

**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS:
 HOW THEY ARE WORKING TOWARDS CPRE’S VISION FOR THE COUNTRYSIDE**
A CPRE Briefing
December 2014

Introduction and Summary

The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) strongly supports neighbourhood planning as a means for communities to determine for themselves how to meet development needs in their area without causing unnecessary harm to the character of their town or village and its surrounding countryside. CPRE is also a member of the Rural Coalition, a cross-sector grouping of NGOs with interests in rural policy. The Rural Challenge 2015, issued by the Coalition in November 2014, identifies a key role for neighbourhood planning and calls for the delivery of neighbourhood plans to be simplified, and their role to be further supported and strengthened, in particular ‘where advanced community-led proposals conflict with developer-led proposals that fail to meet local needs.’

This briefing is not a rigorous study of neighbourhood planning activity. Rather, it provides a discursive review of the types of policies that neighbourhoods have successfully included in plans so far that are relevant to meeting CPRE’s aims expressed in our 2026 Vision for the Countryside. We hope this will be a useful resource for those working on, or considering embarking upon, a neighbourhood plan for their areas. In particular, it highlights the potential of neighbourhood plans in addressing the core themes of landscape, transport and design.

The briefing explores neighbourhood planning policies made between April 2012 and September 2014 with reference to the aspirations of CPRE’s 2026 Vision, and seeks to identify good practice that CPRE local groups and other community groups might follow. It examines the following 12 plans in some detail:

Albrighton (Shropshire)	Ascot, Sunningdale and Sunninghill (Berkshire)
Broseley (Shropshire)	Broughton Astley (Leicestershire)
Cringleford (Norfolk)	Exeter St James (Devon)
Fish Quay (Tyneside)	Oswestry (Shropshire)
Tattenhall (Cheshire)	Thame (Oxfordshire)
Upper Eden (Cumbria)	Uppingham (Rutland)

Themes that emerge from these plans are a close interest in safeguarding the character of town and country, and to record and improve wildlife interest (biodiversity) within these areas. The plans also look to improve transport patterns through greater walking and cycling, traffic calming and in some cases support the re-opening of former rural railways. The plans are positive about the opportunities connected with new development, and in at

least two major cases call for more development than the relevant local planning authority. In doing so the plans contain a clear understanding of how new development should be designed and how it should fit into the townscape and landscape. Following on from these, we would strongly advise groups not to simply copy policies from any of these plans. Neighbourhood plan policies and proposals should be locally distinctive and arise from the characteristics of the neighbourhood and the aspirations of the community. This briefing aims to show what is possible.

Further details of the specific policies considered is provided in the Annex.

Background

Neighbourhood planning was enacted in the Localism Act 2011 and the associated regulations which came into effect in April 2012. Subsequent reforms to Government policy and guidance, in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), have featured further encouragement for neighbourhood plans to come forward, provided they are consistent with overall Government policy aims of promoting economic growth and a significant boost in new housebuilding. Neighbourhood planning has the aim of decentralising power to make planning policy from both central and local government to local communities, a process of ‘double devolution’. For the first time, parish councils or neighbourhood forums can make plans which have full legal and policy standing in deciding planning applications. According to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), as of September 2014, approximately 1250 communities had begun the necessary formalities involved in producing neighbourhood development plans, 150 full draft plans had been produced for consultation and 31 neighbourhood plans had been passed at community referendums. Upper Eden in Cumbria was the first neighbourhood plan to be officially adopted or ‘made’ on April 11th 2013. There is an intentional lack of prescriptive guidelines regarding the structure and content of neighbourhood plans which has resulted in a diverse mix of plans whose range and scope vary considerably. However, each plan outlines a strategy and vision for the future which involves the implementation of a number of specified policies. Themes of landscape, transport and design dominate these visions and this briefing considers the specific policies formulated on them.

2026: CPRE Vision for the Countryside

CPRE encourages public and political debate to enable development of an optimistic and progressive vision for the future of the countryside. We have encouraged the development of neighbourhood planning through our involvement, which ran between 2011 and 2013, in the Government-funded Supporting Communities and Neighbourhoods in Planning project.

Our 2026 Vision, published in 2007, outlines an ideal for the state of Britain’s countryside in 2026. A better quality of life, embracing beauty, local character and enjoyment of green, open spaces, is envisioned. Better planning has been identified as crucial to the achievement of this vision, with a ‘serious devolution of power...to identifiable communities’ based on counties and parishes. Successful urban regeneration through the development of brownfield sites and significant ‘greening’ of the urban landscape has

become almost synonymous with the protection of the countryside. Furthermore, sustainable transport such as walking and cycling begins to replace the ‘hypermobility’ trend of the early century; simultaneously 2026 should see the revival of rural rail. Such developments not only engrain local distinctiveness and a sense of nostalgia they have both wider health and social benefits.

Additionally, in 2026 some landscapes are deliberately allowed to undergo a process of natural progression. These landscapes are connected through a series of green corridors, in particular hedgerows, fostering increased biodiversity. Finally, with increased environmental threats such as climate change, the countryside is a key player in both mitigation and adaptation strategies. Rural buildings are more energy efficient and small-scale renewables are common. A more holistic approach to decision making complements the national growth in green energy.

