

**HEALTHCHECK REPORT**  
**SHINFIELD PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

**Paul McCreery**  
**PMC Planning**  
**9 April 2015**

## Part 1 - Process

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments
1.1	Have the necessary statutory requirements been met in terms of the designation of the neighbourhood area?	Neighbourhood Area Application Decision Notice, dated 22 <sup>nd</sup> November 2012.	Yes. The necessary statutory requirements have been met in terms of the designation of the neighbourhood area.
1.2	If the area does not have a parish council, have the necessary statutory requirements been met in terms of the designation of the neighbourhood forum?	Not applicable.	As the area does have a parish council the question of a neighbourhood forum does not arise.
1.3	Has the plan been the subject of appropriate pre-submission consultation and publicity, as set out in the legislation or is this underway?	WBC email dated 17 <sup>th</sup> March 2015.	<p>It is understood that the pre-submission consultation has yet to be undertaken, pending the results of this health check. Regulation 14(b) requires the qualifying body to consider the list of consultation bodies and consult with those which it considers appropriate.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendation 1.</u></b></p> <p><b>The qualifying body should record that it has reviewed the list of consultation bodies and that it has consulted with those that it considers appropriate.</b></p>

1.4	Has there been a programme of community engagement proportionate to the scale and complexity of the plan?	Shinfield Plan – Consultation Statement (contained within Shinfield Plan Basic Conditions Statement – draft of 16 <sup>th</sup> January 2015).	The consultation statement records the programme of community engagement which is clearly proportionate to the scale and complexity of the plan.
1.5	Are arrangements in place for an independent examiner to be appointed?	WBC email dated 17 <sup>th</sup> march 2015.	The arrangements for the appointment of an independent examiner will be put in place following the results of this health check.
1.6	Are discussions taking place with the electoral services team on holding the referendum?	WBC email dated 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2015.	Discussions are taking place for the holding of the referendum and a firm timetable will be produced following the result of this health check.
1.7	Is there a clear project plan to bring the plan into force and does it take account of local authority committee cycles.	WBC email dated 17 <sup>th</sup> March 2015.	A firm timetable for bringing the plan into force will be produced following the results of this health check.
1.8	Has an SEA screening	Planning Practice Guidance at paragraph 028	<b><u>Recommendation 2.</u></b>

1.9	<p>been carried out by the LPA?</p> <p>Has an HRA screening been carried out by the LPA?</p>	<p>states:- “To decide whether a draft neighbourhood plan might have significant environmental effects, it must be assessed (screened) at an early stage of the plan’s preparation according to the requirements set out in regulation 9 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. These include a requirement to consult the environmental assessment consultation bodies.” A “Draft Determination Statement on the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Shinfield Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan” is in place. That document also appears to incorporate HRA screening.</p>	<p><b>The draft SEA and HRA screening procedures should be finalised.</b></p>

**Part 2 – Content**

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments
2.1	Are policies appropriately justified with a clear rationale?	Shinfield Plan (version of 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2015) Plan and Appendices.	<p>Appendix B is described as “Maps of the Parish”. Appendix B currently only contains one plan, an “Illustrative Master Plan Wider Context” prepared by Barton Wilmore. The justification for the policies would be improved if more plans could be included, for example “Shinfield Neighbourhood Area” plan prepared for the Area Application and possibly a constraints and opportunities plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 3</b></p> <p><b>Consideration should be given to including more plans to better illustrate the Neighbourhood Plan. These could include the “Neighbourhood Area” plan which shows the whole parish and possibly a constraints and opportunities plan to show constraints such as areas of excessive noise, flood plains, woodland, important hedgerows and water features.</b></p>
2.2	Is it clear which parts of the draft plan form the ‘neighbourhood plan	Shinfield Plan. Version of 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2015.	It appears that the entire Plan (pages 1 to 27) comprise the Neighbourhood Plan and the Basic Conditions Statement and Appendices do not. The plan would be improved if

	proposal' (i.e. the neighbourhood <i>development plan</i> ) under the Localism Act, subject to the independent examination, and which parts do not form part of the 'plan proposal', and would not be tested by the independent examination?		<p>this could be explicitly stated at the outset.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendation 4</u></b></p> <p><b>The plan should contain a statement making it clear which parts form the 'Neighbourhood Plan proposal' and which parts are supporting information.</b></p>
2.3	Are there any obvious conflicts with the NPPF?	Shinfield Plan, Version of 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2015.	There are conflicts with NPPF, see 2.7 below.
2.4	Is there a clear explanation of the ways the plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development?	Shinfield Plan, Version of 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2015.	<p>Section 3 of the Basic Conditions Statement – Achievement of Sustainable Development – states “The Shinfield Plan seeks to achieve the principles of sustainable development through policy 2 (Sustainable Development). This statement is incorrect as policy 2 is entitled “General Design Principles”. Policy 3 is entitled “Sustainable Development”.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 5</b>  <b>Redraft section 3 of the Basic Conditions Statement to refer to Policy 3 not Policy2.</b></p> <p>Apart from this minor error, the plan does explain how it will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p>
2.5	Are there any issues around compatibility with human rights or EU obligations?	Shinfield Plan, Version of 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2015.	<p><b>Recommendation 6 (a)</b></p> <p><b>Section 5 of the Basic Conditions Statement should be deleted and replaced with a statement that the proposed</b></p>

