area and the community's wish to see it improved to support economic and social development.</p> <p>Plainly the upgrading of existing networks will be managed and developed by communications companies in their own right. Other developers carrying out the usual range of residential and commercial development have neither the ability nor the remit to improve the overall standards of electronic connectivity.</p> <p>On this basis I recommend a modification that replaces both policies with one which supports the installation of new electronic infrastructure. This will bring the clarity required by the NPPF and will make a better linkage between policy and supporting text.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--

		deployment.			
35	Policy CO1.1	CO.1.1: The significance of undesignated heritage assets (as listed in Figures 14a and 14b) will be recognised and they will be given the requisite level of protection.	<p>Replace CO1.1 with the following:</p> <p>The buildings set out below and shown on Figure 14a are identified as important character buildings: Tanyard Spion Kop The House of Bread Christchurch School House Salem Chapel and Band Hut Brick House</p> <p>Proposals for the demolition, redevelopment or substantial alterations to the important character buildings should demonstrate the consideration that has been given to retaining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The important character building itself; • Its most distinctive and important features; • The positive elements of its setting and its relationship to its immediate surroundings; and • The contribution that the building and its setting makes to the character of the local area. 	<p><u>CO1.1 The buildings set out below and shown on Figure 14a are identified as important character buildings:</u></p> <p><u>Tanyard</u> <u>Spion Kop</u> <u>The House of Bread</u> <u>Christchurch School House</u> <u>Salem Chapel and Band Hut</u> <u>Brick House</u></p> <p><u>Proposals for the demolition, redevelopment or substantial alterations to the important character buildings should demonstrate the consideration that has been given to retaining:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The important character building itself;</u> • <u>Its most distinctive and important features;</u> • <u>The positive elements of its setting and its relationship to its immediate surroundings; and</u> • <u>The contribution that the building and its setting makes to the character of the local area.</u> 	<p>Community Policy 1</p> <p>This policy has a focus on the variety of community facilities in the Plan area. It is extensive given the range of facilities which it addresses. CO1.1/2/3 identify and safeguard undesignated heritage assets. CO1.4 addresses more general community facilities.</p> <p>I recommend modifications to the various components of the policy so that they have the clarity required by the NPPF. In particular CO1.1 does not identify the level of protection that will be afforded to undesignated heritage assets. In particular it does not have regard to national policy which indicates that the responsibility for preparing local lists rests with the local planning authority (here FoDDC). The recommended modifications remove any direct reference to undesignated heritage assets as this is terminology usually associated with the preparation of a local list of heritage buildings. I recommend that the buildings are instead identified as 'character buildings'. The effect would be identical. I also recommend the deletion of UHA 6: TPO lime trees. By definition the trees concerned are already protected. The policy would also be far clearer if it included a schedule of buildings affected in a similar style to that adopted in CO1.4.</p>

36	Policy CO1.4	<p>CO.1.4: The existing community areas identified on the map will be safeguarded as community facilities, comprising the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Berry Hill Memorial Institute (The Hut). • Berry Hill Social Club. • The Five Acres site (which is already registered as an Asset of Community Value). 	In CO1.4 replace 'on the map' with 'in figure 14a' and delete 'comprising the following elements'	<p>CO.1.4: The existing community areas identified on the map <u>in figure 14a</u> will be safeguarded as community facilities, comprising the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Berry Hill Memorial Institute (The Hut). • Berry Hill Social Club. • The Five Acres site (which is already registered as an Asset of Community Value). 	
37	CO1.4 supporting text		<p>At the end of the paragraph in the supporting text that straddles pages 50/52 of the Plan add:</p> <p>'Whilst the Five Acres site is identified as a community facility in policy CO1.4 of this Plan it is recognised that the implementation of Policy FA 1 will have an impact on the overall mix of uses on this site. That policy sets out appropriate guidance on this matter.'</p>	<p><u>Whilst the Five Acres site is identified as a community facility in policy CO1.4 of this Plan it is recognised that the implementation of Policy FA 1 will have an impact on the overall mix of uses on this site. That policy sets out appropriate guidance on this matter.</u></p>	
38	Community policy 2	<p>CO.2.1: Positive encouragement will be given to proposals that result in improving health and health-care facilities, new health-care or outreach health facilities.</p>	Replace the policy with: 'Proposals for health care and health outreach facilities will be supported.'	<p>CO.2.1: Positive encouragement will be given to proposals that result in improving health and health-care facilities, new health-care or outreach health facilities.</p> <p><u>Proposals for health care and health outreach facilities will be supported.</u></p>	<p>Community Policy 2</p> <p>The policy sets out support for proposals for health and health care facilities. I recommend a modification so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF. As submitted it merely provides 'positive encouragement' for such proposals.</p>

