

Leeds City Council

**Thorner  
Neighbourhood Plan  
2021-2033**

**Independent Examiner's Report**

By Ann Skippers BSc (Hons) MRTPI FHEA FRSA AoU

28 November 2024

## Contents

	<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>The role of the independent examiner and the examination process</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Neighbourhood plan preparation</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Compliance with matters other than the basic conditions</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>The basic conditions</b>	<b>9</b>
	<i>National policy and advice</i>	9
	<i>Sustainable development</i>	11
	<i>The development plan</i>	11
	<i>Retained European Union (EU) obligations</i>	12
	<i>European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)</i>	14
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Detailed comments on the Plan and its policies</b>	<b>14</b>
	1. Introduction	15
	2. Thorner Past and Present	15
	3. Our Vision	15
	4. Policy Outline	16
	- Policy A1	16
	- Policy A2	17
	- Policy A3	18
	- Policy A4	19
	- Policy A5	19
	- Policy A6	20
	- Policy B1	21
	- Policy B2	24
	- Policy B3	25
	- Policy B4	27
	5. Implementation	27
	Appendices	27
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>Appendix 1 List of key documents</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Appendix 2 Questions of clarification from the examiner</b>	<b>31</b>

## Summary

I have been appointed as the independent examiner of the Thorner Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Thorner is a historic village located about six miles north east of Leeds City centre. With a population of around 1630, the majority of the Parish falls within the Green Belt, with the exception of the built-up area of Thorner.

The Plan is the result of a sustained period of work. It is based on the Village Design Statement adopted by the City Council in 2011 as a supplementary planning document. It addresses the concerns of local residents as well as the opportunities presented to enhance green spaces and the countryside which surrounds the village.

The Plan has been produced to a high standard. However, it has been necessary to recommend some modifications. In the main these are intended to ensure the Plan is clear and precise and provides a practical framework for decision-making as required by national policy and guidance.

Subject to those modifications, I have concluded that the Plan does meet the basic conditions and all the other requirements I am obliged to examine. I am therefore pleased to recommend to Leeds City Council that the Thorner Neighbourhood Development Plan can go forward to a referendum.

In considering whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Neighbourhood Plan area I see no reason to alter or extend this area for the purpose of holding a referendum.

Ann Skippers MRTPI  
Ann Skippers Planning  
28 November 2024



## 1.0 Introduction

This is the report of the independent examiner into the Thorner Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan).

The Localism Act 2011 provides a welcome opportunity for communities to shape the future of the places where they live and work and to deliver the sustainable development they need. One way of achieving this is through the production of a neighbourhood plan.

I have been appointed by Leeds City Council (LCC) with the agreement of the Parish Council, to undertake this independent examination. I have been appointed through the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (NPIERS).

I am independent of the qualifying body and the local authority. I have no interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan. I am a chartered town planner with over thirty years experience in planning and have worked in the public, private and academic sectors and am an experienced examiner of neighbourhood plans. I therefore have the appropriate qualifications and professional experience to carry out this independent examination.

## 2.0 The role of the independent examiner and the examination process

### *Role of the Examiner*

The examiner must assess whether a neighbourhood plan meets the basic conditions and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The basic conditions<sup>1</sup> are:

- Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan
- The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development
- The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area
- The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, retained European Union (EU) obligations<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Set out in paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and paragraph 11(2) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

<sup>2</sup> Substituted by the Environmental Assessments and Miscellaneous Planning (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2018/1232 which came into force on 31 December 2020

- Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan.

Regulations 32 and 33 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) set out two additional basic conditions to those set out in primary legislation and referred to in the paragraph above. Only one is applicable to neighbourhood plans and was brought into effect on 28 December 2018.<sup>3</sup> It states that:

- The making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

The examiner is also required to check<sup>4</sup> whether the neighbourhood plan:

- Has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body
- Has been prepared for an area that has been properly designated for such plan preparation
- Meets the requirements to i) specify the period to which it has effect; ii) not include provision about excluded development; and iii) not relate to more than one neighbourhood area and that
- Its policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I must also consider whether the draft neighbourhood plan is compatible with Convention rights.<sup>5</sup>

The examiner must then make one of the following recommendations:

- The neighbourhood plan can proceed to a referendum on the basis it meets all the necessary legal requirements
- The neighbourhood plan can proceed to a referendum subject to modifications or
- The neighbourhood plan should not proceed to a referendum on the basis it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

If the plan can proceed to a referendum with or without modifications, the examiner must also consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the neighbourhood plan area to which it relates.

If the plan goes forward to referendum and more than 50% of those voting vote in favour of the plan then it is made by the relevant local authority, in this case LCC. The

---

<sup>3</sup> Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018

<sup>4</sup> Set out in sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act and paragraph 11(2) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

<sup>5</sup> The combined effect of the Town and Country Planning Act Schedule 4B para 8(6) and para 10 (3)(b) and the Human Rights Act 1998

plan then becomes part of the 'development plan' for the area and a statutory consideration in guiding future development and in the determination of planning applications within the plan area.

### ***Examination Process***

It is useful to bear in mind that the examiner's role is limited to testing whether or not the submitted neighbourhood plan meets the basic conditions and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and paragraph 11 of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).<sup>6</sup>

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that the examiner is not testing the soundness of a neighbourhood plan or examining other material considerations.<sup>7</sup>

In addition, PPG is clear that neighbourhood plans are not obliged to include policies on all types of development.<sup>8</sup> Often representations suggest amendments to policies or additional policies or different approaches and new policies. Where I find that policies do meet the basic conditions, it is not necessary for me to consider if further amendments or additions are required. Some representations raise other matters such as maintenance and I feel sure the Parish Council will wish to consider these issues moving forward.