Key Policies: Landscape

In all neighbourhood plans which have so far been ‘made’, there is a section that relates to ‘landscape’ and associated issues relating to the environment, open spaces and biodiversity. The aim is to protect and conserve open spaces which are important to local communities and are recognised for their beauty, amenity, wildlife and/or recreational value. Such policies recognise opportunities that might arise from development for increasing connectivity between green spaces, improving the overall appearance of an area and enhancing green infrastructure, whilst resisting unnecessary and inappropriate development.

In the neighbourhood plan for Tattenhall (Cheshire West and Chester), landscape character was a primary consideration in the design statement.

The role of hedgerows has been recognised in several neighbourhood plans. Tattenhall identifies them as important corridors for wildlife (LSCP1 policy). In Albrighton hedgerows are biologically important being principally made up of blackthorn, hawthorn and hazel as well as mature tree species such as alder and willow. They also often support elder, bramble, briar and ivy. However, enlargement of fields surrounding the village resulted in hedgerow destruction with detrimental environmental impacts, including damaging landscape character. Consequently it is a feature of many neighbourhood plans that landscape features, including hedgerows, should be retained and protected from any new developments with several plans outlining protection policies i.e. Albrighton’s ALB10 policy, Brosley’s ENV5 policy and Cringleford’s ENV3 policy.

Oswestry in Shropshire and Fish Quay in North Tyneside are examples of mixed urban and suburban landscapes. Oswestry is flanked by more sensitive landscapes; Old Oswestry Hill Fort to the north, Brogyntyn parkland to the north west, Broomhall and Llanforda parkland and the Oswestry uplands to the west and the Morda Valley to the south. Fish Quay has a special natural environment which includes a locally designated Area of Special Coastal Protection, the Northumberland Coast Shore Site of Special Scientific Interest and the Northumbrian Coast SPA and Ramsar site begins around 300 metres away from the Fish Quay Neighbourhood Plan boundary. Thame, South Oxfordshire, is also a high quality

urbanised environment including, but not limited to, a historic town centre which dominates the Thame Conservation Area, some good open spaces and an attractive riverside. The parish also includes the Cuttle Brook Nature Reserve which provides a habitat for various species as well as a recreational area for the community. Thame Park is recognised as a Historic (registered) Park and as a County Wildlife Site due to the rich grasslands and woodland contained within it.

The continuation of current protection provided by national and local landscape and conservation designations is fundamental to all neighbourhood plans. Any development that would have an adverse environmental impact in these locations would not be permitted. A rigorous management regime for designated sites has been highlighted as necessary by Cringleford's ENV1 policy in South Norfolk, and all plans seek to improve and extend key ecological sites.

In addition to nationally recognised site designations, analysis of neighbourhood plans highlighted several examples of local authority designations and areas which have high local value. The Oswestry neighbourhood plan, policies ST12 and ST14, aims to designate Shelf Bank as a Local Nature Reserve and explore the potential for the local authority to create a new Country Park at Brogytyn respectively. Broughton Astley and Exeter St James both outline areas of 'Local Green Space' in their plans. Broughton Astley's EH1 policy designates the locally valued green spaces at Frolesworth Road Recreation Ground, War Memorial, Cottage Lane and the disused railway, as 'Local Green Spaces' in order to protect their identity. These spaces, along with any existing areas of public open space will be protected to promote social interaction and community cohesion. In Exeter St James, policy EN3 ensures that development on the existing Local Green Space at Queens Crescent Garden would only be permitted where it forms a part of a comprehensive landscape design for the garden and would enhance community enjoyment of the space.

Some neighbourhood plan policies focus on the retention of local landscape character and the need for strategic gaps between developments. For example, the ENV1 policy for Cringleford proposes that the parish has a designated 'Landscape Protection Zone'. This ensures that the landscape setting of the village and the existing wildlife corridor is maintained and acts as a buffer against traffic noise. Further to this, the ENV1 policy proposes the retention of key strategic gaps at the development fringe with no new developments permitted within the Landscape Protection Zone. Exceptions to this will only be made if developers can demonstrate that new developments can improve the landscape and have no negative impacts on the Strategic Gap between Cringleford and Hethersett. The neighbourhood plan for Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale in Windsor and Maidenhead, also has policies concerned with maintaining strategic gaps. The NP/EN1 policy states that any new development must be located and designed to maintain the separation of the villages and to complement the characteristics of the gaps through a number of defined mechanisms. Similar to a 'strategic gap', Uppingham parish aims to create an appropriate landscape 'buffer zone' on its northern boundary of the Uppingham Gate development site to maintain the rural setting of the town (policy P12).

The Cringleford parish is surrounded by the Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland character area and is adjacent to the Yare Valley Urban Fringe. This landscape makes a

significant contribution to the creation of an aesthetically pleasing and green entry into historic Norwich. The Yare valleys and its tributary, the Thickthorn Stream, are of a high ecological value. The location of Cringleford has put considerable pressure on the natural environment of the parish, particularly at the urban fringe. Therefore, landscape sensitivity and visual quality are particular issues at points adjacent to the road network with open landscape parcelled up by mature hedgerows and trees, intersections of roads and the urban fringe creating a unique mosaic. Consequently Cringleford has outlined a series of mechanisms in its ENV1 and ENV2 policy including the implementation green infrastructure, screening, bunding, mature tree planting and the development of ‘tree-belt’ in order to maintain a high quality, ‘green’ appearance to the village.

