

## Changes to Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan for Referendum

The following summarises the main changes to the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan from that used in the WBC consultation to the version in the Referendum.

Text in black is from the inspector. There is very little if any scope to alter his position.

Text in red shows our response to the recommended changes.

Text in blue shows WBC's response to our proposed wording.

Recommended modification 1: (pages 6 and 17)  
in Section 3.2 delete the fourth and fifth strategic aims and objectives and insert "to promote locally specific policies to be taken into account by decision makers in determining planning applications and appeals."

delete Section 6.4

Changed exactly as required

Agreed

Recommended modification 2: (page 13)

In Policy VI

delete part (a) and insert "Proposals that will result in significant amounts of vehicular movements must demonstrate that the proposal will not severely adversely affect highway safety."

First part exactly as required.

Agreed

delete part (b) which should be transferred to supporting text

Second part, policy deleted

Agree with the deletion of (b)

and "The Forum will work with WBC to ensure that it informs the Forum of proposals, of which it is aware, for adjoining planning areas which might adversely affect road safety and traffic flows through Pyrford." Added to supporting text.

A suitable position for the text contained in (b) to be transferred to would be at the end of the paragraph that begins with...

"The Forum is aware that planning proposals outside their direct area..."

You will note that the wording of (b) has been amended slightly however the intent remains.

The paragraph now reads :

The Forum is aware that planning proposals outside their direct area may adversely impact highway safety and lead to increased congestion. It is appreciated that WBC does not control development applications in adjoining boroughs but can and does comment, through a 'duty to co-operate' where it appears that there could be adverse effects upon traffic both in and through Pyrford. Woking Borough Council should where appropriate and reasonable notify the Forum of proposals outside the

Neighbourhood Area and in adjoining neighbouring authorities of which it is aware, which might adversely affect road safety and traffic flows through Pyrford.

Recommended modification 3: (page 21)

In Policy BE1 c)

delete “maintain” and insert “seek to maintain reasonable”

after “screens” insert “where practicable”

replace “unique” with “important”

delete the sentence commencing “If solar”

Changed exactly as required

Agreed

Recommended modification 4: (page 23)

Replace Policy BE 2 with “Development proposals must demonstrate that they will not result in on-road parking to the detriment of highway safety or adverse impact on the character of the area”

Changed exactly as required

Agreed

Recommended modification 5: (page 24)

In Policy BE3 replace the final sentence with “All development proposals should include facilities for waste bins to be concealed from publically accessible locations.”

Changed exactly as required

Agreed

Recommended modification 6: (pages 25 – 27)

In Policy OS1

delete “permitted” and insert “supported”

delete “within the Pyrford Neighbourhood Area”

and delete the final paragraph of Section 8.1.2

First 2 items changed exactly as required.

Agreed

Changed text above map 4 from “The escarpment is a very distinctive feature of the area and the views, to and from it, are outlined below in Map 4. to “The escarpment is a very distinctive feature of the area and is outlined in Map 4.

Agree with: “The escarpment is a very distinctive feature of the area and is outlined in Map 4.

Also moved 2nd paragraph on page 27 beginning “The character of this area is a priority concern ...” to above Map 4.

Agree (formatting change- not required by Examiner)

Removed “Pyrford” from title of Map 4 and key to green line on map.

Agree (not required by the Examiner)

Recommended modification 7: (page 29)

Replace Policy OS3 with “Proposals that impact on the character of a right of way should be accompanied by an assessment of the effect of the proposal in this

respect, and development that would cause significant harm will not be supported.”

Changed exactly as required

Agreed

Recommended modification 8: pages (30 – 32)

In Policy OS 4

replace (a) with “Development within Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) in Map 6 will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that development would not have an adverse impact to the integrity of the nature conservation interest that cannot be mitigated.”

replace (b) with “To be supported development proposals must demonstrate they will not result in a net loss of bird nesting habitat for declining species or nest loyal species.”

the examples referred to in (b) should be transferred to the text supporting the policy

delete “permitted” and insert “supported”

First, second, and 4th items changed exactly as required.

