



Intelligent Plans
and examinations

Report on Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan 2021 - 2036

An Examination undertaken for Huntingdonshire District Council with the support of Great Gransden Parish Council on the August 2022 submission version of the Plan.

Independent Examiner: Andrew S Freeman BSc (Hons) DipTP DipEM FRTPI

Date of Report: 30 November 2022

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Contents

Main Findings - Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction and Background	3
Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan 2021 - 2036	3
The Independent Examiner	3
The Scope of the Examination	4
The Basic Conditions.....	5
2. Approach to the Examination	5
Planning Policy Context	5
Submitted Documents.....	6
Site Visit.....	6
Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	6
Modifications	7
3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights.....	7
Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	7
Plan Period.....	7
Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	7
Development and Use of Land	8
Excluded Development.....	8
Human Rights.....	8
4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions	8
EU Obligations	8
Main Issues.....	8
Issue 1 – Spatial Strategy.....	9
Issue 2 – Natural and Historic Environment	11
Issue 3 – Open Space	12
Issue 4 – Transport and Road Safety Improvements	14
Issue 5 – Education	14
Other Matters	14
5. Conclusions.....	14
Summary.....	14
The Referendum and its Area	15
Overview	15
Appendix: Modifications	16

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- the Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Great Gransden Parish Council;
- the Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – the Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan Area – Figure 1 on Page 11 of the Plan;
- the Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2021 - 2036; and
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

1. Introduction and Background

Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan 2021 - 2036

- 1.1 Great Gransden is a civil parish and village in the southeastern corner of the Huntingdonshire District of Cambridgeshire, with South Cambridgeshire District being on the other side of the parish boundary to the southeast. The village lies between Bedford and Cambridge, with Cambridge some 20 km to the east-northeast. Huntingdon itself is about 16 km away to the north-northwest and St Neots approximately 10 km to the west-northwest.
- 1.2 The parish was designated as a neighbourhood area by Huntingdonshire District Council in July 2018. Since then, plan preparation has proceeded under the auspices of a Steering Group. The resultant draft Neighbourhood Plan has a vision, seven broad topic areas and 13 detailed policies.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.3 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan by

Huntingdonshire District Council with the agreement of Great Gransden Parish Council.

- 1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with over forty years' experience. I have worked in both the public and the private sectors. I am an independent examiner and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 1.5 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
 - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.6 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ("the 1990 Act"). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions;
 - Whether the plan complies with provisions under Section 38A and Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"). These are:
 - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
 - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
 - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
 - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'; and
 - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.
 - Whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the plan proceed to referendum.
 - Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ("the 2012 Regulations").

- 1.7 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

- 1.8 The “Basic Conditions” are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:
- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
 - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
 - be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations; (under retained EU law)¹ and
 - meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.
- 1.9 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires 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 2017.²

2. Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Huntingdonshire District Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is Huntingdonshire’s Local Plan to 2036.
- 2.2 Planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented.

¹ The existing body of environmental regulation is retained in UK law.

² This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

Submitted Documents

2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:

- the draft Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan 2021-2036, August 2022;
- a map of the Plan which identifies the area to which the proposed neighbourhood development plan relates (Figure 1 on Page 11 of the Plan);
- the Consultation Statement, August 2022;
- the Basic Conditions Statement, August 2022;
- all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
- the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report, August 2022; and
- the request for additional clarification sought in my letter dated 20 October 2022 and the response from Great Gransden Parish Council of 3 November 2022.³

Other published (Regulation 16 consultation) supporting documents comprise:

- the Character Assessment, August 2022;
- the Housing Need Survey Results Report, June 2018;
- the Rationale for Local Green Spaces and Other Valued Green Spaces, August 2022; and
- the Built-Up Area Boundary Rationale, August 2022.⁴

Site Visit

2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 7 November 2022 to familiarise myself with it and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

³ View at: <https://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/>

⁴ View all Regulation 16 published documents at: [Great Gransden Submission \(Regulation 16\) Neighbourhood Plan - Details - Keystone \(objective.co.uk\)](https://www.keystoneobjective.co.uk/great-gransden-submission-regulation-16-neighbourhood-plan-details)

Modifications

- 2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

- 3.1 The Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by Great Gransden Parish Council, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by Huntingdonshire District Council on 30 July 2018.
- 3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for the Great Gransden parish and does not relate to any land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2021 to 2036.