It is evident that the more urbanised townscapes have landscape policies that are adapted to the differing needs of the built and natural environment. For example, Fish Quay’s neighbourhood plan states that the popular bankside area is characterised by established open green areas which contribute towards biodiversity, provides environmental services such as cleaning the air and absorbing carbon, as well as improving a sense of community well-being. There is strong civic support for maintaining wildlife corridors in urban environments, as a resource for wildlife and biodiversity as well as for their aesthetic value.

CPRE’s 2026 Vision paints a picture of a more beautiful, biologically diverse and tranquil environment. It also envisions that wild flora and fauna, in decline since the beginning of the century, has returned and flourished particularly due to the preservation of hedgerows and green corridors. The policies outlined here therefore reflect this vision. Steps are being made towards CPRE’s vision for a more beautiful and tranquil countryside as both rural and urban neighbourhood plans champion the continuation and possible expansion of locally designated sites. As such, the large network of nationally recognised conservation sites and protection zones can be improved through the addition of other local authority designations i.e. Oswestry’s potential designation of Shelf bank as a Local Nature Reserve. The maintenance and expansion of Local Green Spaces and strategic gaps so prominent in the neighbourhood plan policies of Exeter St James and Cringleford, will be highly significant in the achievement of the 2026 vision. Finally, in urban townscapes such as Fish Quay, the priority for open space and improving biodiversity echoes CPRE’s aims for increased biodiversity and the ‘greening’ of urban landscapes as well as successful urban regeneration characterised by brownfield development.

Key Policies: Transport

All adopted neighbourhood plans reviewed outline policies under the umbrella of ‘transport’. However, whilst Exeter St James has policies specifically headed ‘Transport’, Oswestry and Thame discuss the relevant policies under sections entitled ‘A Well-connected Town’ and ‘Getting Around’. Such policies focus predominantly on improving accessibility and public transport options. For example, Oswestry’s WC2 policy aims to realise the proposed Cambrian Railway connection from Oswestry to the main line at Gobowen Railway Station whilst speeding up the phased development of the ‘Railway Line Greenway’ (a walking and cycling route) situated alongside. Similarly, Thame’s policy GA3 seeks developer contributions to support the provision of a cycle route to Haddenham and

Thame Parkway Rail Station, consequently improving accessibility to rural rail. Tattenhall's neighbourhood plan hopes future policies will champion the reopening of Tattenhall Road Railway Station (closed in 1966) and longer term aspirations seek the creation of a new railway station to provide access to the wider national rail network and as a major alternative to car travel.

All neighbourhood plans recognise a preference for modal shift from car to sustainable travel, such as cycling and public transport. As such, most plans emphasise developments should increase the attractiveness of sustainable modes of transport. In particular, Broseley in Shropshire, highlight safety as a key determinant of transport choice. Consequently, Broseley aims to promote its unique network of 'jitties' along with other footpaths and bridleways, and increase their usage through better signage and surface improvement (policy HP7). The improvement of quality, definition and safety of pedestrianised and cycle routes are also key considerations for Uppingham in Rutland. The majority of plans, including Uppingham, also consider the needs of the physically disadvantaged in their transport policy, eg. Tattenhall specifically proposes that development should enhance access for people in wheelchairs, with disabilities and those with pushchairs. Its HFT2 policy proposes to target safety and accessibility for these groups by addressing the lack of dropped crossings and continuous footways throughout the village.

Further, to encouraging more sustainable travel, the construction of new and enhanced walking and cycling routes between and within neighbourhoods is a common theme of neighbourhood plans. For example, Broughton Astley's T1 policy for Harbourside states new developments are to take place alongside the existing urban landscape where there are good travel choices, whilst Cringleford's TR3 policy proposes the concept of 'Walking Neighbourhoods'. This ensures walking and cycling routes are considered at the design phase to connect any new developments with facilities.

In recognition of increasing impacts from traffic all plans propose the implementation of significant traffic calming. Broseley also intends to ban all HGVs within a designated area to reduce negative impacts and increase the attractiveness of sustainable forms of transport (HP6). Therefore plans ensure new developments are designed to minimise the use of private cars in favour of alternative forms of transport whilst walking and cycling paths should provide appropriate access to public transport, i.e. bus stops in Uppingham and the rail station in Thame with sufficient provision for cycle parking at these sites.

The transport policies outlined in neighbourhood plans adopted since April 2012 clearly aim to develop an efficient movement network that protects, promotes and improves the local landscape. Oswestry, Thame and Tattenhall identify railway development as a vital policy within their plans in order to strengthen rural communities, improve accessibility and lessen environmental impacts through reducing the need to use private cars. For similar reasons, the revival of rural railways is at the forefront of CPRE's 2026 vision for the countryside. Furthermore, all plans have championed the importance of sustainable travel with the construction and improvement of safety on cycle and foot paths.

There are also some examples of transport policies of which CPRE is less supportive. Exeter St James D1 policy outlines plans for the construction of further parking facilities which could be considered as excessive or unnecessary development. Similarly, Albrighton's ALB8 policy encourages the provision of further off-street car parking for public use close to the High Street. Cringleford's TRA 1 policy also proposes the construction of new major estate roads and new link roads to allow access to the main development sites west of Round House Way and Castley Lane. However, the actual scales of these proposals are not clear and policies have stated that these new developments should facilitate use of public transport and be fully integrated into the existing landscape. Therefore these proposals could in fact be appropriate and easily integrated into the existing surroundings. Furthermore the parking facilities proposed for Exeter St James also incorporate parking space for bicycles whilst other Shropshire plans such as those proposed for Broseley, have specific policies targeting parking control.