A representation makes comments about the process, governance and constitution of the Steering Group. An independent examiner has no authority to consider such matters which should be dealt with through internal complaints handling procedures of the qualifying body or local planning authority.

PPG<sup>9</sup> explains that it is expected that the examination will not include a public hearing. Rather the examiner should reach a view by considering written representations. Where an examiner considers it necessary to ensure adequate examination of an issue or to ensure a person has a fair chance to put a case, then a hearing must be held.<sup>10</sup>

After consideration of all the documentation and the representations made, I decided that it was not necessary to hold a hearing.

In 2018, the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (NPIERS) published guidance to service users and examiners. Amongst other matters, the guidance indicates that the qualifying body will normally be given an opportunity to comment upon any representations made by other parties at the Regulation 16 consultation stage should they wish to do so. There is no obligation for a qualifying body to make any comments; it is only if they wish to do so. The Parish Council made

---

<sup>6</sup> Paragraph 11(3) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and PPG para 055 ref id 41-055-20180222

<sup>7</sup> PPG para 055 ref id 41-055-20180222

<sup>8</sup> Ibid para 040 ref id 41-040-20160211

<sup>9</sup> Ibid para 056 ref id 41-056-20180222

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

comments on the Regulation 16 stage representations and I have taken these into account.

I am very grateful to everyone for ensuring that the examination has run so smoothly and in particular Kwame Steadman at LCC.

I made an unaccompanied site visit to familiarise myself with the Plan area on 11 September 2024.

### ***Modifications and how to read this report***

Where modifications are recommended they appear in a bullet point list of **bold text**. Where I have suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in **bold italics** in the bullet point list of recommendations. Modifications will always appear in a bullet point list.

As a result of some modifications consequential amendments may be required. These can include changing policy numbering, section headings, amending the contents page, renumbering paragraphs or pages, ensuring that supporting appendices and other documents align with the final version of the Plan and so on.

I regard these issues as primarily matters of final presentation and do not specifically refer to all such modifications, but have an expectation that a common sense approach will be taken and any such necessary editing will be carried out and the Plan's presentation made consistent.

Some representations also point out a number of drafting or similar errors and minor updating of a factual nature.<sup>11</sup> These can be carried out at the discretion of the Parish Council in association with LCC as minor modifications as the Plan progresses to the next stages.

## **3.0 Neighbourhood plan preparation**

A Consultation Statement has been submitted.

Work began on the Plan in 2012. A Village Design Statement (VDS) had been produced and adopted by LCC in 2011 as a supplementary planning document. Work progressed using the VDS as a basis for taking forward policies.

The Consultation Statement explains that the aim of the engagement process was to inform and invite participation engaging a wide range of people, ensure information was widely accessible and events took place at key milestones and prompt feedback was given. It is good to see a well-thought out and appropriate engagement strategy.

---

<sup>11</sup> I particularly refer to the representations received from the Leeds Local Access Forum and Dr Nigel J Cussans

A Steering Group was established and met regularly and publicly with reports back to monthly Parish Council meetings. A variety of communication methods were employed including articles in the Parish magazine, notices, website and events. A very helpful table in the Consultation Statement summarises the activity.<sup>12</sup>

Pre-submission (Regulation 14) consultation took place between 19 July – 31 August 2021. The consultation was publicised using a newsletter and direct email. Two drop-in events were held.

I consider that work on the Plan has been successful in engaging the local community over a sustained period.

Submission (Regulation 16) consultation was carried out between 22 July – 16 September 2024.

A total of 32 representations were received at Regulation 16 stage. I have considered all of the representations and taken them into account in preparing my report.

## **4.0 Compliance with matters other than the basic conditions**

I now check the various matters set out in section 2.0 of this report.

### **Qualifying body**

Thorner Parish Council is the qualifying body able to lead preparation of a neighbourhood plan. This requirement is satisfactorily met.

### **Plan area**

The Plan area is coterminous with the administrative boundary for the Parish. LCC approved the designation of the area on 31 January 2013. The Plan relates to this area and does not relate to more than one neighbourhood area and therefore complies with these requirements. The Plan area is shown on page 6 of the Plan.

### **Plan period**

The Plan period is 2021 – 2033. This is clearly shown on the Plan's front cover. This requirement is therefore satisfactorily met.

---

<sup>12</sup> Consultation Statement page 8



## **Excluded development**

The Plan does not include policies that relate to any of the categories of excluded development and therefore meets this requirement. This is also helpfully confirmed in the Basic Conditions Statement.

## **Development and use of land**

Policies in neighbourhood plans must relate to the development and use of land. Sometimes neighbourhood plans contain aspirational policies or projects that signal the community's priorities for the future of their local area, but are not related to the development and use of land. If I consider a policy or proposal to fall within this category, I will recommend it be clearly differentiated. This is because wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable.<sup>13</sup>

In this case, the Plan captures those non-planning community actions in Appendix 01. They are clearly differentiated and explained in the Plan.<sup>14</sup> I consider this approach is appropriate for this Plan.

## **5.0 The basic conditions**

### **Regard to national policy and advice**

The Government updated the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 5 September 2023. This revised Framework replaces the previous National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012, revised in July 2018, updated in February 2019 and revised in July 2021.

