

Supplementary Planning Draft Document for Developer Contributions

Notes for Barkway Parish Council Meeting: 10 March 2020

1.11.1	BK3 is omitted from strategic sites for which there are detailed policies
3.2.1	A commitment to deliver social value through the planning system is set out in the section on the economic development of town centres. The document should also recognise that economic appraisal is required where development will harm the local economy as with the implications of businesses that would be damaged by BK3.
4.1.4	LTP4 on sustainable transport promotes walking, cycling, and improving access to public transport whilst working to reduce the need for journeys overall. Developers must support sustainable transport and modal shifts. If developers argue that to support sustainable transport would make their scheme unviable – then such developments should not go ahead.
5.2.3	It is noted that where developers provide affordable housing off site, this is additional to their on-site provision; for example, for a development of 100 houses off site provision would be 67%. This could lead NHDC to be incentivised to agree to off-site provision – which may not be the desired outcome.
5.2.24	It is noted that donor sites for off-site provision in rural areas must be within a 15 minute drive, or 30 minutes by public transport. This may not be feasible, or desirable in rural areas beyond the green belt.
5.2.40/41	It is noted that staircasing is to be restricted to 80% of equity share in shared ownership properties in Barkway and Nuthampstead
5.2.71	Designated protection areas for allocation of social housing in rural parishes is: Parish

	<p>Adjoining parish Other rural parish Elsewhere</p> <p>But 5.2.72 is proposing to waive this for Barkway and decide case by case because of the BK3 development. PC objects to this as BK3 should not be allocated and the ordinary rules for rural areas should apply.</p>
7.8.4	<p>The proposal for the transfer of the freehold of community buildings is clear, but the proposals for developer support of ongoing management arrangements, for example for community hubs is far too vague. As with the proposals in 8.2.4 the commitment to ongoing management should be for 10 years, or more.</p>
8.4.7	<p>No standards are being set for the protection of green corridors which are to be considered on a case by case basis. This is unacceptably vague and leaves this important aspect of protecting the countryside and its biodiversity too vulnerable.</p>
	<p>It is noted that 1% of any development should be set aside for self-build. This does not seem to be reflected in the strategic sites proposed in the LDP.</p>

Para 6: Local Planning Methods of Consultation

Where the public make comments on planning matters in a way that is inadmissible, for example comments to their local councillor, or in response to NHDC's Twitter, or other social media accounts, the Council should contact them to point this out and to advise them how to make comments that will be taken into account.

The Council should consider how to change its management of its social media to allow public comments to be validly made through these media.