

**CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL
CADDINGTON and SLIP END PARISH COUNCILS**

**SUBMISSION VERSION
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN for CADDINGTON & SLIP END**

**Hearing to be held at 10.00am on Thursday 15th March 2018
at The Heathfield Centre, Hyde Road, Caddington, LU1 4HF.**

AGENDA

1. Examiner's introduction

- 1.1 Introductions and welcome
- 1.2 Hearing procedure
- 1.3 Any questions regarding procedural matters

2. Meeting the Basic Conditions

- 2.1 In my Hearing Discussion Note I have set out a number of issues that relate to the requirement to meet the Basic Conditions. I will lead a discussion on the basis of the contents of this Note.

3. Concerns of Flood Risk Management and drainage

- 3.1 Central Bedfordshire Council's Sustainable Drainage Engineer commented that previous recommendations do not seem to have resulted in any change to the text of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Therefore there is a continuing concern that mention should be made of flood risk and potential management.
- 3.2 Thames Water also makes reference to what it considers to be a desirable policy on 'Water and Wastewater Infrastructure' and what it considers to be references or a statement that should be included. A concern is also raised about a sewage treatment works.
- 3.3 We will briefly discuss both sets of responses.
- 3.4 Anglian Water Services Ltd. comments that Affinity Water is responsible for water services within the Parish (parishes?) and should be consulted. I would like confirmation that this has been done.

4. Concerns of Historic England

- 4.1 Whilst welcoming various elements of the NP, Historic England seeks the identification of the heritage assets mentioned in its response, with a positive strategy, and that locally important buildings, archaeological remains, and landscapes should be detailed. It also suggests additional wording to Policy CASE13, raises an issue about the use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds and the exemptions for listed buildings etc in respect of energy efficiency requirements. We will briefly discuss these matters.

5. Concerns of Sport England

- 5.1 Sport England has concerns about the element of Policy CASE13 which deals with viability and the possible loss of playing field provision, and suggests how this concern might be addressed. We will briefly discuss these matters.

6. Minor Matters

- 6.1 There are a small number of inaccuracies or inconsistencies in the NP that I wish to explore:
- Green Belt – Paragraph 1.7 states that “ The area ... is wholly washed over by the South Bedfordshire Green Belt”. Paragraph 1.36 states that “Caddington is wholly within the Green Belt ...”. Both these statements appear to be incorrect.
 - I am having difficulty in understanding paragraph 1.46 of the CaSENP: this does not appear to refer to the matters dealt with in paragraphs 1.42 – 1.45 and I do not know what “site” is referred to at the beginning of the second sentence. But then I would also comment that there is only 1 paragraph under the heading of this section - Local Plan Policy - that deals with the subject.
 - At the top of page 19, where Policy Case1 continues, there is a reference to Policy CASE1 that I believe should be a reference to policy CASE13.
 - Paragraph 5.5 refers to open spaces: the bullet point that refers to Caddington Sports and Social Club itemises ‘sports, event and bar facilities’ – it is not clear (although will be known locally of course) whether these facilities include open space.
 - The first line of Policy CASE8 refers to financial contributions – is it CIL that is being referred to here?
 - Paragraph 6.4 provides support for “a new commercial renewable energy system” – could or should the nature of this be indicated?
 - In Policy CASE11, the final sentence at the end of the policy appears to be out of place – should it come after the first 3 bullet points?
 - There appears to be some odd emphasis in Policies CASE13 and CASE14, with bold text that may not be intended?
 - Section 10 of the NP would be more meaningful if it included an indication of the ‘non-land use’ issues that are contemplated.
 - Figure A6 (page 49) has no chart title, whilst Figure A7 has a title but also has “Chart Title” above the data.

7. Any other matter?

- 7.1 Anything of relevance that has not been dealt with above.

Close of Hearing

See Examiner’s Procedure Note over

EXAMINER'S PROCEDURE NOTE

For the benefit of participants who may not be familiar with this type of hearing, I set out a guide that I hope will be helpful.

There are no procedural rules that govern hearings that are part of the examination of a neighbourhood plan, but as in the case where there are rules, for example the Planning Inspectorate's guidance for local plan examinations, it is for the Examiner to determine the procedure, who should participate and how long is spent on any particular topic.

The hearing is essentially 'inquisitorial' rather than 'adversarial'. That means that there will be no cross-examination, although I will use my discretion to allow questions to be raised across the table. Therefore I will lead the discussion that will be around a table and run with a reasonable degree of informality, subject to me ensuring that the purpose of the hearing is observed. Naturally I will observe the rules of natural justice to ensure that each party gets a fair opportunity to make the points that are important to them. In advance, I see no reason why each party should not have two participants at the table, although I would prefer there to be a main participant nominated. I may need to review this immediately before the hearing starts or when I know how many parties will be attending.

I will, of course, explain procedure at the beginning of the hearing and will answer any questions that may arise.