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

- 3.4 Plan preparation and consultation on the Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan were carried out as detailed in the Parish Council's Consultation Statement, August 2022. Designation by Huntingdonshire District Council took place on 30 July 2018. In advance of this, there was an inception stage (May 2017 to January 2018) involving initial discussions, a decision to proceed and the raising of initial awareness throughout the parish.
- 3.5 There followed an initial Plan development stage between February 2018 and February 2019. The main focus of this phase was consultation with the community and evidence gathering. A survey of residents and a housing needs survey were carried out at this stage.
- 3.6 Advanced Plan development took place between March 2019 and December 2021. The output from earlier phases was refined into a draft Plan. Further engagement and consultation were also carried out.
- 3.7 Formal consultation under Regulation 14 was undertaken between 1 March 2022 and 12 April 2022. There were 51 responses from residents and 20 from statutory consultees. A summary of the comments made and the actions to be taken are set out in Appendices F and G of the Consultation Statement.

- 3.8 Consultation under Regulation 16 ran from 25 August 2022 until 7 October 2022. The District Council has recorded some 76 representations from 20 different parties. These include the District Council itself as well as developers and landowners, various public bodies and members of the public.
- 3.9 I am satisfied that, at both the Regulation 14 and the Regulation 16 stages, the consultation process met the legal requirements and there has been procedural compliance. Regard has been paid to the advice on plan preparation and engagement in the PPG.

Development and Use of Land

- 3.10 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with Section 38A of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

- 3.11 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for “excluded development”.

Human Rights

- 3.12 Great Gransden Parish Council is satisfied that the Plan does not breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998). From my independent assessment, I see no reason to disagree.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

EU Obligations

- 4.1 The Neighbourhood Plan was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by Huntingdonshire District Council, which found that it was unnecessary to undertake SEA. Having read the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion, I support this conclusion.
- 4.2 The Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan was further screened for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), which also was not triggered. The site is not in close proximity to a European designated nature site. Natural England agreed with this conclusion.⁵ From my independent assessment of this matter, I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issues

- 4.3 Having regard to the Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan, the consultation responses and other evidence, and the site visit, I consider that there are

⁵ See email dated 24 February 2022 in Appendix 1 of the Screening Report.
Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

five main issues relating to the Basic Conditions for this examination. These concern:

- Spatial Strategy;
- Natural and Historic Environment;
- Open Space;
- Transport and Road Safety Improvements; and
- Education.

4.4 Before I deal with the main issues, I have a few observations to make with regard to the representations. First, the Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan should be seen in the context of the wider planning system. This includes Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 as well as the NPPF and PPG. It is not necessary to repeat in the Neighbourhood Plan matters that are adequately dealt with elsewhere.⁶ Having said that, there may be scope to give emphasis to issues particularly relevant in the context of Great Gransden.

4.5 Secondly, the Neighbourhood Plan does not have to deal with each and every topic raised through the consultation. In this regard, the content of the Neighbourhood Plan and the scope of the policies is largely at the discretion of the qualifying body, albeit informed by the consultation process and the requirements set by the Basic Conditions.

4.6 Thirdly, my central task is to judge whether the Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the Basic Conditions. Many of the representations do not demonstrate or indicate a failure to meet those conditions or other legal requirements. Similarly, many of the suggested additions and improvements are not necessary when judged against the Basic Conditions.

4.7 The following section of my report sets out modifications that are necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions. Some of the proposed modifications are factual corrections.⁷ Others are necessary in order to have closer regard to national policies and advice. In particular, plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous.⁸ In addition, the policies should be supported by appropriate evidence.⁹

Issue 1 – Spatial Strategy

4.8 Policy G1 of the draft Plan sets a boundary for the built-up area of Great Gransden and determines provisions that will apply to proposals both within and outside this boundary. In this regard, there are a number of clarifications that are required.

⁶ See NPPF Paragraph 16 f).

⁷ Modifications for the purpose of correcting errors is provided for in Paragraph 10(3)(e) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.

⁸ NPPF, Paragraph 16 d).

