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1.0 Introduction and Background

The Parish Council decided at the beginning of 2015 that it would be in the parish’s interests to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by the Localism Act 2011 and generate a Neighbourhood Plan. This would give the community a greater say in the way in which their parish develops. The intention to produce a Neighbourhood Plan was communicated to all households through the Parish Council newsletter and engagement encouraged. All households were informed in April 2015 that the parish had been designated a Neighbourhood Area, and were urged to attend workshops as part of the consultative process.

This Consultation Statement documents the engagement process and outcomes that have informed the Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish of Pluckley.

1.1 Legislative requirements

This Consultation Statement fulfils the legal requirement of Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 set out in Para. 15 (2) relating to the Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan (PNP) Community engagement and consultation work, summarised below. Para 15 (2) states:
(2) In this regulation “consultation statement” means a document which—
(a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
(b) explains how they were consulted;
(c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
(d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

2.0 Aims for ongoing programme of public engagement

The aim of public Engagement was to gather local people’s ideas and wishes for the future of their Parish. We have done this to ensure that PNP gives a clear audit trail of activities and outcomes and provides the evidence base for this.

The background evidence for the document was gathered through focused community engagement reaching the widest audience possible: both within the village and other people within representative groups that might naturally form part of a larger community.
A series of public engagements continued on from the initial and very successful PNP event April 2015. People were invited to respond to focused questionnaires on key issues relating to the future of their Parish.

Section 4 of this Statement shows the methods used in informing and obtaining people’s feedback at engagement events.

Subsequent events were designed by PNP to create a transparent and open process, which would have the support and involvement from the outset of the local community and other interested parties in shaping the future of their Parish.

This report documents the process and outcomes of the various public engagement events and activities.
3.0 Snapshot: 2011 Census Socio-economic profile

Population
The 2011 Census gives a population for Pluckley Parish of 1,069. The age demographics show that the Parish has a lower than average, across District, County, Regional and national statistics of young people aged between ages 0 and 16.

Ethnicity
The 2011 census identified that the population of the parish of Pluckley is mostly homogenous with 96.3% of the population comprising white British people. 1.5% classified themselves as white, other. 0.8% identified themselves as white gypsy or Irish traveller. 1.3% of BME non-white. The majority of the population has English as a first language.

Housing
The 2011 Census identified 427 households in Pluckley Parish.

Economic activity
68% (692) of the population of the Parish are aged between 16-64. 64.0% (565 people) are economically active. This is lower than the 72.6% of the District, 72% of the region and 70% of the country.

Car ownership
Because of the rural nature of the area, car ownership at 91.1% of households is higher than the district (84.2%), regional (81.4%) and national (74.2%) averages. The average number of cars per household is higher at 1.8 vehicles, as opposed to the national average of 1.2 vehicles.

Health
Generally people within the Parish consider themselves in either very good health or good health at 84%, higher than the wider local and national statistics.

This data has informed the method of publicising events and specifically targeting local groups to engage. These include the harder to reach younger families through the many local clubs where the age group is a majority of the population, yet known to engage less readily.
4.0 Methods of communicating engagement events

- **Web site** [www.pluckley.net](http://www.pluckley.net). The website carried news of progress with the plan; announcements of meetings; the remit of the Steering Group; Steering Group minutes; consultation questionnaires; consultation workshop minutes; the draft plan.
- Notices on Parish noticeboards, located around the parish, of all public meetings and consultation deadlines.
- Parish Council newsletter, updating on progress, delivered quarterly to every household in the parish.
- A large banner in the village centre encouraging response to the draft plan.
- Local newspaper, regular updates in the Roundabout column covering local villages.
- Post Office, posters of events and copies of the draft plan.
- Local shops and public houses, copies of the draft plan.
- **Word of mouth.** While this was not a strategically chosen means of communication, in a small village it was the case that the Parish Councillors were able to communicate and promote response from parishioners by meeting them in the course of daily routine and social activities.
- **Telephone.** Direct encouragement to attend consultation workshops was made to ensure the workshops represented all areas of our dispersed settlement and to encourage younger residents.