			<p><b>plan does not breach and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation 6(b)</b></p> <p><b>The qualifying body, in consultation with the LPA should consider what steps should be taken for the NP to record compliance with the basic conditions as set out in Planning Practice Guidance Paragraphs 078 and 079.</b></p>
2.6	Does the plan avoid dealing with excluded development including nationally significant infrastructure, waste and minerals?	Shinfield Plan version of 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2015.	Yes. The Plan avoids dealing with excluded development including nationally significant infrastructure, waste and minerals.
2.7	Is there consensus between the local planning authority and the qualifying body over whether the plan meets	WBC email of 18 <sup>th</sup> March 2015.	Paragraph 184 of the NPPF states that 'Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.' Not only would the proposed parking policy

<p>the basic conditions including conformity with strategic development plan policy and, if not, what are the areas of disagreement?</p>		<p>undermine the strategic borough-wide policy, but it could also result in fewer dwellings (ie less development) than is set out in the Local Plan as the allocated sites would deliver fewer dwellings per site as an increase in the parking requirements would result in an increase in the land required per dwelling.</p> <p>Bullet 11 in paragraph 17 of the NPPF identifies the core planning principles which should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The 11<sup>th</sup> principle is to 'actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable'. Requiring such a high level of car parking spaces be provided per dwelling undermines this key planning principle.</p> <p>CC07 of the MDD states that development planning permission will only be granted where the proposal demonstrates how the proposed parking provision meets the standards set out in Appendix 2 of the MDD and that the new scheme retains an appropriate overall level of off-street parking. It further explains that the parking requirements are designed to acknowledge differences between development proposals and the transport facilities and infrastructure serving different areas, as well as the role of smarter choices and demand management measures in promoting sustainable travel patterns. The parking requirements for dwelling houses found in Appendix 2 are based on accessibility and the character of the area and are divided into three categories: urban, town, and fringe and village. Shinfield Parish contains both town and fringe and village classifications. Paragraph 2.3.4 in the Parking Standards Study Report which underpins Wokingham's borough-wide parking</p>
--	--	--

			<p>policy states that most new housing in the borough is located in identified Strategic Development Locations (SDLs) which will be supported by improvements in transport infrastructure and services which will be designed to encourage more sustainable travel patterns. 'The provision of parking is an important element in the overall design of these SDLs, as parking is a major factor in influencing travel. A careful balance needs to be achieved between allowing Wokingham residents to own cars, whilst encouraging use of alternative modes of travel and not allowing car parking to dominate the urban landscape.' Because of these reasons, Wokingham Borough's parking policy is a strategic policy for the borough. The proposed parking policy in the neighbourhood plan would both undermine this policy and is not in general conformity with the borough's strategic policy.</p> <p>The proposed parking policy has the potential to negatively impact the Borough's housing supply.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendation 7.</u></b></p> <p><b>The Neighbourhood Plan should be re-drafted to delete the new parking policy in preference for a statement that the Neighbourhood Plan complies with the development plan in this respect, and all necessary consequential changes to the plan should be made to reflect this development plan compliance.</b></p>
2.8	Are there any obvious errors in the plan?		<p>Paragraph 7.18.6 (page 9) states that the location of the SANG's are shown on the maps. These maps have yet to be prepared and it may be possible to show the location of the SANG's on a new Constraints Plan.</p> <p>The Illustrative Master Plan Wider Context is a plan</p>

			<p>prepared by Barton Wilmore. Subject to copyright considerations it may be better for the plan to be presented as a local authority produced document. Clarity of the plan would be improved if it could include a key or legend. The plan could possibly be produced as a detached item on A3 sized paper to be read separately from the text.</p> <p>Appendix J “Environmental Issues” includes a List entitled “Non land-use planning issues of concern to residents”. Some of these are land use planning issues - such as preservation of as much green open space as possible. This list could be re-titled “Environmental issues of concern to residents”.</p> <p>Appendix L is entitled “Parish Council wish list items”. This could be retitled “Parish Council community objectives”.</p>
2.9	Are the plan’s policies clear and unambiguous and do they reflect the community’s aspirations?	Shinfield Version of 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2015.	Subject to the above comments, the plan’s policies are clear and they do reflect the community’s aspirations.

--	--	--	--