Agreed

Table 2 has been moved to follow the 2nd paragraph after Map 6 on page 32

Agreed (formatting change- not required by Examiner)

...and the heading” Birds of conservation known to be present in Pyrford include:” has been changed to “Birds of conservation concern known to be present in Pyrford include those in Table 2.”

Agreed, but would it be more accurate and consistent to title Table 2 ‘Birds of conservation concern known to be present in Pyrford’ rather than ‘Endangered birds...’- as the term ‘endangered’ is not used in the source data from rspb

The original text from OS4 (b) suitably modified has been added to the 3rd paragraph and reads “In support of Policy OS 4(b) it is recommended that efforts should be made to retain essential bird habitats such as hedgerows, mature or veteran trees, standing dead wood, ponds, woodlands and spinneys encompassed by proposed developments. Where nest loyal species such as swift are affected by a development suitable alternative nesting habitat should be provided. Swift bricks, for example, should be included in new buildings where known nests will be lost as a result of development.”

Agree, however there is no need for the first part since it is the policy justification for OS4. It is suggested that the insertion below be made at the end of the sentence that begins ‘Birds provide a source...’ This now reads.

Birds provide a source of enjoyment to many residents of the area and, where it is possible, they would like to retain and enhance breeding populations. Efforts should be made to retain essential bird habitats such as hedgerows, mature or veteran trees, standing dead wood, ponds, woodlands and spinneys encompassed by proposed developments. Where nest loyal species such as swift are affected by a development suitable alternative nesting habitat should be provided. Swift bricks, for example, should be included in new buildings where known nests will be lost as a

result of development.

Recommended modification 9: (pages 33/34)

In Policy OS 5 delete “permitted” and insert “supported”

Changed exactly as required

Note that OS5 has moved from page 33 to page 34.

Agreed

Delete “in keeping with the character of the area” and insert “significantly represented in the Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland areas defined in Map 9 below”

Changed exactly as required

Agreed

Recommended modification 10: (page 37)

In Policy SCS 1

delete “of, or harm to,” and insert “, or loss of a significant part of,”

delete “provided plans are in accordance with other policies in this development plan and are consistent with WBC Core Strategy. Proposals should” and insert “where they”

Changed exactly as required

Agreed

Recommended modification 11: (page 39)

Replace Policy SCS 2 with “New recreation facilities for children will be supported. To be supported major development proposals (as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) must include recreation facilities appropriate for use by children”

Changed exactly as required

Agreed

Recommended modification 12: (page 40)

Replace Policy SCS 3 with “Given the older demographic, the provision of new healthcare and wellbeing facilities, including the provision of retirement housing, will be supported”

Changed exactly as required

Agreed

136. I have also made a recommendation for modification of the Neighbourhood Plan in the Annex below.

Annex: Minor Corrections to the Neighbourhood Plan

I am able to recommend modification of the Neighbourhood Plan in order to correct errors.

41 The Neighbourhood Plan has been produced to a very high standard and appears to be free from errors that are typographical in nature. There are however adjustments necessary to correct errors of fact or to achieve greater clarity as follows:

delete “and the views, to and from it, are outlined below in Map 4” from section 8.1.2

Changed exactly as required (page 26)

Agreed

The Borough Council suggest deletion of the final word of Section 8.3.2 – the word “below”

Changed exactly as required (page 29)

Agreed

In Section 10 “in Plan implementation” would achieve greater clarity than “after the Plan implementation”

Changed exactly as required (page 43)

Agreed

· Footnote reference 2, paragraph 8.1.2 (page 26)

Agreed

· Key to map 3. Add hyphen ‘neo victorian’ and pluralise the second ‘house’

· (Coldharbour Road contains a good example of neo-Victorian houses within a group of original Victorian houses. This creates a pleasant street scene.

Agreed