Key Policies: Design

Design policies are fundamental to neighbourhood plans, although in the majority of plans 'design' is not given its own section. Instead, design aspects permeate throughout all areas of the plan and are included in most, if not all, of the stated policy sections.

The most prominent policy relating to design is that new developments should recognise, respect and if possible, follow the existing character of the area. Albrighton (policy ALB11) states that proposals should aim to protect the distinctive and historic settlement patterns of the area. This reflection of current character is also an integral part of the Fish Quay and Tattenhall plans. For example, Fish Quay (policy 4.2.6) aims to maintain the historic townscape through retaining specific positive features such as fishing industry paraphernalia, the net shed railings, the sculpture outside the Dolphin public house, and some of the modern street furniture. Similarly, Tattenhall's BEP2 policy proposes that new developments should reflect the gradual and incremental growth that has historically characterised the Parish. Visual similarity is therefore paramount and new developments should be designed to mirror the grain, density, quality and materials of the existing urban landscape. Signage design has been highlighted as another key design point. Plans require it to be discreet, inoffensive and positively contribute to the visual setting. Although design proposals feature heavily throughout neighbourhood plan policies, Upper Eden in Cumbria is the only plan to specifically state that the maintenance of local character is to be considered more important than achieving a minimum housing density figure (policy UENDP4).

Several design clauses propose significant integration with the local surroundings. Exeter St James (policy D1) considers this integration vital for both landscape context and the existing built environment and as such, planning permission will not be granted for poorly designed development that does not improve local character and quality of an area as well as its functionality. Any development should reinforce local distinctiveness and should not result in the over-supply or excessive concentration of one particular use i.e. takeaway restaurants (policy C4). A core factor in landscape integration is the protection of local viewpoints. Fish Quay's 4.3.3 policy states that "existing vantage points should be protected and enhanced, such as from the Stag Line building and the Wooden Doll public

house". Similarly, Dockwray Square was built by the rich maritime population and designed so that the houses could clearly see the river. It follows that this view should be retained and the creation of new viewing opportunities i.e. slot views at Clive Street, should be encouraged.

All of the adopted neighbourhood plans recognise the opportunity for new developments to improve the quality of the local landscape. Oswestry's TC1 policy proactively addresses the number of vacant town centre premises and intends to re-establish their use for beneficial purposes. Although Fish Quay supports maintaining the local vernacular, its plan appreciates that often modern design is more appropriate than old pastiche. Consequently, policy 4.2.4 states high quality existing designs and historic features should be used as benchmarks for new developments and innovative design proposals for individual plots that meet the outlined criteria are to be encouraged.

In recent years specific issues such as climate change have become more prominent and require consideration in neighbourhood plans. Some plans explicitly outline objectives for adaptation and/or mitigation i.e. Exeter St James policy SD4 ensures all new developments are constructed to high standards of sustainability. It also outlines how it has sought to reduce its environmental impacts through several mechanisms including, but not limited to: reducing the consumption of fossil fuels, promoting efficiency, the re-use and recycling of resources, the production and consumption of renewable energy and the provision of green infrastructure. Tattenhall also encourages the incorporation of 'green technology' including rainwater collection for use in toilets, photovoltaic cells and heat exchange systems in new buildings (policy 4.10.1). Other plans are less detailed in the mechanisms of achieving sustainable development but reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF, North Tyneside Council's adopted Sustainable Development and Construction Guide (2007) and the Design Quality SPD (2010) for Broughton Astley and Fish Quay respectively.

The design theme of neighbourhood plans also encompasses proposals for the delivery of housing. Although neighbourhood planning is considered by many to be an obstacle to development there are instances where neighbourhood plans have in fact called for more housing than stated in the local plan. For example, the neighbourhood plans for both Thame and Upper Eden can be considered as following a 'pro-growth' strategy. Both neighbourhood plan housing targets exceed those outlined by their respective local authorities with Thame increasing provision from 600 units to 775 and Upper Eden from 479 units to 543; this equates to a 29% and 13% increase respectively.

In planning for the delivery of homes, neighbourhood plans have outlined specificities such as housing density and the type of housing provided. For example Upper Eden (UENDP4 policy) suggests net building densities should seek to comply with the density target in the Core Strategy whilst Cringleford (HOU3 policy) proposes an average approximately 25 dwellings per hectare (gross, so also including roads and green space). With regard to the types of housing proposed, it remains very site specific. The plan for Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale, and the plan for Cringleford, state a mix of housing is required with the latter suggesting well integrated, small clusters of affordable housing is required in order to achieve the social mixing implied by the concept of 'balanced communities'. Following

an assessment of community needs, Broughton Astley's H2 policy proposes 30% of housing should be high quality affordable housing that is suitable for older people and those with disabilities. Similarly, the development of small infill/windfall sites in the plan for Exeter St James proposes a mix of both affordable homes for local people and good quality private residential development (SD3 policy).

The provision of affordable housing is a key feature of neighbourhood plans and Upper Eden has a number of policies which target their development. Policy UENDP1 states rural exceptions sites for single plot affordable housing will be permitted to meet local needs if there is an evidence-base for it. Policy UENDP3 states that within Kirkby Stephen and Brough housing developments of four units or more should address the local need for older persons' housing. This may be through several mechanisms such as the provision of bungalows or other suitable housing types and must be restricted to occupancy of those local households where one person is over the state retirement age. Further to this, the Council may seek to establish affordable housing alongside the housing for older people. Beyond Kirkby Stephen and Brough affordable housing will remain the priority for single plot proposals.