The NPPF is the main document that sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

In particular it explains that the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will mean that neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies in local plans or spatial development strategies and should shape and direct development outside of these strategic policies.<sup>15</sup>

Non-strategic policies are more detailed for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development.<sup>16</sup> They can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level, establishing design principles, conserving and

---

<sup>13</sup> PPG para 004 ref id 41-004-20190509

<sup>14</sup> The Plan pages 4, 11 and 33

<sup>15</sup> NPPF para 13

<sup>16</sup> Ibid para 28

enhancing the natural and historic environment as well as set out other development management policies.<sup>17</sup>

The NPPF also makes it clear that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than that set out in strategic policies or undermine those strategic policies.<sup>18</sup>

The NPPF states that all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence; evidence should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying policies and take into account relevant market signals.<sup>19</sup>

Policies should be clearly written and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. They should serve a clear purpose and avoid unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area including those in the NPPF.<sup>20</sup>

On 6 March 2014, the Government published a suite of planning guidance referred to as Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). This is an online resource available at [www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance) which is regularly updated. The planning guidance contains a wealth of information relating to neighbourhood planning. I have also had regard to PPG in preparing this report.

PPG indicates that a policy should be clear and unambiguous<sup>21</sup> to enable a decision maker to apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. The guidance advises that policies should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence, reflecting and responding to both the planning context and the characteristics of the area.<sup>22</sup>

PPG states there is no 'tick box' list of evidence required, but proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken.<sup>23</sup> It continues that the evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies.<sup>24</sup>

Whilst this has formed part of my own assessment, the Basic Conditions Statement sets out how the Plan's policies correspond to national policy and guidance. The Basic Conditions Statement refers to a previous iteration of the NPPF, but nonetheless remains helpful because of the way in which this section is presented. For the avoidance of doubt, I have examined the Plan against the most recently published NPPF.

---

<sup>17</sup> NPPF para 28

<sup>18</sup> Ibid para 29

<sup>19</sup> Ibid para 31

<sup>20</sup> Ibid para 16

<sup>21</sup> PPG para 041 ref id 41-041-20140306

<sup>22</sup> Ibid

<sup>23</sup> Ibid para 040 ref id 41-040-20160211

<sup>24</sup> Ibid

## **Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development**

A qualifying body must demonstrate how the making of a neighbourhood plan would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

The NPPF confirms that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.<sup>25</sup> This means that the planning system has three overarching and interdependent objectives which should be pursued in mutually supportive ways so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives.<sup>26</sup> The three overarching objectives are:<sup>27</sup>

- a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
- c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

The NPPF confirms that planning policies should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but should take local circumstances into account to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.<sup>28</sup>

Whilst this has formed part of my own assessment, the Basic Conditions Statement sets out how the Plan helps to achieve sustainable development.

## **General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan**

The development plan consists of a number of documents. Of relevance to this examination is the Leeds Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review) adopted in 2019 and the Site Allocations Plan.

The Core Strategy was originally adopted in November 2014 and amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review (CSSR) which was adopted in September 2019. The Core Strategy (as amended by the CSSR) sets a revised housing requirement for the period

---

<sup>25</sup> NPPF para 7

<sup>26</sup> Ibid para 8

<sup>27</sup> Ibid

<sup>28</sup> Ibid para 9

2017 – 2033, amends policies on affordable housing, green space and sustainable construction and introduces new policies on housing space standards, accessible homes and electric vehicle charging points.

The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) was originally adopted on 10 July 2019, but was subject to a High Court challenge. Subsequently, the SAP was changed by the remittal process involving 37 policies of the SAP. The remitted elements of the SAP amended the adopted SAP 2019 by deleting 36 sites and returning them to the Green Belt, allocating one site for employment use. The SAP 2019 (as amended 2024) was adopted by LCC on 17 January 2024.

Whilst this has formed part of my own assessment, the Basic Conditions Statement contains a basic assessment of how the Plan policies generally conform to relevant strategic policies.

Where I have not specifically referred to a strategic policy, I have considered all strategic policies in my examination of the Plan.

### ***Emerging Plans at LCC level***

LCC has started work on a Leeds Local Plan 2040. At the time of writing, work progresses on the Leeds Local Plan 2040 with the next consultation anticipated in 2025.

There is no legal requirement to examine the Plan against emerging policy. However, PPG<sup>29</sup> advises that the reasoning and evidence informing the local plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which the Plan is tested. Furthermore Parish Councils and local planning authorities should aim to agree the relationship between policies in the emerging neighbourhood plan, the emerging local plan and the adopted development plan with appropriate regard to national policy and guidance.<sup>30</sup>

### **Retained European Union Obligations**

A neighbourhood plan must be compatible with retained European Union (EU) obligations. A number of retained EU obligations may be of relevance for these purposes including those obligations in respect of Strategic Environmental Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment, Habitats, Wild Birds, Waste, Air Quality and Water matters.

With reference to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) requirements, PPG<sup>31</sup> confirms that it is the responsibility of the local planning authority, in this case LCC, to ensure that all the regulations appropriate to the nature and scope of the draft neighbourhood plan have been met. It states that it is LCC who must decide whether the draft plan is compatible with relevant retained EU obligations when it takes the

---

<sup>29</sup> PPG para 009 ref id 41-009-20190509

<sup>30</sup> Ibid

<sup>31</sup> Ibid para 031 ref id 11-031-20150209

decision on whether the plan should proceed to referendum and when it takes the decision on whether or not to make the plan.

### ***Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment***

The provisions of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the 'SEA Regulations') concerning the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment are relevant. The purpose of the SEA Regulations, which transposed into domestic law Directive 2001/42/EC ('SEA Directive'), are to provide a high level of protection of the environment by incorporating environmental considerations into the process of preparing plans and programmes.

The provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations'), which transposed into domestic law Directive 92/43/EEC (the 'Habitats Directive'), are also of relevance to this examination.

Regulation 63 of the Habitats Regulations requires a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to be undertaken to determine whether a plan is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. The HRA assessment determines whether the Plan is likely to have significant effects on a European site considering the potential effects both of the Plan itself and in combination with other plans or projects. Where the potential for likely significant effects cannot be excluded, an appropriate assessment of the implications of the Plan for that European Site, in view of the Site's conservation objectives, must be carried out.