5.0 Overview of engagement activities

From April to August 2015, workshops were held across the parish to explain about Neighbourhood Plans and seek feedback about the benefits. Each of the workshops was structured to provide a mix of respondents by age, sex and location of residents.

Based on responses from the earlier parish plan, and the Parish Design Statement, a community Questionnaire (Q1) was designed and delivered across the parish in June 2015. This was made available on the parish website and a hard copy delivered to every household.

From this engagement several key topics were confirmed, summarised in this report and informed the PNP.

- **Survey of the character of the village and its setting within the landscape.** (This is covered in the Plan in Section 4. About Pluckley and Section 6. Managing our Rural Environment.)
Survey of the location and type of businesses and other facilities in the village. (See PNP Section 4. About Pluckley and PNP Section 8. Economy and Communications.)

Information on the presence of local services and groups

Future thinking about the village

Parish wide questionnaires

Consideration of the relationships of the existing settlement and proposed new development

A set of indicators against which to judge the success of the forthcoming development

Public engagement events

Smaller public engagement activities, publicity about the PNP and call for volunteers

Working groups meeting using topics chosen through public engagement events.

6.0 Steering Group

Steering Group membership was initially drawn from volunteers from the Parish Council. Each main habitation area of the parish was represented on the Steering Group. Calls for more members have been made since January 2015, and a number of residents with specific skills have been co-opted to help on occasion throughout the preparation of the Plan. See Appendix A4 of this Statement for the remit of the Steering Group and meeting minutes.

7.0 Diary of events

The following photographs are from some of the public events held in the village hall. Data is provided in the following tables of dates, method of publicising, number of attendees.
Oct 2015 – Village Hall meeting
Feb 2016 – Village Hall meeting
Feb 2016 – Village Hall meeting (cont)
## 7.0 Diary of events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Approx. Nos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION OF PNP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>Announcement that the Parish Council was applying to prepare a NP</td>
<td>Newsletter W/site, press</td>
<td>Every household</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1: Feedback from Introduction and more detail</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>Pluckley declared a Neighbourhood Area</td>
<td>Newsletter, W/site, press</td>
<td>Every household</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circulate leaflet to Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>1st Steering Group meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steering group</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Annual Parish meeting Engagement and call for workshop volunteers and leaflets</td>
<td>Parish Hall</td>
<td>Public attended</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stage 2: Review of best practice, liaison with Borough Council, consultation within parish, meetings with site owners, assessment of development sites, drafting of plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar onward 2015</td>
<td>Steering Group liaises with Ashford Borough Council and reviews experience of other neighbourhoods</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Aug 2015</td>
<td>Workshops meet to develop ideas for topics and feedback</td>
<td>Parish Hall</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2015</td>
<td>Questionnaire developed with Market Research agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Aug 2015</td>
<td>Questionnaires distributed to every household and available for completion on-line</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td>Responses from workshops and questionnaires analysed and parish wishes established</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Group/Research agency</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2015</td>
<td>Site visits</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2015</td>
<td>Landowner meetings to ascertain their aspirations, meetings with retailers and discussion with school/surgery</td>
<td>Parish Hall</td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2015</td>
<td>Assessment of sites against scoring matrix and sites to be supported for development determined</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Grp/Parish Council</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2015</td>
<td>Resident meeting to announce results of consultation and landowner discussions. Presentation of supported sites for development.</td>
<td>Parish Hall</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2015</td>
<td>Steering group liaison with retained Consultant to draft chapters for further public consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>Parish Council approves draft PNP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>Draft PNP pre-submitted to ABC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb – Apr 2016</td>
<td>Pre-submission NP Regulation 14 published for consultation, in parish, to ABC, and statutory consultees. All the forms of communication listed in section 4 of this Consultation Statement were utilised.</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2016</td>
<td>Public meeting to present draft PNP and seek parish feedback</td>
<td>Parish Hall</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2016</td>
<td>Formal submission of revised draft NP Regulation 15 to ABC, following approval by the Parish Council 24.8.16</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24.08.16
8.0 Summary of consultation replies and Neighbourhood Plan response