⁹ PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

- 4.9 First, there is reference to the acceptability of rural exception housing schemes “on the edge of the Built-Up Area Boundary”. This term is lacking in precision. It is intended to mean¹⁰ that the scheme would share a common boundary with the defined built-up area. As such, reference to a contiguous scheme would be appropriate. I appreciate that this is different from the terminology used in the Local Plan (“well related”); but a contiguous development would be one that is well related and which uses a defined boundary as the reference point.
- 4.10 A further criterion is for the development to be “in safe walking distance to village amenities”. For clarity, this should be expressed in a way that doesn’t exclude other considerations; also, for consistency (for example with Policy G2), to “easy” walking distance.
- 4.11 Secondly, the policy refers to the “exceptional circumstances” set out in Paragraph 80 of the NPPF (avoiding isolated homes in the countryside). This is a term that has limited and specific application (for example, in relation to Green Belts). To avoid any confusion, reference should be made to “the circumstances” in common with the NPPF on this point.
- 4.12 Thirdly, the policy refers to residential development proposals that provide a “housing mix suitable for meeting local needs”. For the avoidance of doubt, this should cross-refer to the explanatory text where this means schemes including one or more of the following elements: smaller dwellings, affordable housing, housing for older people, bungalows or flats.
- 4.13 As written, this requirement would apply to all housing schemes, regardless of their size. This was not the intention.¹¹ There should be inclusion of the proviso “where the scale permits”.
- 4.14 I have given consideration as to whether other sites should be included within the built-up area boundary. These sites include Brook House (east of Mandeau Brook), Gransden Hall riding school area and land off Eltisley Road. However, I am happy that the proposed boundary reasonably defines the extent of Great Gransden’s built-up area without unnecessary extension or inclusion of outlying development.
- 4.15 Appropriate clarifications to Policy G1 – A Built-Up Area Boundary Strategy for Great Gransden are set out in proposed modification **PM1**.
- 4.16 The second policy under the spatial strategy heading is Policy G2 – Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites. This provides for “small scale” affordable housing “on the edge of the Built-Up Area Boundary” for people with “a Great Gransden connection”. The meaning of these terms is not stated and needs to be clarified in a modification.

¹⁰ See Parish Council’s answers to my questions, 3 November 2022.

¹¹ See Parish Council’s answers to my questions, 3 November 2022.

- 4.17 The policy overlaps with Local Plan Policy LP 28, Rural Exceptions Housing. Both policies deal with matters such as the number, size, type and tenure of the affordable housing; affordability in perpetuity; and the role of open market housing or plots suitable for custom or self-build homes. However, these provisions are expressed in different ways and there is duplication as well as considerable scope for confusion.
- 4.18 The Local Plan deals with such matters in a more comprehensive manner. For a decision maker to apply policy on rural exception sites with sufficient clarity and with consistency and confidence, it would be better for the Neighbourhood Plan policy to defer to the Local Plan albeit with provisions that are particularly relevant in Great Gransden. This is achieved through proposed modification **PM2**.
- 4.19 Policy G3 (Local Character and Design) includes a provision whereby ribbon and greenfield development will not be supported. This could be seen as contrary to exceptions allowed by national policy and the Development Plan. The policy should recognise such exceptions.
- 4.20 On a further point, there is reference to the parking of cars, cycles “etc”. This is intended to be a reference to electric scooters and mobility scooters.¹² Proposed modification **PM3** provides clarification as well as accordance with local and national policy.

Issue 2 – Natural and Historic Environment

- 4.21 Policy G4 (Development, Landscape Character and Valued Views) includes a provision whereby proposals will not be supported where they would adversely impact on valued views as shown on Figure 8 and described in the text of the draft Plan.
- 4.22 On a preliminary note, I would say that the policy should refer to any *significant* impact. It is quite possible that there would be an adverse impact of some sort but that such impact would not be material. My principal concern is, however, whether the ten views to which the policy relates can be regarded as views of any particular merit or significance.
- 4.23 Starting with View A, this looks over an undulating landscape falling away from the road and then rising to the horizon. There are field boundary hedgerows and wooded areas in view but with overhead power lines and large buildings in the distance. I cannot say that views of The Postmill (Grade II* listed building and scheduled monument) are particularly obvious. It is a fairly typical agricultural landscape of no special merit.
- 4.24 As to View D, there are two identified views, one looking southeast from The Riddy and one looking to the west. Views into the land to the southeast of The Riddy are severely restricted by the trees and shrubs that line the ditch at this point. Beyond are overgrown fields with the

¹² See Parish Council’s answers to my questions, 3 November 2022.

upper parts of houses and bungalows along West Road visible along the rear boundary.