A Screening Report for both SEA and HRA dated June 2020 has been prepared by LCC. It concluded that the Plan was unlikely to have significant environmental effects. Consultation with the statutory bodies was undertaken. Responses from Historic England, the Environment Agency and Natural England concurred.

I have treated the Screening Report to be the statement of reasons that the PPG advises must be prepared and submitted with the neighbourhood plan proposal and made available to the independent examiner where it is determined that the plan is unlikely to have significant environmental effects.<sup>32</sup>

Taking account of the characteristics of the Plan, the information put forward and the characteristics of the areas most likely to be affected, I consider that retained EU obligations in respect of SEA have been satisfied.

Turning now to HRA, the Kirk Deighton Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is around 7km from the Plan area at its nearest point.

---

<sup>32</sup> PPG para 028 ref id 11-028-20150209

The Screening Report concludes that no likely significant effects are predicted, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Further assessment was not needed.

On 28 December 2018, the basic condition prescribed in Regulation 32 and Schedule 2 (Habitats) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) was substituted by a new basic condition brought into force by the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018 which provides that the making of the plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Habitats Regulations.

Given the distance from, the nature and characteristics of the European sites and the nature and contents of the Plan, I agree with the conclusion of the Screening Report and consider that the prescribed basic condition relating to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 is complied with.

### ***Conclusion on retained EU obligations***

National guidance establishes that the ultimate responsibility for determining whether a plan meets EU obligations lies with the local planning authority.<sup>33</sup> In undertaking work on SEA and HRA, LCC has considered the compatibility of the Plan in regard to retained EU obligations and does not raise any concerns in this regard. LCC will also review this again in reaching a view on whether the Plan can proceed to referendum following receipt of my report.

### **European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)**

The Basic Conditions Statement contains a brief statement in relation to human rights and equalities. Having regard to the Basic Conditions Statement, there is nothing in the Plan that leads me to conclude there is any breach or incompatibility with Convention rights.

## **6.0 Detailed comments on the Plan and its policies**

In this section I consider the Plan and its policies against the basic conditions. As a reminder, where modifications are recommended they appear in **bold text** and where I suggest specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in ***bold italics***.

The Plan is presented to a high standard with many photographs of the local area that give a strong sense of place. The Plan begins with helpful abbreviations and contents pages that lists the 10 policies as well as acknowledgement of the Steering Group Committee.

---

<sup>33</sup> PPG para 031 ref id 11-031-20150209

## 01 Introduction

This is a helpful introduction to the Plan that sets out the background and includes a useful diagram showing the neighbourhood planning process. It is clear that the Plan is based on a desire to address the concerns of the local community, but also the opportunities. It is based on, and builds on, a successful Village Design Statement.

The Plan area is shown on Plan Reference No 01 on page 6 of the Plan. Gateways are also shown on this map and partially obscure the Plan area boundary in places. For clarity and the avoidance of doubt, a map showing the Plan area boundary in its entirety should be included within the Plan document.

In addition, I am informed that the text contains a typo which should be corrected.

- **Include a map that shows the Plan area boundary in its entirety and unencumbered in the main Plan document and move Plan Reference No 01 to Appendix 02**
- **Correct Census figure of “75,500” in paragraph 1.2 on page 5 of the Plan to “751, 485”**

## 02 Thorner Past and Present

This is an interesting section that sets out the context for the Parish.

## 03 Our Vision

The vision statement is:

“Our vision is to maintain the character of Thorner as a distinctive rural community set in a special landscape setting, conserving its rich historic and architectural heritage and ensuring that new development reflects the qualities and characteristics that people value in the Parish.

Existing green spaces within the parish will be protected and retained for the benefit of the community, which will also benefit from enhanced pedestrian and cycle connectivity.”

The vision statement is supported by six objectives. All are articulated well and relate to development and use of land issues.

The objectives usefully appear before each policy. I noticed that some additional ones not shown in the list in this section appear on pages 12, 16, 18, 22, 24, 26 of the Plan. These should be added for completeness.

- **Add the additional objectives on pages 12, 16, 18, 22, 24 and 26 of the Plan to the objectives on page 10 of the Plan**

## 04 Policy Outline

This section has a helpful page that explains the status of the planning policies which follow. It refers to sustainable development and explains that each policy is accompanied by supporting text that sets out the context and evidence for each policy. The policies are set out in two themes; A Development and B Green Spaces.

### Policy A1 - Design

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.<sup>34</sup> Being clear about design expectations is essential for achieving this.<sup>35</sup>

It continues that neighbourhood planning groups can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of an area and explaining how this should be reflected in development.<sup>36</sup> It refers to design guides and codes to help provide a local framework for creating beautiful and distinctive places with a consistent and high quality standard of design.<sup>37</sup>

It continues that planning policies should ensure developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive, are sympathetic to local character and history whilst not preventing change or innovation, establish or maintain a strong sense of place, optimise site potential and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.<sup>38</sup>

The Thorner Village Design Statement Character Assessment (VDS) is an important document which identifies the styles of buildings and townscape in the village.

CSSR Policy P10 refers to design and states that new development, including alterations, should be based on a contextual analysis and deliver high quality inclusive design appropriate to its location, scale and function.

---

<sup>34</sup> NPPF para 131

<sup>35</sup> Ibid

<sup>36</sup> Ibid para 132

<sup>37</sup> Ibid para 133

<sup>38</sup> Ibid para 135



Thorner has a Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings. CSSR Policy P11 seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

CSSR Policy G9 seeks biodiversity improvements.

