

Section Title 12.3 Broughton
Number of responses 9
Summary of main points Total number of Objections - 2 Total number of Support - 1 Total number of neither Object nor Support - 6 <u>Statutory Consultees</u> <u>Natural England</u> Support for development principles and suggest they remain after the Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted. (id.395) Support for Policy BRT01 (g), which refers to the inclusion of frequent areas of attractive open spaces between developments. (id.395) Consideration of how open spaces may be connected throughout Broughton is advised. (id.395) Support for BRT01 h). (id.395) The SSP2 could specify a local policy in relation to vulnerable and declining species in those areas covered by the GI strategies. (id.395) <u>Other Consultees</u> <u>Development Principles</u> Conflict within the development principles between e) and m) in relation to density of new properties. (id.17) The open space referred to in criterion i) has been built and therefore irrelevant. (id.17) Criterion o) is unrealistic given that most of the High Street has been developed into residential units. (id.17) Policy BRT01 should be removed if the Neighbourhood Plan is made. (id.495) Objection to Policy BRT01. (id.495) <u>Housing Allocations</u> Site RA/127 represents a logical infill opportunity. (id.564) Objection to the removal of site RA/127. (id.564)

Objection to Policy BRT02 – Meadow Close site allocation. **(id.495)**

Clarification is required in relation to the scale of the proposed allocation. **(id.495)**

The site assessment for site RA/096 should be changed in relation to cultural heritage. **(id.495)**

Housing Delivery/Requirements

The proposed approach to housing delivery in the rural area would fail to meet the needs of the area. **(id.451)**

The dwelling rates in the Neighbourhood Plan and Table 12 are inadequate. **(id.454)**

There is an imbalance between the housing that has been provided in Broughton and the needs of the village. **(id.454)**

Broughton has the capacity to accommodate a far greater level of growth because of the existing facilities/services. **(id.454)**

Higher levels of housing should be proposed for Broughton. **(id.539)**

A housing requirement for the Broughton Neighbourhood Area should be set to reflect the Category A status of the village. **(id.539)**

Support for the strategy to direct development towards more sustainable settlements, although this not being achieved in Broughton. **(id.539)**

Support for the approach to development in Broughton in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan in the event that the Neighbourhood Plan is not made. **(id.495)**

Support for the identification of Broughton as a Category A village. **(id.495)**

Objection to a statement page 94 of the Housing Allocations Background Paper (May 2018). **(id.495)**

Neighbourhood Plan

The site in the Neighbourhood Plan will make little contribution to the Borough's Rural Area requirement, in a village that is considered to be one of the most sustainable in the Rural Area. **(id.539)**

The Neighbourhood Plan has not been fairly tested against the strategic needs of the borough. **(id.564)**

The strategic policies that Neighbourhood Plans are expected to conform to should be defined. **(id.482)**

Settlement Boundary

The settlement boundary excludes many areas of developable land. **(id.454)**

The village boundary is defined to support growth as a Category A village but restricts it by leaving limited sites for future development. **(id.454)**

Support for the proposed amendments to the settlement boundary. **(id.564)**

Promotion of additional sites

Promotion of an additional site for consideration, at Land to the Rear of 18-20 Glebe Avenue. **(id.451), (id.454), (id.456)**

Request to include Land to the Rear of 18-20 Glebe Avenue to be included within the settlement boundary. **(id.451), (id.454), (id.456)**

Promotion of additional site for consideration as allocation, (RA/127) The Paddock, Meadow Close. **(id.564)**

Site RA/096 'Land West of Cransley Hill and Darlow Close' should be reconsidered as a potential housing allocation. **(id.495)**

Implications of New National Planning Policy Framework

Refer to this section in the 'Rural Area' chapter summary sheet.

Summary of officer comments

A majority of the comments received for Broughton have mentioned the scale of the proposed development in the SSP2 and the Neighbourhood Plan is not proportionate to the size of the village.

With regards to comments that request for the reconsideration of previously discounted sites, these sites have been assessed and their suitability has been considered. This has resulted in one site remaining for consideration RA/127, however given that the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan has been 'made', policies that relate to site allocations have been removed from the SSP2.

Those sites which have yet to be considered and assessed as part of the SSP2 process again will not be considered further through the SSP2 given the status of the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan has been inspected by an independent examiner and has been deemed to be sound in accordance with the strategic policies in the JCS and more generally, the NPPF.

The purpose of settlement boundaries are to make a clear distinction between the open countryside and the urban form of settlements, The principles used

to define the settlement boundaries in the SSP2 have evolved since 2005 and now the current principles provide a clear methodology and rationale to this process. This allows the protection of open countryside and the growth of settlements in suitable locations.

Policy BRT01 will be removed from the Plan following the adoption of the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan.

Next steps

- Prepare response to address rural housing delivery
- Remove Policy BRT01 (Broughton Development Principles)