39		<p>POLICY</p> <p>CO.3.1: Support the use of land for community orchard project.</p> <p>CO.3.2: Support local initiatives, such as allotments, to produce locally grown produce when suitable land becomes available and the project is viable.</p>	<p>Replace CO3.1/3.2 with: 'Proposals to use land for a community orchard project or for other initiatives that would produce locally-grown food produce will be supported'.</p>	<p><u>Proposals to use land for a community orchard project or for other initiatives that would produce locally-grown food produce will be supported.</u></p>	<p>Community Policy 3</p> <p>This policy supports both proposals for a community orchard (CO3.1) and to produce locally-grown produce (CO3.2). In both cases the policy reads more as an objective than a policy. In neither case are any specific proposals identified.</p> <p>To address these matters in general, and to provide the clarity required by the NPPF I recommend that the two policies are combined into a general, supporting policy.</p>
40		<p>FA.1.1: Redevelopment of the site (dependent on sufficient land availability and environmental protection) for uses providing jobs and community involvement is strongly supported, to include enhancing the sports facilities, high-technology industries, education, training, research, hospitality, leisure, tourism and health or other service uses or spaces for occupation by micro or small businesses.</p> <p>Subject to the implementation of the above uses, the policy will allow for viability and other issues that may arise in the future.</p> <p>The development is expected to achieve the following priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a mix of recreational opportunities including play and cultural areas, sports facilities, informal recreation and multi-use facilities to include: the development of sports buildings and open areas to create leisure 	<p>Replace FA1.1-1.3 with the following: 'Proposals for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Five Acres (Gloscol) site as shown on Figure 17 will be supported.</p> <p>All proposals should demonstrate how they relate to and secure the implementation of a master plan for the delivery of education, recreation, tourism, employment, community health and open space development.</p> <p>Within the context of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site proposals for up to 80 dwellings will be supported where the dwellings concerned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> act as enabling development to support community health or other recreational uses; and/or form part of a mixed development in the event that there is not a viable community use for the wider site; and/or form part of a mixed development in the event that the entire site is not required for community uses and where part of the 	<p><u>FA1.1 Proposals for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Five Acres (Gloscol) site as shown on Figure 17 will be supported.</u></p> <p><u>All proposals should demonstrate how they relate to and secure the implementation of a master plan for the delivery of education, recreation, tourism, employment, community health and open space development.</u></p> <p><u>Within the context of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site proposals for up to 80 dwellings will be supported where the dwellings concerned:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>act as enabling development to support community health or other recreational uses; and/or</u> <u>form part of a mixed development in the event that there is not a viable community use for the wider site; and/or</u> <u>form part of a mixed development in the event that the entire site is not required for community uses and where part of the community provision is made</u> 	<p>Five Acres Policy 1</p> <p>This policy sits at the heart of the Plan. It is based on exciting and emerging proposals for the redevelopment of this important site. It is located in the centre of the Plan area off the A4136. It represents the most significant development opportunity in the Plan area. It also represents the most significant opportunity for the Plan area to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>The importance of the site is recognised in the FoDDC Allocations Plan. Policy AP58 of that Plan allocates the 18 hectares site for mixed development including education, recreation, tourism, open space employment community and possibly housing uses. The policy has attracted representations from FoDDC, the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), the Theatres Trust and Gladman Development Limited. In most cases the representations relate to the relationship between the policy in the submitted Plan and Policy AP58 in the Allocations Plan. The matter is further complicated as Five Acres site in the submitted Plan occupies a more concentrated area than that in Policy AP58 of the Allocations Plan.</p> <p>The eventual development of the various components of the site is being refined and developed. The Plan comments that the West Dean and Coleford Regeneration</p>