The design policies outlined in recently adopted neighbourhood plans predominantly focus on maintaining existing character through sensitivity to the context of the development whilst simultaneously appreciating and taking advantage of the opportunities for landscape improvement. Oswestry's TC1 policy promoting town centre regeneration and Upper Eden's UENDP4 policy specifically favouring local character over the fulfilment of a minimum housing density requirement are examples of good practice. These reflect CPRE's 2026 vision where new buildings enhance local distinctiveness and sense of place and where successful urban regeneration has been crucial in the protection of the countryside. Furthermore, the inclusion of policies which target environmental impacts through championing energy efficiency, sustainable development and 'green-technology' complement CPRE's vision for the countryside. Finally, neighbourhood plans outlining specific housing provision policies which reflect the identified local needs i.e. the 30% target for affordable housing provision in Broughton Astley. The provision for affordable housing within several neighbourhood plans highlights the increased recognition and importance of community integration and social cohesion which is very much in line with CPRE's vision for the future. It is clear from the housing provision outlined in Thame and Upper Eden that neighbourhood plans seek to promote and facilitate development in both rural and urban areas.

Conclusion

31 neighbourhood plans have been made since the relevant legislation came into effect in April 2012. A number of relevant themes have been considered above and discussed under the key policy umbrellas of landscape, transport and design.

All plans recognise the priority attached to development and growth yet policies emphasise the importance of protecting and enhancing the environmental context of settlements. Consequently, in both rural and urban areas the maintenance and creation of both open spaces and green corridors are important for visual, recreational and

biodiversity purposes. Transport sustainability was also a key focus. In order to discourage the use of private cars policies targeted pedestrian and cycle safety as well as public transport provision. Investment in rural rail, particularly in Oswestry, is a primary consideration which aims to strengthen rural communities. Furthermore, the design policies discussed support and aim to preserve local distinctiveness and character. Mitigation and adaptation strategies were also a primary focus, particularly in the plans for Fish Quay and Thame due to their river locations and associated flood risk. All plans also included policies promoting green technology or green infrastructure in either new or existing developments. Housing provision within new developments in terms of number of units and type of housing was also addressed. The majority of neighbourhood plans prioritised community needs, e.g. Broughton Astley proposes that 30% of the new housing stock should be for affordable housing. The pro-growth plans for both Upper Eden and Thame highlighted that neighbourhood plans are not necessarily anti-development.

Neighbourhood planning has allowed policies relevant to landscape, transport and design to come to the forefront of development plans. It suggests that development in rural areas can be beneficial and that the countryside can, not only survive, but flourish despite increasing pressures from contemporary issues such as climate change, globalisation and the built environment. Several areas where neighbourhood planning policies can be considered good practice have been identified. CPRE recognises the potential role neighbourhood planning can play in achieving the 2026 vision and encouraging development in both rural and urban areas through a democratic planning system that recognises the countryside as both a finite resource and as a national asset of tremendous value.

CPRE thanks Chloe Evans for her work in compiling and preparing this briefing.

Further reading

CPRE / NALC, *How to Shape Where You Live*, January 2012. Available from <http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/housing-and-planning/planning/item/2689-how-to-shape-where-you-live-a-guide-to-neighbourhood-planning>.

DCLG, *National Planning Policy Framework* (March 2012) and *Planning Practice Guidance* (March 2014). Both available from <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/>.

Regular *Notes on Neighbourhood Planning* are also issued by DCLG and are available from www.gov.uk.

Locality, *A guide to writing planning policies for neighbourhood plans*, September 2014; and *User Experience of Neighbourhood Planning Research*, 2014 undated. Both available from <http://mycommunityrights.org.uk>.

Turley Associates, *Neighbourhood Planning: Plan and Deliver?*, March 2014. Available from www.turley.co.uk. This considers neighbourhood plans from a developer perspective.

CPRE

November, 2014

Annex 1: Summary of the Adopted Neighbourhood Plans Investigated and their Policies Associated with Design, Landscape and Transport.

WHERE	DATE PLAN WAS MADE	WEB LINK	DESIGN	LANDSCAPE	TRANSPORT
Shropshire-Albrighton	01/06/2013	http://www.albrightonparishcouncil.gov.uk/AlbrightonNPLight-FINAL.htm	ALB11	ALB10	ALB8
Shropshire-Broseley	10/09/2013	http://shrop.net/live/images/cme_resources/Groups/gC1085236-8B8A-4E63-8CB2-9367C98B6D54/Press%20releases%20and%20public%20notices/Town-Plan-approved-by-SC.pdf	DS.1	ENV.1	HP.1
			DS.2	ENV.2	HP.2
			DS.3 Boundaries	ENV.3	HP.3
			DS.4 Architectural features	ENV.4	HP.4
			DS.5 Doors and Windows	ENV.5	HP.5
			DS.6 Chimneys		HP.6
			DS.7 Innovative individual proposals		HP.7
			DS.8 Shopfronts		HP.8
			DS.9 Street Furniture	HP.9	
			DS.10 Advertising Boards		
Shropshire-Oswestry	26/09/2013	http://offlinehbpl.hb	ST1	ST11	WC1
			ST2	ST12	WC2