Policy A1 seeks to ensure that any new development uses the guiding principles in the VDS and respects the scale, design and materials of the public realm. It supports the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs). It refers to Building for a Healthy Life 2020, a new iteration of Building for Life 12 which is a design toolkit and Building with Nature, guidance on delivering good green infrastructure.

Policy A1 has regard to the NPPF and is a local expression of CSSR Policies P10 and P11 in particular using the excellent and detailed VDS. It will help to achieve sustainable development in Thorner. However, it needs to be made clearer that all the criteria apply.

There is a typo in the policy to correct. The supporting text refers to Appendix 10 which should be Appendix 9.

With these modifications, the policy will meet the basic conditions.

- **Correct “...he...” in the second bullet point of the policy to “...the...”**
- **Change the full stops at the end of each criterion in the policy to ; and add the word “and” at the end of the fourth bullet point in the policy**
- **Correct the reference to “Appendix 10” on page 12 to “Appendix 9”**

## **Policy A2 – Building Extensions**

The Plan explains that Thorner is a rural Parish in the Green Belt. A review of planning applications revealed that the most common type of application were householder and those affecting listed buildings. As a result, a policy specifically on extensions is likely to be much used and effective.

Policy A2, based on guidelines in the VDS, sets out four criteria aimed at ensuring that residential extensions should be ancillary to the host building, appropriate to the character of the street, use suitable materials and are compatible with local amenity considerations.

The policy could be made more robust with the addition of a reference to appearance as well as character and extending the amenity considerations specifically referred to.

In addition, it needs to be made clearer that all the criteria apply.

With these modifications, the policy will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF as detailed above, being a local expression of CSSR Policies P10 and P11 in particular and helping to achieve sustainable development.

- **Add the words “or appearance” after “...harm the character...” in the second bullet point of the policy**
- **Add the words “or otherwise harm living conditions” at the end of the last bullet point in the policy**
- **Change the full stops at the end of each criterion in the policy to ; and add the word “and” at the end of the third bullet point in the policy**

### **Policy A3 – Backland Development**

This policy resists backland developments unless they comply with the six criteria set out in the policy. The Plan explains that gardens make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the village as well as being important for biodiversity, help with flooding and climate change as well as air quality and the social well being and fabric of this vibrant village. Along Main Street, many of the traditional buildings have relatively narrow frontages but deep plots to the rear known as a burgage.

The Thorner Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan also stresses the importance of Thorner’s vulnerability to the subdivision of plots and the loss of natural and historic environment through infill housing and development.<sup>39</sup>

This policy has regard to the NPPF insofar as it sets out criteria to resist inappropriate development of gardens where this would cause harm to the distinctive character of the local area. It is a local expression of CSSR Policy P10 on design which specifically refers to the layout of development being appropriate to its context and spaces and CSSR Policy P11 on conservation. It will help to achieve sustainable development.

However, the language used in the policy could be more robust and it should be clearer that all criteria need to be met. The policy does not need to refer to LCC level policies as any relevant policies will be applied anyway and light pollution is subject to the next policy in the Plan. It also refers to UDP Policy H9 which has been superseded by CS policies and so this reference should be removed. With these modifications, the policy will meet the basic conditions.

- **Amend the policy to read:**

**“Backland Developments will not be supported *unless*:**

---

<sup>39</sup> Thorner Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan page 2

- *the original burgage plot, garden or croft alignment is retained;*
- *the vernacular appearance and the local character of development in the locality is not harmed;*
- *the resulting density of development in the surrounding area would be appropriate given the prevailing character and setting;*
- *smaller or affordable housing is provided;*
- *the development would enhance the landscape, biodiversity and visual amenity of the site through planting schemes and opportunities for wildlife, for example through tree planting, hedgerows and shrubs;*
- *it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that suitable access, parking and sustainable drainage can be provided; and*
- *the development conforms to Building with Nature standards where possible.”*

#### **Policy A4 – Light Pollution**

The NPPF indicates that policies should ensure new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.<sup>40</sup>

In so doing, the NPPF refers to limiting the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.<sup>41</sup>

Thorner is a village which does not have street lighting. This policy seeks to ensure that these aims of the NPPF is realised. It meets the basic conditions and no modifications are recommended.

#### **Policy A5 – Parking**

This policy seeks to ensure that satisfactory parking provision is made in new developments. The Plan explains that on-street parking is an issue given the nature of

---

<sup>40</sup> NPPF para 191

<sup>41</sup> Ibid

the roads. This also results in restricting access on footways. The lack of parking has resulted in some gardens being converted into parking areas.

The NPPF generally refers to the quality of parking, its convenience, accessibility, secure and safe parking and the enhancement of local areas through well designed and thought through provision. Two further criteria can be added to the policy to have better regard to the NPPF which supports plug-in and other ultra low emission vehicles in safe and accessible locations<sup>42</sup> alongside the provision of parking with surface permeability.

It also needs to be made clearer that all the criteria apply.

With these modifications, the policy will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, being in general conformity with CSSR Policy P10 which refers to parking and the need to design this in a positive manner which is integral to the scheme and CSSR Policy T2 that sets out accessibility requirements for new development. The policy will help to achieve sustainable development.

- **Add at the end of the first paragraph of the policy “and meet all of the following criteria:”**
- **Add two new criteria that read: “Parking areas are to provide maximum surface permeability.” and “Ensure suitable provision for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.”**

## Policy A6 - Flooding

In relation to meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change, the NPPF states that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future.<sup>43</sup> The planning system should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.<sup>44</sup>

It continues that plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures.<sup>45</sup>

CSSR Policy EN5 manages flood risk.