- 4.25 To the west, there is a similar overgrown field of no visual interest rising to a thin hedge line on the northwestern boundary. Overhead power lines and industrial buildings can be glimpsed in the distance.
- 4.26 There are also two views labelled as View E. The view looking south is from a vantage point in the middle of a field, away from the closest footpath or other public vantage point.
- 4.27 From what I have read and seen, I have concluded that there is insufficient evidence to support the inclusions of Views A, D (both views) and E (view looking south) within Policy G4. Appropriate modifications are included in proposed modification **PM4**. Otherwise, I am content that the remaining Valued Landscape Views are sufficiently evidenced to justify the inclusion of the viewpoints.
- 4.28 In Policy G5 (Conserving and enhancing Great Gransden's Conservation Area), there is again reference to adverse impacts (as opposed to significant adverse impacts). It is adverse impacts on views into, out of and within the Conservation Area that will not be supported. Such views are, in fact, shown on Figure 8. However, this is not stated nor is the Conservation Area boundary shown on the plan. Appropriate amendments (proposed modification **PM5**) would clarify the situation.
- 4.29 Policy G6 deals with protecting and enhancing biodiversity in the parish including the possible seeking of contributions that would help protect or enhance Gransden Woods. It is unclear however how contributions would be assessed and calculated. Clarity would be added through reference to Policy LP 4 of the Local Plan (Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery) and the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (proposed modification **PM6**).
- 4.30 The policy lists a number of measures aimed at increasing net gains in biodiversity including restoration and enhancement of the existing ecological network across the Gransden Brook Corridor (Figure 5). I appreciate that the Corridor is widely drawn. Nevertheless, it includes land adjacent to the Gransden Brook and its tributaries and covers the likely associated wildlife corridor. It is an appropriate area on which to focus action.

[Issue 3 – Open Space](#)

- 4.31 The first part of Policy G7 deals with Local Green Space where four sites are so designated. The policy indicates that development will not be acceptable "other than in the exceptions identified in national policy". National policy (NPPF Paragraph 147) allows for the demonstration of "very special circumstances" as an exception. However, development would be allowed in principal if "not inappropriate". For clarity, Policy G7

should refer to consistency with national Green Belt policy as a whole, including all its various provisions. I am however content that the four listed sites be confirmed as Local Green Spaces.

- 4.32 The second part of Policy G7 deals with Other Valued Green Spaces to which Local Plan Policy LP 32 (Protection of Open Space) would apply. The open space covered by Policy LP 32 include parks, village greens, play areas, sports pitches, allotments, semi-natural areas and substantial private gardens. However, some of the spaces identified under Policy G7, and Spaces A, B, C and D in particular, are in a very different category, essentially agricultural land in private ownership.
- 4.33 Spaces A and B lie on either side of The Riddy. They have been described above in connection with Policy G4 and the views marked D. First and foremost, they are areas of privately-owned but neglected agricultural land of no particular landscape merit. Space C (The Hayfield) has more visual interest providing as it does a contrast between a large open agricultural field (privately owned) and the northern edge of Gransden Woods, all visible from a public footpath. These three spaces are open in character and form part of the village's setting. However, they do not warrant special attention as open space of public value. Normal countryside protection policies would apply.
- 4.34 Space D (The Showfield) is a typical hayfield in private ownership. It has public value as the site of the annual Gransden Agricultural Show, allowed through the permission of the owners, although that is not its main purpose. It would be wrong to apply the special protection afforded through Policy LP 32 in order to safeguard its ongoing availability for the show.
- 4.35 In the circumstance, the evidence does not support the designation of Sites A, B, C and D as Other Valued Green Spaces. They should be deleted from Policy G7 as in proposed modification **PM7** which also contains clarifications on Local Green Space. The remaining Other Valued Green Spaces are, in my view, appropriate for inclusion in the policy.
- 4.36 Under Policy G8 (Development and Open Space Requirements), all schemes will be expected to contribute to the provision of open space in the parish. However, it is unclear how contributions would be assessed and calculated. Clarity would be added through reference to Policy LP 4 of the Local Plan (Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery) and the Developer Contributions SPD. Proposed modification **PM8** refers.
- 4.37 Policy G9 applies to the public rights of way network. However, as written, the policy would apply to permissive paths; also, to development that is "clearly visible from public rights of way". Permissive paths should not be the subject of the policy since the landowner could withdraw access rights. As to clear visibility, this could extend to a considerable distance. The provision would be unreasonable as well as lacking in clarity.

Appropriate amendments would be added through proposed modification **PM9**.

Issue 4 – Transport and Road Safety Improvements

- 4.38 Policy G10 has the title “A walkable village and reducing village car use”. There is a requirement that, where pavements or routes are not in place, these must be provided. Such provision can only be made with the agreement of the local highway authority. This point should be recognised, as in proposed modification **PM10**.

