

**INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE MARTON MOSS
NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

EXAMINER: Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Stephen Woodhouse
Chair Marton Moss Neighbourhood Forum

Tom Barrett
Blackpool Council

Examination Ref: 01/AM/MMNP

8 February 2023

Dear Mr Woodhouse and Mr Barrett

MARTON MOSS NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN EXAMINATION

Following the submission of the Marton Moss Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) for examination, I would like to clarify several initial procedural matters. I also have a number of questions for Marton Moss Neighbourhood Forum (MMNF) and Blackpool Council (BC), to which I would like to receive a written response(s) by **Wednesday 22 February 2023** if possible.

1. Examination Documentation

I can confirm that I am satisfied that I have received the draft Plan and accompanying documentation, including the Basic Conditions Statement, the Consultation Statement, the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Scoping Report, the Habitats Regulations Assessment, the SEA Environmental Report and the Regulation 16 representations, to enable me to undertake the examination.

Subject to my detailed assessment of the Plan, I have not at this initial stage identified any very significant and obvious flaws in the Plan that might lead me to advise that the examination should not proceed.

2. Site Visit

I will aim to carry out a site visit to the neighbourhood plan area during the week beginning 13 February 2023. The site visit will assist in my assessment of the draft Plan, including the issues identified in the representations.

The visit will be undertaken unaccompanied. It is very important that I am not approached to discuss any aspects of the Plan or the neighbourhood area, as this may be perceived to prejudice my independence and risk compromising the fairness of the examination process.

I may have some additional questions, following my site visit, which I will set out in writing should I require any further clarification.

3. Written Representations

At this stage, I consider the examination can be conducted solely by the written representations procedure, without the need for a hearing. However, I will reserve the option to convene a hearing should a matter(s) come to light where I consider that a hearing is necessary to ensure the adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case.

4. Further Clarification

From my initial assessment of the Plan and supporting documents, I have identified a number of matters where I require some additional information from Blackpool Council and the Marton Moss Neighbourhood Forum.

I have several questions seeking further clarification, which I have set out in the Annex to this letter. I would be grateful if you can seek to provide a written response(s) by **Wednesday 22 February**.

5. Examination Timetable

As you will be aware, the intention is to examine the Plan (including conduct of the site visit) with a view to providing a draft report (for 'fact checking') within 4-6 weeks of submission of the draft Plan. However, I have raised a number of detailed questions that will require further work and must provide you with sufficient opportunity to reply. Consequentially, the examination timetable will be extended. Please be assured that I will aim to mitigate any delay as far as is practicable. The IPe office team will seek to keep you updated on the anticipated delivery date of the draft report.

If you have any process questions related to the conduct of the examination, which you would like me to address, please do not hesitate to contact the office team in the first instance.

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure that a copy of this letter is placed on the Marton Moss Neighbourhood Forum and Blackpool Council's websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

Andy Mead

Examiner

ANNEX

From my initial reading of the Marton Moss Neighbourhood Plan, the supporting evidence and the representations that have been made to the Plan, I have the following questions for the Marton Moss Neighbourhood Forum (MMNF) and Blackpool Council (BC). I have requested the submission of responses **by Wednesday 22 February**, although an earlier response would be much appreciated. All of the points set out below flow from the requirement to satisfy the Basic Conditions.

Procedural Matters

1. **Question to MMNF.** Please could the following dates be confirmed - Regulation 14 Consultation: 7 March 2022 until 19 April; Regulation 16 Consultation - 17 October 2022 until 28 November? What was the date of submission of the Plan to BC?
2. **Question to MMNF.** I note that English Nature (EN), the Environment Agency (EA) and Historic England (HE) were consulted on the Regulation 14 version of the Plan. I also note the responses from the EA and HE at the Regulation 16 stage. EN was evidently consulted on the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), as illustrated in the Revision History and prior to the final update of the Report. I would be grateful to know the final response of EN to the HRA, whether EN was consulted under Regulation 16 and the details of any response?

Policy MM1

3. **Question to MMNF.** United Utilities (Representation 31) seeks the inclusion of a separate policy on drainage. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (updated August 2022) now includes comprehensive advice on drainage issues and development. Therefore, I am considering adding a reference to the PPG in Policy MMK1 criterion c. which would also then serve to accommodate other general matters raised in the representation. I would be grateful for any comments from the MMNF.

Policy MM4

4. a) **Question to MMNF.** Three proposed housing allocations in Policy MM4 (Sites C, G & H) include alternative numbers of dwellings. What is the justification for the variation in numbers?

b) **Question to BC.** Do the proposals for Sites C, G & H provide sufficient clarity for effective development management? For example, would it be preferable for the allocations to state: "No more than 11 dwellings" at Site C; "No more than 8 dwellings" at Site G and "No more than 6 dwellings" at Site H? Comments from the MMNF would also be welcome.
5. **Question to MMNF.** Housing allocations A, K and M were included in the Regulation 14 Plan but excluded from the submitted Plan. What were the reasons for their exclusion?
6. **Question to MMNF.** Housing site allocation I has a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). In order to accommodate the TPO, should the appropriate form of development be described as "1 detached dwelling fronting School Road" as suggested by BC?
7. **Question to MMNF.** What is the justification for the reduction in the number of dwellings allocated from 3 to 2 on Site N? (See representation 18)

8. **Question to MMNF.** Why have sites MM1, MM2, and MM3 (AECOM schedule) been excluded as housing allocations whereas sites MM10 (Site R) and MM5 (Site S) have been included? (See representation 16)
9. **Question to MMNF.** How many dwellings are provided for in Policy MM4?

Policy MM6

10. **Question to MMNF.** BC suggests the deletion of Policy MM6 c. and d. and the inclusion of a final sentence in the policy (See the Regulation 16 response from BC) with further amendments to the supporting text. Does the MMNF have any comments?

Policy MM8

11. **Question to MMNF.** BC suggests amendments to Policy MM8 and the supporting text. I would be grateful for any comments from the MMNF.