---

<sup>42</sup> NPPF para 116

<sup>43</sup> Ibid para 157

<sup>44</sup> Ibid

<sup>45</sup> Ibid para 158

This policy resists new development that would exacerbate the flood risk in the area. It then sets out three criteria including permeable surfaces and SuDs. This is in line with the NPPF which encourages new development to incorporate SuDs where appropriate.<sup>46</sup>

It meets the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, adding a local layer to CSSR Policy EN5 and helping to achieve sustainable development. No modifications are therefore recommended.

## **Policy B1 -Local Green Spaces**

The Plan proposes 13 areas as Local Green Space (LGS) including four which are designated as Green Space in the Local Plan. The proposed LGSs are shown on page 25 of the Plan and more detailed boundaries are shown in Appendix 02 of the Plan alongside further information about each proposed LGS.

The NPPF explains that LGSs are green areas of particular importance to local communities.<sup>47</sup>

The designation of LGSs should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services.<sup>48</sup> It is only possible to designate LGSs when a plan is prepared or updated and LGSs should be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.<sup>49</sup>

The NPPF sets out three criteria for green spaces.<sup>50</sup> These are that the green space should be in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves, be demonstrably special to the local community and hold a particular local significance and be local in character and not be an extensive tract of land. Further guidance about LGSs is given in PPG.

I saw the proposed areas on my site visit.

1. Thorner Cricket and Football Club is valued for its recreational use. The designation includes a pavilion building which should be removed. An amended plan sent in response to my questions of clarification should be substituted.
2. Thorner Tennis Club is valued for its recreational uses and green areas. The designation should ensure that the Village Hall does not form part of the designation. An amended plan sent in response to the questions of clarification should be substituted.

---

<sup>46</sup> NPPF paras 173, 175

<sup>47</sup> Ibid para 101

<sup>48</sup> Ibid

<sup>49</sup> Ibid

<sup>50</sup> Ibid para 102

3. Butts Garth is registered as a village green and is valued for its history which includes a late medieval cross base. Unfortunately the OS base in Appendix 02 showing the proposed space seemed to be to highlight the nearby allotments. I am however satisfied that the aerial photograph map base and Plan Reference No 04 shows the intended area and that this would be clear to any interested parties. The Appendix should be corrected.
4. Kirkfield Avenue is comprised of five small spaces that together add to the character of the area and provide some leisure and recreation space.
5. Thorner Bottoms Wood is an area of woodland valued for its flora and fauna.
6. Saw Wood is adjacent to Kiddal Wood and is valued for its woodland habitat.
7. Kidhirst Wood (part) is valued for the wood and lake and flora and fauna.
8. Kiddall Wood is valued for its woodland habitat.
9. Norwood Bottoms Wood SSSI (part) is valued for its biodiversity and habitat. There are no details for this LGS in Appendix 02 and these should be added for completeness and consistency to match the format of the other LGSs listed.
10. Millenium Green and the next three proposed LGSs are also designated as Green Space in the Local Plan. This picturesque space is located in the heart of the village and is a focus for many village activities as well as its proximity to the Church and School.
11. St Peter's Churchyard is valued for its historic connections and as a green oasis in the heart of the village as well as an area of tranquility. This should be referred to consistently throughout the Plan.
12. Bowling Green is valued as a popular recreational space. Buildings should be removed from the proposed designation. An amended plan sent in response to the questions of clarification should be substituted.
13. School Grounds are valued for their recreational purpose. Buildings and non-green spaces such as car parks should be removed from the proposed designation. An amended plan sent in response to the questions of clarification should be substituted.

As the plans for Thorner Cricket and Football Club, Thorner Tennis Club, Butts Garth, the Bowling Green and the School Grounds have been corrected or amended, I have considered the need for further consultation. I have concluded this is not necessary given that Butts Garth is a correction and the other retained areas are smaller than those previously consulted upon and therefore no unfairness to any interested party would arise.

In my view, all of the proposed LGSs meet the criteria in the NPPF satisfactorily. The proposed LGSs are demonstrably important to the local community, are capable of enduring beyond the Plan period, meet the criteria in paragraph 102 of the NPPF and their designation is consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services given other policies in the development plan and this Plan.

I have also considered whether there is any additional benefit to be gained by the designation for sites located in the Green Belt or falling within other designations such as a Conservation Area. I consider that there is additional local benefit to be gained by identifying those areas of particular importance to the community.

I also note that CSSR Policy G6 sets the principle of protecting green space from development though it acknowledges there may be cases where the loss of green space to development would allow wider planning benefits to be realised.

The SAP then identifies some green spaces above a 0.2 hectare threshold. As referred to above, four of the proposed LGSs are identified in the SAP. The designations are different and serve different purposes. The designation of these green spaces as LGSs will take precedence over their SAP designation.

Turning now to the wording of the policy, it designates the LGSs and indicates how development proposals will be managed. The NPPF is clear that policies for managing development within a LGS should be consistent with those for Green Belts.<sup>51</sup> I consider the policy should simply refer to this in order to have regard to the NPPF. A modification is therefore recommended.

With these modifications, the policy will meet the basic conditions.

The supporting text refers to paragraph 100 of the NPPF which should be updated and there is a missing word.

- **Substitute the amended plans sent in response to my questions of clarification for the LGSs Thorner Cricket and Football Club; Thorner Tennis Club; Bowling Green and School Grounds**
- **Correct Appendix 02 map base for Butts Garth LGS**
- **Add Norwood Bottoms Wood SSSI details to Appendix 02**
- **Refer to St Peter's Churchyard consistently throughout the Plan including in the policy itself and Appendix 02**

---

<sup>51</sup> NPPF para 103

- **Amend the first paragraph of the policy to read: “the following areas are designated as Local Green Space (LGS) where development *will be managed in accordance with national policy on Green Belts:*”**
- **Update the reference to “paragraph 100” of the NPPF on page 24 of the Plan to “paragraph 106”**
- **Amend the third bullet point objective on page 24 to “Sites of Special *Scientific Interest*”**
- **Consequential amendments will be needed**

## Policy B2 - Trees

The Plan explains the importance of trees in the Parish. Policy B2 seeks to ensure that trees are appropriately protected or replaced where necessary.