Questionnaire responses. Complete questionnaire included in Appendix including statistical response for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issued Raised</th>
<th>What you said</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Plan Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Protect rural character of area, wealth of habitats, and open views throughout the parish</td>
<td>PNDP pols R1, R2, R3 and R4 support this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support limited amount of well-designed housing in appropriate locations and fitting in to the surrounds</td>
<td>Pols H1 and 2 in particular provide a strategic response in delivering development appropriate to fulfilling these criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contain adverse impact of road traffic, particularly by restricting the volume and speed of HGVs</td>
<td>Pol E4 supports this aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support local agricultural and tourism employment</td>
<td>Pol E1 supports this aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage more social inter-action and well-being</td>
<td>PNDP Community Projects support this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular assets to protect</td>
<td>2 Conservation Areas, 50 Listed buildings, open countryside and green recreation areas</td>
<td>Pols R 1, 2, 3. Ensuring a sustainable and resilient community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas of practical common use to the community</td>
<td>Pols H 1 and 2. Provision for new housing development (enabling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assets of Community Value</td>
<td>Pols R3 and H2. Protecting woodland areas and planting native tree and hedge species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pol R3. Local Green Space designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pol R4 Preservation of recreation and leisure spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pol E4 and Community Projects E4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limiting the damage caused by traffic,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued Raised</td>
<td>What you said</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Plan Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Community facilities to be improved** | Village hall extended, made more adaptable employment/ work hub, support local shops, keep fit and sports, maintain open spaces and improve. | Pol C2. Ensuring a sustainable and resilient community  
Pol C1,2. Supporting local community facilities  
Pol C3 Assets of Community Value to be protected  
Pol C2 improving recreation spaces  
CP H3. Footpath maintenance to be improved  
CP H3 to maintain public rights of way  
CP E1 to protect rail service  
CP C4 to alleviate parking at the station |
| **Parish wide facilities to protect** | Open spaces, village hall and improve, post office and farm shops, footpaths, ‘green’ sites held by or influenced by the Parish, village environment and friendship, annual activities | As above  
The non-planning items to be followed up separately by Parish Council |
| **Business and encourage** | Rural scale employment appropriate to area | Pols E 1 and 2. Ensuring a sustainable and resilient community |
| employment | Create a business hub  
| Improve broadband and mobile phone reception | CP C3. Enable at Village Hall  
| CP E2. |
PLUCKLEY NP REG 14 CONSULTATION

This was undertaken in two stages: parish and then statutory consultees.

The parish consultation opened on 10 February 2016 and closed 25 March 2016. Residents were informed at a public meeting, on the parish website, by posters in the village, by leaflets in the village shops and public houses, and in the local newspaper.

There were two respondents:

Mr. & Mrs. Dunn, Lambden Rd. Objected to the inclusion of housing site H1b. The Steering Group responded with the rationale for selection evidencing the support from the community.

Historic England – asked that we add that development at site H1b does not offend re nearby listed properties. The SG has inserted their suggested form of words.

The statutory consultee consultation opened on 13 April 2016 and closed 27 May 2016. The list of consultees was provided by Ashford Borough Council, and added to from local knowledge and research. Each consultee was e-mailed.

The statutory consultees were as listed in Appendix 5:

Responses were received from statutory consultees, as follows:

Historic England - add that development at site H1b does not offend re nearby listed properties. The SG has agreed to insert their suggested form of words.

National Grid - developers should check capacity before proceeding.

Southern Water - developers should be responsible for connection to nearest sewerage outlet. SG has agreed to insert their words.

Parochial Church Council - several comments: Brickyard site needs footpath to village and small houses, and wooded area is private. SG responded with explanation of the 'deal' struck, and pointed out the mixed views re footpath and its cost. The H1b site is backfilling, not permitted in Design Statement. SG responded that the only way to develop in Pluckley, after brownfield sites are exhausted, is in-filling or back-filling. In fact the Design Statement makes no mention at all of back-filling but stresses opposition to in-filling. The village amenities mentioning churchyard should include The Green (memorial garden). This has now been included. Parking at the station. SG responded that Community Project C4 covers this.