		<p>and tourism opportunities; all-weather multi-use sports fields for local sports clubs and schools and indoor and outdoor sports and adventure activities. n Develop the theatre into a multi-occupancy arts and social centre for concerts, plays, gigs, business conventions, a broadcasting studio, social events and exhibitions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a health facility in an area where community facilities are in short supply: see Housing Needs Survey or NHS referrals therapy. • Introduce and enhance health and community facilities within the site by providing dining options and associated facilities. • Provide training facilities to include hospitality, catering and any other suitable appropriate skills. • Introduce and enhance health and community facilities within the site by providing dining options and associated facilities. • To encourage and support facilities for small businesses. • Support the development of a network of pedestrian and cycle links to the site from the surrounding area to 	<p>community provision is made elsewhere in the site included in the Allocations Plan AP58 or within the wider Plan area.</p> <p>The wider development package should be designed and arranged to ensure that it will have no significant adverse effects on the integrity of the River Wye and the Wye Valley Woodlands Special Area of Conservation.'</p> <p>Supporting text In the supporting text replace 'The Five Acres.... (AP58)' with 'The area covered by this policy is a significant part of the wider site included in Policy AP58 of the emerging Forest of Dean Allocations Plan'</p> <p>At the end of the paragraph that makes reference to the regeneration board (p.60) include the following additional text:</p> <p>'The wider package is likely to include the relocation of Gloscol to Cinderford, Northern Quarter and the transfer of the existing site to the Parish Council and to the District Council. These matters will be developed as the project evolves. In the case of the relocation of the Gloscol facility this will be subject to its own separate planning process.</p>	<p><u>elsewhere in the site included in the Allocations Plan AP58 or within the wider Plan area.</u></p> <p><u>The wider development package should be designed and arranged to ensure that it will have no significant adverse effects on the integrity of the River Wye and the Wye Valley Woodlands Special Area of Conservation.'</u></p> <p>Supporting text (1st Paragraph</p> <p><u>The Five Acres GLOSCOL site is allocated for mixed development - (AP58)-The area covered by this policy is a significant part of the wider site included in Policy AP58 of the emerging Forest of Dean Allocations Plan.</u></p> <p>3rd Paragraph</p> <p>A regeneration board has been set up to develop a master plan for the site and to take the project forward in line with community aspirations within this document. <u>'The wider package is likely to include the relocation of Gloscol to Cinderford, Northern Quarter and the transfer of the existing site to the Parish Council and to the District Council. These matters will be developed as the project evolves. In the case of the relocation of the Gloscol facility this will be subject to its own separate planning process.</u></p>	<p>Board has been established to develop a master plan for the site and to secure its development with wider community support. In this context, it is important that the policy retains a degree of flexibility and respects the viability considerations that will need to be addressed. This is a key part of national planning policy and is reflected in the comments of the HCA.</p> <p>The submitted policy reflects the current evolving discussions and negotiations on this site. This situation is also reflected in the comments by both FoDDC and the Parish Council to my clarification note. It is accepted by all parties that the project has not reached a sufficiently-mature stage to have generated a master plan. Similarly, it would be impractical for one to be promoted through the submitted plan in these circumstances.</p> <p>Policy FA1.2 makes specific commentary on the potential for new houses on the site. It proposes around 40 dwellings. This takes account of the potential for the redevelopment of the existing primary school for residential development within the wider context of the development of Allocations Plan site AP58 (which refers to a total of 80 dwellings). I have commented on this matter in paragraph 7.15 of this report. The policy refers to specific restrictions which are commercial and project matters and not directly relevant to this policy.</p> <p>Taking all matters into account, and to bring clarity to the policy in the context of the current circumstances, I recommend that the policy is recast to provide a supporting context to the on-going discussions and to the policy in the emerging Allocations Plan. I also recommend some associated modifications to the supporting text so that it has a closer and more functional relationship with the FoDDC's Allocations Plan. I recommend that the commercial and project matters that appear in FA1.2 of the submitted Plan are recast and repositioned into the supporting text. Plainly they will work themselves out as the project develops and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>reduce reliance on car use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create visitor accommodation suited for tourism growth. • Ensure the development will reflect the landscape character of the area, taking into account habitats and wildlife corridors. <p>Development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the River Wye and the Wye Valley Woodlands Special Area of Conservation.</p> <p>FA.1.2: Around 40 good quality starter/affordable homes will only be allocated to the Gloscol/Lakers site subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relocation of Gloscol to Cinderford, Northern Quarter. • The transfer of ownership of the Gloscol site to WDPC and the FoDDC (see MOU). • The housing allocation will be in accord with provisions contained within this NDP, i.e. the homes are first offered to West Dean and then Forest of Dean residents. <p>This allocation will allow the developments, in FA.1.1 above, to be achieved, and will provide housing for local people.</p>			<p>as the Regeneration Board draws up its master plan.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

		FA.1.3: Support other infrastructure necessary to address the demands that development places on the area, such as education, health, transport and movement, green infrastructure, recreation and other necessary facilities, and promote sustainable links.			
41		General text	Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies		Other changes to the general text may be required elsewhere in the Plan as a result of the recommended modifications to the policies. It will be appropriate for FoDDC and the Parish Council to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text. I recommend accordingly.
42		Policies map	On this basis, I recommend that two maps are retained. The first would be what is currently Map 1 (the neighbourhood area). The second would be the 'Policies Map' based on what is currently Map 2. For the purposes of the 'Policies Map' I recommend that it includes the information already captured in Figures 14a/14b/17.		Nevertheless in the event that the Plan is 'made' it will become part of the development plan and will need a degree of clarity as a Policies Map. On this basis, I recommend that two maps are retained. The first would be what is currently Map 1 (the neighbourhood area). The second would be the 'Policies Map' based on what is currently Map 2. For the purposes of the 'Policies Map' I recommend that it includes the information already captured in Figures 14a/14b/17. In effect, these are the key spatial policies of the Plan. The preparation of a single Policies Map will be invaluable for FoDDC as it implements the Plan through the development management process.
43		Referendum area	The Plan should proceed to referendum based on the neighbourhood area as approved by the District Council on 21 January 2013.		I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. In my view, the neighbourhood area is entirely appropriate for this purpose and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore recommend that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the neighbourhood area as approved by the District Council on 21 January 2013.