		pl.co.uk/NewsAttachments/RLP/Oswestry_Town_Plan.pdf	ST3	ST13	WC3
			ST4	ST14	WC4
			ST5	ST15	WC5
			ST6	ST16	WC6
			ST7	TC12	WC7
			ST8		WC8
			ST9		WC9
			ST10		WC10
			TC1		WC11
			TC2		TC13
			TC7		LE10
			TC8		
			TC9		
			TC10		
			TC11		
			LE3		
			LE4		
Cheshire West and Chester-Tattenhall	01/06/2014	http://tattenhallpc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Tattenhall-Neighbourhood-Plan.pdf	BEP 1		LSCP 1
			BEP 2	LSCP 2	HFT 2
			BEP 3	LSCP 3	HFT 3
			BEP 4	LSCP 4 (Existing developments)	
			BEP 5	LSCP 5 (New developments)	
			BEP 6	LSCP 6	
			BEP 7	LSCP 7	
			BEP 8	LSCP 8	
			BEP 9	LSCP 9	
			BEP 10	LSCP 10	

			BEP 11	LSCP 11	
			BEP 12	LSCP 12	
			BEP 13	LSCP 13	
			BEP 14		
			BEP 15		
			BEP 16		
			BEP 17		
			BEP 18		
			BEP 19		
			BEP 20		
			BEP 21		
Eden- Upper Eden	11/04/2013	file:///C:/Users/ChloeE/Downloads/UpperEdenNeighbourhoodPlan2012_15.pdf	UENDP1 Rural Exceptions Housing for Local People		
			UENDP2 Housing on Farms		
			UENDP3 Housing for Older People	UENDP7 LSC De-designation Policy	
			UENDP4 Housing Densities		
			UECP5 Fibre to the Premises		
			UENDP6 Monitoring and Development Rates		
Exeter- Exeter James St	16/07/2013	http://www.exeter.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=18581&p=0	D1: Good quality design	EN1: Protection of green spaces	T1: Sustainable Transport
			D2: Retail and Commercial Frontages	EN2: Hoopern Valley	T2: Through traffic
			H1: Heritage	EN3: Queens Crescent Garden	T3: Residential Streets
			SD3: Infill / Windfall Sites	EN4: Gardens	T4: Short term parking for local businesses
			SD4: Adapting to climate change	EN5: Trees	T5: Accessibility for all
			C1: Houses in Multiple Occupation	EN6: Biodiversity	T6: St James Park Station

			C2: Large Scale Purpose Built Student Accommodation	C5: Allotments	
			C3: Small Scale Purpose Built Student Accommodation		
			C4: St James Local Community Hub		
Harborough-Broughton Astley	01/01/2014	http://broughtonastley.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/uploads/17533a7de33f538034744930.pdf	SD1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	EH1 - Environment Heritage and Open Spaces for Protection	T1 - Transport and Traffic Management
			H2 - Provision of Affordable Housing	EH2 - Area of Separation	
			P1 - Phasing of development	H3 - Windfall and Back Land Development	
			E1 - Employment		
North Tyneside-Fish Quay	01/04/2013	http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/pls/portals/NTC_PSCM.PSCM_Web.download?p_ID=546688	4.2 Context and Character	Biodiversity and Open Spaces Objective A-C	Transport and Accessibility Objective A-H
			4.3 Responding to Setting and Views	Policy and Evidence Background 10.4.1	Policy and Evidence Background 6.4.1
			4.4 Ensure Ease of Movement	10.4.2	6.4.2
			4.5 The Height of New Development	10.4.3	
			4.6 The Massing and Orientation of New Development	10.4.4	
			4.7 The Form and Shape of New Development	10.4.5	
			4.8 The Scale of New Development		
			4.9 The Materials and Colour of New Development		
			4.10 Development should be of a High Standard of Sustainability		

Rutland-Uppingham	10/07/2014 but currently under judicial review	http://www.uppinghamtowncouncil.co.uk/uploads/final-draft-version-neighbourhood-plan-2013-2016.pdf	P1 - Protect Central Conservation Area	P10 - Environment and Preservation of Important Open Space	Proposal 9 - Transport - Coach Stop
			P2 - Public Information Signage	P11 - Environment and Preservation of Important Open Space	Proposal 10 - Transport - Car Parking Policy
			P9 - Design and Access	P12 - Environment and Preservation of Important Open Space	Proposal 11 - Transport - Safer Walking and Cycling Routes
					Proposal 12 - Transport - Seaton Road Roundabout
Proposal 13 - Transport - New Bus Interchange					
South Norfolk-Cringleford	24/02/2014	http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/planning/media/Cringleford_Neighbourhood_Development_Plan_2013_2026.pdf	GEN2	ENV1	TRA1
			GEN3	ENV2	TRA2
			HOU2	ENV3	TRA3
			HOU3	ENV4	TRA4
			HOU4	ENV5	
			HOU6	ENV6	
			HOU7	ENV7	
			HOU8	SCC8	
			HOU9		
			HOU10		
			ECN4		
			ECN5		
			SCC3		
			SCC4		