Issue 5 – Education

- 4.39 In Policy G13 (Barnabas Oley Primary School and parish pre-school provision), there is reference to required contributions to pre-school and primary school provision. However, it is unclear how contributions would be assessed and calculated. Clarity would be added through reference to the NPPF, Policy LP 4 of the Local Plan (Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery) and the Developer Contributions SPD. Proposed modification **PM11** refers.

Other Matters

- 4.40 There remain two policies that have not been the subject of scrutiny in the above report. These concern roads and new development (Policy G11) and infrastructure priorities (Policy G12). To a greater or lesser extent, these topics are covered in NPPF Sections 4 (Decision-making) and 9 (Promoting sustainable transport). I find that there has been regard for national policy and that the Basic Conditions have been met.
- 4.41 With the modifications that I have recommended, the Plan would meet the Basic Conditions. Other consequential amendments, non-material changes and up-dating (that do not affect the Basic Conditions), including suggestions set out in the representations, can be incorporated into the final version of the Plan.¹³

5. Conclusions

Summary

- 5.1 The Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, and the evidence documents submitted with it.

¹³ PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509.

- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

The Referendum and its Area

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Great Gransden Neighbourhood Plan, as modified, has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Overview

- 5.4 It is evident that a considerable amount of time and effort has been devoted to the development and production of this Plan and I congratulate those who have been involved. The Plan should prove to be a useful tool for future planning and change in Great Gransden over the coming years.

Andrew S Freeman

Examiner

Appendix: Modifications

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
PM1	Page 43	<p>In the first bullet point of Policy G1, replace "the edge of" with "a site contiguous with". After "Boundary", replace "in" with "and within easy and".</p> <p>In the second bullet point, delete "exceptional".</p> <p>At the start of the final bullet point, insert "Where the scale permits,". At the end of the final bullet point, add "(see Paragraph 7.1.17)".</p>
PM2	Page 44	<p>Replace Policy G2 with the following:</p> <p>"Proposals for small scale affordable housing (10 or fewer dwellings) on rural exceptions sites contiguous with the Built-Up Area Boundary will be supported in principle for occupation by people with a genuine local connection with Great Gransden parish provided that the criteria in Policy LP 28 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan, and the related reasoning, are met.</p> <p>In addition, the following local criteria will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the homes are located within safe and easy pedestrian and cycle access to Great Gransden village centre and amenities; and • no significant harm shall be caused to the character of the village, its setting or the countryside."
PM3	Pages 46 and 47	<p>In Policy G3, at the end of the reference to ribbon and greenfield development, add "unless it accords with the specific opportunities afforded by local and national policy".</p>

		In the final paragraph, replace "cycles etc" with "cycles, electric scooters and mobility scooters".
PM4	Page 53	In the final sentence of Policy G4, replace "they would adversely impact" with "there would be a significant adverse impact". On Figure 8, delete View A, View D (both) and View E (looking south). Delete related references in the text. The remaining sites should be relabelled A-F.
PM5	Page 55	In the third paragraph of Policy G5, replace "they adversely impact" with "there would be a significant adverse impact". Insert "(as shown on Figure 8)" after "Conservation Area". On Figure 8, show the Conservation Area boundary.
PM6	Page 59	In Policy G6, after "NPPF", insert "LP 4 of the Local Plan (Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery) and the Developer Contributions SPD (2011) (or any successor documents)".
PM7	Page 63	In Policy G7, replace "will not be acceptable other than in the exceptions identified in national policy," with "shall be consistent with national Green Belt Policy and". Delete Sites A, B, C and D from the list of Other Valued Green Spaces. Delete from Figure 11 and remove related references in the text. The remaining sites should be relabelled A-C.
PM8	Page 66	In Policy G8, after "NPPF", insert "LP 4 of the Local Plan (Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery) and the Developer Contributions SPD (2011) (or any successor documents)".

PM9	Page 68	In Policy G9, delete “or Permissive Path, or which is clearly visible from a Public Right of Way”. In the final paragraph, delete “and permissive path”.
PM10	Page 71	In Policy G10, replace “these must be provided” with “provision shall be made as required by the District Council in consultation with the local highway authority”.
PM11	Page 77	In the first sentence of Policy G13, after “as per” insert “the NPPF, Local Plan, Policy LP 4 (Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery) and the Developer Contributions SPD (2011) (or any successor documents)”.