The NPPF is clear that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment including through the recognition of the intrinsic character of the countryside and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services of trees and woodland.<sup>52</sup>

The NPPF recognises that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change.<sup>53</sup> Although this refers to urban environments, the principle also must apply to rural areas.

CSSR Policy G2 resists the loss of ancient woodland and veteran trees, but also seeks to increase native and appropriate tree cover in the District.

The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan also highlights the importance of trees in the area.

The policy wording could be more robust. It also suggests a replacement rate above the LP, but does not specify what this might be. Therefore a modification is made to amend the policy. With this modification, the policy will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, be a local expression the CSSR and help to achieve sustainable development.

The supporting text should be updated with regard to a map reference.

---

<sup>52</sup> NPPF para 180

<sup>53</sup> *ibid* para 136



- **Amend Policy B2 to read:**

**“New development should *retain* trees of good arboricultural and/or amenity value. British Standards Classification suggest trees of Category C and above meet this need.**

**Development will not be supported where trees are to be *removed* or replaced without good reason *essential to the overall scheme*.**

**If *tree* removal is demonstrated to be necessary, trees should be replaced in accordance with the latest Local Plan Policy and, *where* possible, a tree replacement rate the same or better than the Local Plan *requirement*.**

**The integration of existing trees and hedgerows into development proposals will be supported.”**

- **Update “(Refer to the map on page 5 for Gateways....)” at the bottom of page 28 to “(Refer to the map on page 6...)”**

### **Policy B3 - Views**

The NPPF states that policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment including through the protection of valued landscapes and sites of biodiversity value, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and, minimising impacts on, and providing net gains for, biodiversity.<sup>54</sup>

CSSR Policy P10 specifically refers to views and the need to ensure development protects and enhances them.

CSSR Policy P12 seeks to conserve and enhance the character, quality and biodiversity of townscapes and landscapes including their historical and cultural significance.

The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan also highlights the importance of views identifying key views and vistas pertinent to the Conservation Area.

Policy B3 identifies a number of views and four gateways. The views are shown on page 29 of the Plan and more information about each view is given in Appendix 04. The gateways are identified in Appendix 02.

There is little doubt that the village and surrounding area is of distinctive quality. The village is settled in undulating farmland of ridge and valley. Views – both short and long distance - abound.

---

<sup>54</sup> NPPF para 180

In response to a query about the accuracy of the viewpoints, a revised map and amended Appendix 04 has helpfully been provided. The amended Appendix more accurately pinpoints each viewpoint and the description of each view, and in some cases, the photograph has been changed. I consider that the amended map and Appendix should be substituted in the interests of clarity.

I have considered each of the views at my site visit. For those views I was not able to see, I was able to understand the extent and context of the 17 views. The identification of the views seems to me to be based on work in the Conservation Area Appraisal Management Plan and the VDS. Many of the views shown on the amended map submitted as part of the Parish Council's response to my queries are the same or very similar to those identified in one or other or both of those two documents.

I consider all of the views have been appropriately identified apart from Views 8 and 9. These two views are from locations outside the Plan area and as the Plan can only cover the Plan area, it is not possible to include these views.

With regard to the gateways, all four are based on work in the VDS.

I consider the policy should refer to Appendix 04 as well as the map.

With these modifications, the policy will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, adding a local layer of detail to CSSR Policies P10 and P12 and helping to achieve sustainable development.

There are some modifications to the supporting text and Appendix 02. In the interests of clarity given these modifications, I consider it would be preferable for a new, separate appendix on the gateways be created with the inclusion of the four photographs and the Plan Reference No 01 moved to the same location. Consequential amendments will also be needed.

- **Substitute the map (Plan Reference 02) and the amended Appendix 04 sent on 27 September 2024 for the existing Plan Reference 02 found on pages 29 and 46 of the Plan and the existing Appendix 04 on page 47 of the Plan**
- **Delete Views 8 and 9**
- **Amend the first bullet point of the policy to read: *"To conserve the landscape and rural character and setting of the Neighbourhood Plan Area, development proposals shall, where appropriate, demonstrate how they will ensure that there is no detrimental impact on the key features and attributes of the views listed below and identified on Plan Reference 02 and in Appendix 04:***

**[add list of the 15 retained views using the same names as in the amended Appendix 04]**

- **Amend the words towards the bottom of page 28 of the Plan to “(Refer to the map in Appendix 02)”**
- **Create a new [separate] appendix for the gateways information**
- **Move Plan Reference No 01 on page 6 of the Plan to Appendix 02 or new appendix**

## **Policy B4 – Pedestrian and Cycle Links**

The NPPF states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed and opportunities to change transport usage and to promote walking and cycling are pursued.<sup>55</sup> It encourages patterns of growth to be managed to support the objective of sustainable transport.

The NPPF also seeks to protect and enhance public rights of way.<sup>56</sup>

I consider the policy meets the basic conditions by having regard to national policy, being in general conformity with, and a local expression of, CSSR Policies T1 and T2 which support sustainable travel in principle and helping to achieve sustainable development. No modifications are therefore recommended.

## **05 Implementation**

This is an excellent section which sets out how the Plan will be used. It refers to annual monitoring by the Parish Council which is not currently mandatory, but I consider this is good practice and so welcome this intent.

This section of the Plan refers to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It sets out a list of priorities for CIL monies.