South Oxfordshire-Thame	18/07/2013	http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Final%20Thame%20Neighbourhood%20Plan%20-%20March%202013.pdf	ESDQ14	ESDQ1	GA1
			ESDQ15	ESDQ2	GA2
			ESDQ16	ESDQ3	GA3
			ESDQ17	ESDQ4	GA4
			ESDQ18	ESDQ5	GA5
			ESDQ19	ESDQ6	GA6
			ESDQ20	ESDQ7	
			ESDQ21	ESDQ8	
			ESDQ22	ESDQ9	
			ESDQ11		
			ESDQ12		
			ESDQ13		
			ESDQ23		
			ESDQ24		
ESDQ25					
ESDQ26					
ESDQ27					
ESDQ28					
ESDQ29					
Windsor and Maidenhead-Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale (General Policies)	29/04/2014	file:///C:/Users/ChloeE/Downloads/Ascot,%20Sunninghill%20and%20Sunningdale%20Neighbourhood%20P	NP/H2 - Mix of Housing Types	NP/EN1 - Gaps Between villages	NP/T1 - Parking and Access
			NP/DG1 - Respecting the Townscape	NP/EN2 - Trees	NP/T2 - Cycle Routes
			NP/DG2 - Density, Footprint, Separation, Scale, Bulk	NP/EN3 - Gardens	
			NP/DG3 - Good Quality Design	NP/EN4 - Biodiversity	
			NP/DG4 - Heritage Assets	NP/EN5 - Green Corridors	

		lan.pdf	NP/DG5 - Energy Efficiency and Sustainability		
--	--	-------------------------	---	--	--

Annex 2: Example Table of the Adopted Neighbourhood Plans Investigated and their Policies Associated with Design, Landscape and Transport. The Table Shows the 3 Policy Areas for Uppingham's Neighbourhood Plan, Rutland and for Broughton Astley's Neighbourhood Plan for Harborough.

WHERE. DATE MADE. WEBLINK.	POLICY		
	DESIGN	LANDSCAPE	TRANSPORT
Rutland-Uppingham 10/07/2014 http://www.uppinghamtowncouncil.co.uk/uploads/final-draft-version-neighbourhood-plan-2013-2016.pdf	<p>P1 - Protect Central Conservation Area: All future development in the town centre conservation area should comply with the County Council's conservation and heritage policies including those for listed buildings. Wherever possible, construction materials and finishes should complement the surrounding area and the character and heritage of the immediate environment. Where approved, modern replacement/new build materials should also visually complement the immediate environment. Commercial property alterations and frontages should complement the heritage of the immediate environment with suitable wall mounted signage. Any enhancement of the street furniture, signage and street lighting should have a heritage appearance but also regard for energy conservation and public safety. Any modernisation of the Market Place and High Street should complement their heritage with the installation of new infrastructure being as unobtrusive as possible. Such development should not hinder their community use for events.</p> <p>P2 - Public Information Signage: The Plan supports the installation of additional pedestrian and parking signage in the town. Signage should be of heritage appearance and may be wall or column mounted. The existing signage policy of Rutland County Council is supported with a view to a coordinated approach, particularly in the conservation area. Highway signs must comply with County Council</p>	<p>P10 - Environment and Preservation of Important Open Space: Every household shall be within a 20 minute walk of open countryside.</p> <p>P11 - Environment and Preservation of Important Open Space: In accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS23 no further development, apart</p>	<p>Proposal 9 - Transport - Coach Stop: The Plan supports the siting of a long distance coach stop in the town.</p> <p>Proposal 10 - Transport - Car Parking Policy: The Plan supports a move to local control or ownership of the town's main car parks with a view to implementing local parking policies appropriate to a small market town. New housing developments should link communal parking spaces to individual properties</p>

	<p>Highways policies with regard to size, height, materials and location.</p> <p>P9 - Design and Access: Developers must demonstrate in a Design and Access Statement how their proposed development reinforces Uppingham’s character and heritage. The statement must set out how the proposals follow the policies and guidance in relevant national and local documents as well as this Plan. The Design and Access Statement must address the following; i. Context and character; ii. Historic character; iii. Connection with the countryside; iv. Quality for pedestrians, cyclists and the physically disadvantaged; v. Development density and build quality; vi. Car Parking; vii. Landscaping and access to open and green space; viii. Occupier controlled access to fibre, copper and other home office services; ix. Environmental footprint and x. Play provision. The Town Council reserves the right to require an individual architectural review on any development of 25 houses or more or any single building of more than 3000sqm. Such reviews should be carried out by an appropriately qualified independent body and conducted within the design review guidelines established by RIBA or CABI. The Plan acknowledges existing policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the current and emerging policies of Rutland County Council.</p>	<p>from amenities, will be permitted on green space within the Plan boundary beyond that proposed in this Plan or acknowledged in its policies.</p> <p>P12 - Environment and Preservation of Important Open Space: An appropriate landscape buffer zone to a standard in keeping with the town’s rural setting will be enforced on the northern boundary of the Uppingham Gate development site (Site D).</p>	<p>where appropriate.</p> <p>Proposal 11 - Transport - Safer Walking and Cycling Routes: The Town Council should pursue the construction of appropriately signed safer walking and cycling routes in and out of the town centre linking them to the design requirements of new development sites. Such routes should reflect the additional needs of the physically disadvantaged.</p> <p>Proposal 12 - Transport - Seaton Road Roundabout: The Plan supports a re-examination of the problems being caused by the present design of the roundabout at the top of Seaton Road.</p> <p>Proposal 13 - Transport - New Bus Interchange: The Plan supports a major review and possible re-design of the present bus interchange with the aim of</p>
--	---	--	--

