

Huntington Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Huntington Parish Council's Response to the Independent Examiner's Clarification Note

Points for Clarification

Policy H1

Paragraphs 42-58 comprehensively explain the challenging circumstances in which the Plan has been prepared. They also address the inherent uncertainties on the eventual outcome of the emerging Local Plan.

I am minded to remove any direct reference to the proposed ST8 site in the emerging Local Plan from the policy and leave the supporting text to explain the context.

I am also minded to recommend that the first two sentences of paragraph 57 are deleted. In my view they are unnecessary within the wider context of the final sentence of paragraph 54.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposed approach?

Huntington Parish Council Response: We are happy with the proposed approach.

Policy H2

The policy is general in nature. The Plan will need to be sufficiently flexible to address a mix of smaller windfall sites and the potential for the delivery of a strategic site in the Plan period. I am minded to recommend a modification to the policy which would make a distinction on housing mix between local sites and a potential strategic site.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this approach?

Huntington Parish Council Response: We would welcome the suggested modification to make more of a distinction on housing mix between local sites and a potential strategic site.

Policy H3

Does the policy add any value to existing and emerging policies of the City of York Council on this matter?

Huntington Parish Council Response: Its inclusion reflects that the issue of affordable housing is of special importance to Huntington. That housing affordability is a major issue as reflected in the findings from the community consultation undertaken as part of the development of the Plan as well as from other statistical sources. The Policy is intended to support and provide local content and justification to existing and emerging policies of the City of York Council on this matter. It is considered that it does add value.

Policy H9

This policy reads more as a statement of intent rather than a policy. Could it become a Community Aspiration rather than a land-use policy?

Huntington Parish Council Response: This policy seeks to support the listing, longevity, appreciation and community value of an Asset of Community Value (ACV). It has been included as policy because

ACV status can be material to planning decisions during the period the asset remains on the ACV List. This is also reflected in the use of the phrase “support the retention” in para 117. We would prefer to see it retained as a policy perhaps with some minor tweaking to emphasise its land-use planning aspects.

Policy H10

I saw the importance of the two retail parks during my visit.

As submitted the policy has an unspecific approach. In what way does the Plan intend to support their continued role?

It appears that there are two options to remedy this matter. The first is that the policy is deleted. The second is that I recommend modifications so that it becomes more specific (for example in resisting any proposed changes of use of retail/related use to other uses).

Does the Parish Council have any comments on its intentions for the policy and which of the two options would best match those intentions?

Huntington Parish Council Response: We support and welcome the second intention. Paragraph 4.3.9 of the submitted York Local Plan is key where it talks about supporting the existing function of Monks Cross for bulky goods retailing and other restricted comparison goods in line with the provisions of Policy R4 (and R1).

Policy H13

Is the implication of the policy that hot food take-aways would not be supported other than in the identified locations? We can confirm that this is the intention.

I understand the second part of the policy. However, is it more a matter for planning conditions rather than a policy?

In addition, I am minded to recommend the deletion of the elements of the policy about emptying of litter bins and keeping the area adjacent to the premises clear (from litter) as they are not directly land use matters.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposed approach?

Huntington Parish Council Response: We are happy to be led by yourself on the above two points. One option might be if the text was removed from the policies and included in the supporting text.

Policy H15

I have looked at the submitted Local Green Spaces (LGS) Assessment. It is generally a very thorough document. The photographs are helpful.

Two specific questions arise:

- are the proposed LGSs shown anywhere on clearer maps than on Map 3 of the submitted Plan?
- what are the sizes of each of the proposed LGSs?

Huntington Parish Council Response: CYC has kindly agreed to supply larger scale maps, plus the sizes for each one. These will be provided in the new year.

Policies H16/H18

Both policies are a very well-crafted.

Huntington Parish Council Response: Thank you for these comments.

Policy H19

I understand the approach taken.

However, is the traffic management element of the policy a land use matter?

Are there any current or emerging proposals for the widening or dualling of the YORR?

Huntington Parish Council Response: It is considered that traffic management is a land use matter. At the time the Plan was being prepared the widening or dualling of the YORR was a realistic option. We have sought clarification from CYC on the current status of these proposals this should then clarify whether this is land use matter or more a legitimate aspiration. The Council have advised that the dualling of the York Outer Ring Road (A1237) from the A19 to Hopgrove Roundabout (Where the A1237 meets the A64) have 'Programme Entry Status with the Department for Transport' The submitted Local Plan also highlights junction improvements on all roundabouts on the A1237.

I would welcome any comments you have on them.

Huntington Parish Council Response: Can the Parish Council also suggest that part 2 of Policy H1 be removed as we understand from CYC that it is conflict with the submitted Local Plan.