Kent Invicta - unable to comment until they have seen the draft Local Plan.
The PNP has now been updated to embrace these comments as above.

9.0 Conclusion

It is comforting to receive the confirmation from the community engagements that the original community mandate received through the early work of the Pluckley Parish Plan and earlier documents is being reached. Consultation results reported here confirm the PNP is well received by the public and the majority consider the Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan a worthy beginning for a more sustainable, happier and healthier future for the parish and its surrounding communities.
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PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Site Assessment Criteria

Small development (fewer than 5 homes)
Offers small, affordable homes for young people
Offers smaller homes for downsizing elderly residents
Does not impact on open views
Not situated within the ‘green heart’ of the parish (as defined in the Parish Design Statement)
Fits into the surrounding area
Does not impact on trees, hedgerow and woodland
No impact on roadside frontage
The landform allows screening
Limited impact on different habitats
Must not be prone to flooding
Easy access and limited danger to highway impact
Preservation of agricultural use
Previously developed land favoured
Not within Conservation Area
No proximity to Listed buildings
Accessibility to open space
Accessibility to equipped play area
Presence of footpath
Availability of public transport (bus or train)
Proximity to shops
Proximity to school
No adverse impact on employment.
PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Supported Sites

- Minimal visible impact
- Small-scale development
- Provides small/medium homes for starters
- Provides small/medium homes for ‘downsizers’
- Fits into surrounding area
- Previously developed sites favoured

Supported Development Sites
PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Non-supported sites for housing

- Detrimental visible impact
- Does not fit well into surrounding area
- Within ‘green heart’ exclusion area
- Adverse impact from roadside

Non-supported Development Sites for housing
PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Development Boundaries

- 3 areas defined for Pluckley
- Red lines denote outer edge of development area
PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Progress so far...

January 2015  - Parish Council decides to apply
               - Liaison with Ashford Borough Council

February 2015 - Public Notice issued

March 2015    - Parish of Pluckley designated a Neighbourhood Area

April 2015    - Community advised and invited to participate
               - Ashford Borough Council provides site owners

June-August 2015 - Questionnaires and Workshops within community
                   - Further site owners come forward

September 2015 - Community response analysed, needs identified
                 - Discussions with site owners
                 - Site Assessment matrix drawn up
Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

Our Vision for Pluckley

Our vision is for Pluckley to continue to thrive, meeting the evolving needs of its community while preserving the rural character, natural beauty and views that are what attract its residents and visitors alike.

Consultative Process to date

2015
Jan - Announcement that the Parish Council intends to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan
Mar – Pluckley declared a Neighbourhood Area, advised through Communicate
May – Annual Parish meeting. NP explained and call for volunteers
Apl/Aug – series of resident Workshops
Jul/Aug – Questionnaires to every household and on-line via website
Oct – Resident meeting giving results of consultation and inviting feedback
Dec – Feedback in Communicate

2016
Feb 10 – resident meeting, launching draft Plan and start of six week consultation period
Feb 2016 - Board 2

Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

List of Policies

Managing our Rural Environment
R 1. Landscape Character and Design
R 2. Protection of Views and Rural Setting
R 3. Designation of Local Green Spaces
R 4. Recreation and Community Use
R 5. Energy

Housing and Development
H 1. New Residential Development
H 2. Housing Site Allocations:
H 2A. Site at Pluckley Thorne
H 2B. Site off Lambden Road
H 2C. Site at Pluckley Brickworks
H 3A. Design Standards
H 3B. Encouraging Sustainable Development
H 3C. Materials
H 3D. Lighting

Economy, Communications and Transport
E 1. Agriculture and Tourism Development
E 2. Commercial Development
E 3. Better Communications
E 4. Traffic Management throughout the Parish

Community and Leisure
C 1. Social inter-action and Community Life
C 2. Protection of Community Facilities
C 3. Retention of Community Facilities
C 4. Assets of Community Value
C 5. Recreation Spaces
Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