This section includes the non-planning related community actions which are further identified in Appendix 01.

## **Appendices**

There are a number of appendices and consideration could now be given to whether they all remain necessary at this stage of the process.

---

<sup>55</sup> NPPF para 104

<sup>56</sup> Ibid para 100

Appendix 01 details Community Projects.

Appendix 02 details the LGSs and the Gateways subject of Policies B1 and B3 respectively.

Appendix 03 refers to trees and Policy B2.

Appendix 04 contains details about the views referred to in Policy B3. The appendix refers to Policy B4 so this should be corrected.

Appendix 05 contains information on parking in support of policy A5.

Appendix 06 contains information in support of Policy A6. The map on page 57 should be future-proofed.

Appendix 07 details the consultation carried out.

Appendix 08 is Census data.

Appendix 09 is the Character Assessment taken from the VDS.

Appendix 10 contains details of listed buildings and should be future-proofed.

Appendix 11 is a map of rights of way and it would be preferable to retitle the map public rights of way. This appendix should again be future-proofed.

Appendix 12 contains links to plans. It also has a comment reply sheet which should now be removed in the interests of clarity.

- **Correct the reference to “Policy B4” in Appendix 04 to “Policy B3”**
- **Add a sentence to Appendix 06 which reads: “*Up to date information on flooding should be sought from the Environment Agency or another reliable source.*”**
- **Add a sentence to Appendix 10 which reads: “*Up to date information on listed buildings and other heritage assets should be sought from Historic England or another reliable source.*”**
- **Replace the title “Public Footpath Plan” in Appendix 11 with “*Public Rights of Way*”**
- **Add a sentence to Appendix 11 which reads: “*Up to date information about public rights of way should be sought from Leeds City Council or another reliable source.*”**
- **Delete the comment reply sheet from page 71 of the Plan**

## 7.0 Conclusions and recommendations

I am satisfied that the Thorner Neighbourhood Development Plan, subject to the modifications I have recommended, meets the basic conditions and the other statutory requirements outlined earlier in this report.

I am therefore pleased to recommend to Leeds City Council that, subject to the modifications proposed in this report, the Thorner Neighbourhood Development Plan can proceed to a referendum.

Following on from that, I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Neighbourhood Plan area. I see no reason to alter or extend the Plan area for the purpose of holding a referendum and no representations have been made that would lead me to reach a different conclusion.

I therefore consider that the Thorner Neighbourhood Development Plan should proceed to a referendum based on the Thorner Neighbourhood Plan area as approved by Leeds City Council on 31 January 2013.

*Ann Skippers* MRTPI

Ann Skippers Planning  
28 November 2024

## Appendix 1 List of key documents specific to this examination

Thorner Neighbourhood Plan 2021 – 2033 Final Consultation April 2024

Basic Conditions Statement July 2023

Consultation Statement July 2023

Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report June 2020 (LCC)

Thorner Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2009 (LCC)

Core Strategy amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) adopted November 2014, amendments adopted September 2019

Site Allocations Plan as amended 2024 Section 1: Introduction and Section 2: Retail, Housing, Employment and Green Space Overview adopted July 2019, amendments adopted 17 January 2024

Site Allocations Plan as amended 2024 Section 3: Proposals for the 11 Housing Market Characteristic Areas 6. Outer North East adopted July 2019, amendments adopted 17 January 2024

Other documents on the Parish Council website [www.thorner-parish-council.org.uk](http://www.thorner-parish-council.org.uk)

**List ends**

## Appendix 2 Questions of clarification from the examiner

### Thorner Neighbourhood Plan Examination

#### Questions of clarification from the Examiner to the Parish Council and LCC

Having completed my initial review of the Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan), I would be grateful if both Councils (as appropriate) could kindly assist me as appropriate in answering the following questions which either relate to matters of fact or are areas in which I seek clarification or further information. Please do not send or direct me to evidence that is not already publicly available.

**1. Policy B1: Local Green Spaces:**

- a. The proposed LGSs should not include any buildings or hard surfaces within the designated area. Please could revised maps be provided for LGSs 01 (Thorner Cricket and Football Club) (i.e. ensure the pavilion building is excluded from the proposed LGS); 02 (Tennis Club and Environs)(i.e. ensure tennis courts and village hall are excluded); 10 (Bowling Green).
- b. What are the light(er) green areas shown on LGSs 02 (Tennis Club and Environs) and 11 (School Grounds); is this a simple production issue and it is the intention that these areas are included in the proposed LGS designations?
- c. LGS 03 Butts Garth; the map shows an allotment area, but the photograph outlines the Village Green and the text seems to refer to the Village Green? What is the intention please?

- 2. Policy B3: Views.** I found it difficult to relate the viewpoints on the Appendix 04 map at my visit to the views shown in the accompanying photographs. Whilst I appreciate the map indicates the location of the viewpoints are approximate, I would like them to be accurate and relate to, and reflect, the photographs. Please could each arrow location be carefully checked on the map and plotted accurately (as necessary) to reflect the photographs in the appendix? It may be useful to use a viewpoint symbol on the map rather than a directional arrow which would give a wider view?)

- 3.** Please provide me with a copy of or link to the Thorner Conservation Area Appraisal.

It may be the case that on receipt of your anticipated assistance on these matters that I may need to ask for further clarification or that further queries will occur as the examination progresses. These queries are raised without prejudice to the outcome of the examination. Where I have invited changes to be suggested, this is entirely without prejudice to my consideration of the issue.

Please note that this list of clarification questions is a public document and that your answers will also be in the public domain. Both my questions and your responses should be placed on the Councils' websites as appropriate.

With many thanks,  
Ann Skippers MRTPI  
Independent Examiner  
16 September 2024