

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE MAVESYN RIDWARE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

INDEPENDENT EXAMINER:
Christopher Collison BA(Hons) MBA MRTPI MIED IHBC

To Lichfield District Council and Mavesyn Ridware Parish Council

By email to Patrick Jervis, Lichfield District Council, and Lewis Anderson, Clerk to Mavesyn Ridware Parish Council. Copy to Cllr Antony Jones Chairman MRPC

Dated 8 November 2024

Dear Lewis and Patrick

Mavesyn Ridware Neighbourhood Development Plan Independent Examination - Examiner letter seeking clarification of matters

Further to my initial letter of 7 November 2024 I am writing to seek clarification of the following matters:

Policy MR01

1. Part 1a of the policy refers to amendment of the Hill Ridware Settlement Boundary. Please explain what this is an amendment from, and where I can see the criteria used and the basis of identification of the amended boundary.
2. In that part 1a of the policy supports residential development within the Hill Ridware Settlement Boundary please explain why part 1c of the policy is necessary.
3. In that part 1a of the policy supports residential development within the Hill Ridware Settlement Boundary does part 1d of the policy only apply outside the Hill Ridware Settlement Boundary?
4. Please explain how Part 1d of the policy has sufficient regard for national policy which provides for the demolition of heritage assets in stated circumstances. See paragraphs 207 and 209 of the NPPF.
5. Please explain the term “the requirements of design and other policies” in part 6 of the policy.

Policy MR02

6. In the context of the recommendation relating to Policy MR02 in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report May 2024, and in the context of the Regulation 16 representation of the Environment Agency I am mindful to recommend a modification to add a requirement that any proposed development scheme for the site must be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment that demonstrates the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient and the development will not result in flood risk to any existing properties outside the site. I invite comment on this intended modification.

7. Please explain the term “an active frontage” as used in part 3a of the policy.

Policy MR04

8. Please explain how a house that is a “self-build” to meet specific local need includes significant measures to offset the unsustainable location.

Policy MR06

9. Please explain how the approach adopted in part 2 of the policy has sufficient regard for national policy relating to listed buildings.

10. What listed building Grade are the buildings and structures referred to in parts 2a and 2b of the policy.

11. Are the heritage assets identified in part 3 of the policy being identified as non-designated heritage assets, and if so, what were the criteria for their selection?

Policy MR07

12. Please explain how part 4 of the policy has sufficient regard for national policy as set out in paragraph 186 of the NPPF which refers to ancient woodland.

I request any response to these matters is agreed as a joint response of the Parish and District Councils wherever possible. This request for clarification and any response should be published on the District Council website.

To maintain the momentum of the Independent Examination I would be grateful if a reply could be sent to me by Noon on Monday 18 November 2024.

For the avoidance of doubt recommendations of modification of the Neighbourhood Plan that may be contained in my report of Independent Examination will not be limited to those matters in respect of which I have requested clarification.

I should be grateful if the District Council and the Parish Council could acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Best regards

Chris Collison
Independent Examiner
Planning and Management Ltd