			<p>creating safer walking routes between the town centre and Tod's Piece, a safer highway and a more attractive landscape linking walking and cycling routes and the new Heritage Trail to improved access to buses.</p> <p>Proposal 3 - Technology and Infrastructure - Community Safety: As funds become available, the Plan supports creating new roundabouts at the southern entrance to the town near Uppingham Community College (UCC) and part way down Leicester Road at the entrance of the new housing developments. It also supports further action to control speed in London Road and other suitable sites.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>Harborough - Broughton Astley</p> <p>01/01/2014</p> <p>http://broughtonastley.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/uploads/17533a7de33f538034744930.pdf</p>	<p>SD1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development: The Parish Council will support proposals that accord with the policies in the Broughton Astley Neighbourhood Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in the Harborough District Core Strategy). When commenting on development proposals the Parish Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework; and will work proactively with applicants to find joint solutions which mean that proposals can be supported wherever possible; and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental sustainability of the area.</p> <p>H2 - Provision of Affordable Housing: i. To meet identified needs within the community at least 30% of all new housing developments will be high quality affordable housing. ii. Developments will be expected to contribute to the provision of affordable homes that are suitable to meet the needs of older people and those with disabilities.</p>	<p>EH1 - Environment Heritage and Open Spaces for Protection: i. Working with the Highway Authority, developers and local environmental groups improved access to the countryside will be sought by improving the network of existing public rights of way. ii. The green spaces at Frolesworth Road Recreation Ground, War Memorial, Cottage Lane and the disused railway, which have been demonstrated to be of significance to the local community, are designated as 'Local Green Spaces' in order to protect their identity. The Local Green Spaces are identified in (Fig.6) iii. Existing areas of public open space and Local Green Spaces will be preserved in order to promote social interaction, community activity and active play. iv. New public open space, including formal open space, walking routes and spaces for informal/formal community activities will be created at Site 1B and Site 2 v. Broughton Astley's Listed buildings - St Marys Church, Sutton in the Elms Baptist Church, Quaker Cottage and the Stone House - will be protected in line with national policy. (Fig 7). vi. Liaison will take place with appropriate authorities to provide support to community groups to maintain and improve the brook through the village. vii. The use of renewable energy solutions as part of new developments will be encouraged.</p> <p>EH2 - Area of Separation: An area of separation lying to the north of Broughton Way and east of Sutton Lane, and amounting to approximately 7 ha of agricultural grazing land will be maintained between the two settlements of Broughton Astley and Sutton in the Elms. Development which would detract from the open character of this area or reduce the visual separation of Broughton Astley and Sutton in the Elms should not be permitted. i. The area of separation is desirable in order to ensure that the identity and distinctiveness of settlements is retained. (Fig. 5) ii. Development for recreational use such as Community</p>	<p>T1 - Transport and Traffic Management: We will work together with the Highway Authority, public transport providers, local schools and developers to develop a long term sustainable strategy for improvements to the highway network and the management of traffic in and around Broughton Astley to reduce the impact of development on the community by: i. Encouraging better access to and increased use of public transport; ii. Working with the District Council to refurbish the existing village centre car park in order to provide more spaces; iii. Ensuring that new development takes place adjacent to the built up area where there are good travel choices; iv. Improving links within the existing built-up area for walking, cycling and bus provision; v. Ensuring other vehicular traffic keeps to appropriate routes; and</p>
---	---	---	--

	<p>P1 - Phasing of development: i. The development and construction of sites which bring the most potential benefit in the shortest timescale to the community of Broughton Astley will be supported. ii. A logical sequence of phased construction will be monitored by the Steering Group on an annual basis, with its progress assessed to ensure that Broughton Astley is not falling below its allocation of housing. iii. The developers of Sites 1 and 2 will be required to work together to ensure that community facilities are provided in accordance with the proposed phasing of construction.</p> <p>E1 - Employment: i. The existing employment area at Swannington Road should be protected as a Key Employment Area, recognising that it provides the only significant employment opportunities at present. ii. An area of 1.7ha of employment land will be allocated within development Site 1A; adjacent to the existing Key Employment Area. iii. Land at Broughton Way will be allocated for mixed employment / service and leisure use; its purpose to create employment for local people and contribute towards the economy of Broughton Astley.(Site EMP 1) iv. Employment opportunities on mixed-use</p>	<p>Woodland, Country Park or informal public open space will be supported providing the proposals do not detract from the open and undeveloped character of the area.</p> <p>H3 - Windfall and Back Land Development: i. It is accepted that there may be some windfall developments over the life of the Neighbourhood Plan on previously developed 'brownfield' or unallocated sites with direct highways access. Small, well designed residential sites which do not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area and neighbouring properties will be supported. The impact of such windfall development will be incorporated into the on-going monitoring and review process. ii. In principle development will be supported on sites of less than 5 dwellings on previously developed land. iii. In respect to back land and tandem development in gardens of existing properties; such developments will be resisted where they have the potential for loss of amenity of neighbouring properties; through loss of privacy, loss of daylight, visual intrusion by a building or structure, loss of car parking, loss of mature vegetation or landscape screening and additional traffic resulting from the development. iv. Any windfall, back land or tandem development must have a direct highway frontage.</p>	<p>vi. Encouraging 'safe routes to schools' schemes.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>development sites will be supported providing that the type of use proposed would not have a detrimental effect on the environment or wellbeing of people in neighbouring properties. v. The construction of the community and leisure facility to provide employment opportunities within the village will be supported. vi. Through multi-agency working we will create a wider range of employment opportunities within Broughton Astley to meet local needs through a variety of specified ways.</p>		
--	---	--	--