How the Sites were selected

- Ashford BC’s ‘call for sites’ + local landowners coming forward = 10 sites

- Scoring matrix devised from guidelines supplied by ABC, plus wishes expressed by residents during Consultation

- Each site tested against the scoring matrix

- Key issues: Small-scale, views protected, impact from roadside, housing type, use of previously developed land

- Four sites ‘scored’ better than the rest and, between them, met the Parish’s needs

- One site subsequently rejected by KCC Highways because of sight lines at access

- Three sites are supported in the Plan
Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

R2 - Protection of Views and Rural Setting
R3 - Designation of Local Green Spaces

1. Green Heart
2. Fir Toll Triangle
3. Station Area
Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

H2 - Housing Site Allocations
Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

Community Projects

Housing and Development

- Project H 1 – Local Needs Housing
- Project H 2 – Managed homes for the Elderly
- Project H 3 – Footpaths/pavements

Economy, Communications and Transport

- Project E1 - Rail Services
- Project E2 - Communications
- Project E3 - Limit HGV traffic through the parish
- Project E4 - Contain the speed of traffic through the parish.

Community and Leisure

- Project C 1. Recreation Spaces
- Project C 2. Social Interaction
- Project C 3. Village Hall
Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

Where the draft Neighbourhood Plan can be viewed

Electronic copies
- On the website www.pluckley.net under Parish Council

Paper copies
In the following shops:
- Village Store and Post Office,
- Gary Boodle Butchers,
- Helen Baird Farm Shop.
In the following pubs:
- Black Horse
- Dering Arms
- Rose & Crown
Other locations:
- Pluckley Station waiting room
- St. Nicholas church
- Charing Library
- Ashford Borough Council Gateway
Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

PROJECT TIMETABLE
(best estimate - subject to revision)

Pre-submission
- Parish Council agrees draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) - done
- Steering Group (SG) works on Consultation Statement (Jan/Feb)
- SG/retained Consultant work on Basic Conditions Statement (Jan/Feb)
- Draft NP available to residents for 6 weeks consultation period, and ABC, from 10 Feb.
- Responses considered, discussed with ABC, and Plan amended (end Mar.)

Submission
- NP, Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement submitted to ABC (Apl.)
- ABC checks (Apl.)
- If in order, ABC publicises for 6 weeks and invites representations (Apl./May)
- ABC appoints an independent examiner (Apl)

Examination
- ABC sends NP to independent examiner (May/Jun)
- Examiner responds with report, which ABC publishes (Jun)
- ABC decides whether NP ready to go to referendum (Jun)

Referendum
- ABC publishes notice of referendum (Jun/July)
- Referendum (July)
- Results declared (July)

Adoption (August)
PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – WORKSHOP 14 MAY 2015

Present: Steering Group members (Beattie, Newman, O’Connor, Smith)
13 residents: 5 centre, 3 Thorne/Fir Toll, 2 Station, 3 Outlying. Names/addresses collected.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan? This was explained, its significance in planning terms, the process required, how the Parish Plan (PP) and Parish Design Statement (PDS) fitted in, the timetable envisaged.

The aims of this workshop were expressed: to review/confirm the key points of the PP and the PDS; to build a vision for the parish looking to 2030; to explore the need for development.

The main findings of the Parish Plan 2009 and Update 2013 were considered:
1. Development should be small-scale and dispersed. All 13 agreed. P does not want housing estates.
2. Developments of 5 or more houses should be resisted. 12 agreed. 1 felt that, if the need could not be fulfilled through shortage of sites, then up to 10 could be acceptable if a site was available.
3. Sheltered housing for elderly residents should be provided by the village cluster. A need was perceived. Given the practical requirement that any such provision demands a minimum of 30 dwellings in order to provide the desired facilities, all 13 agreed that the village cluster, in a neighbouring community, was the best solution.
4. We should control the numbers and speed of traffic, particularly HGVs. All 13 agreed. This is seen as a major issue impairing the quality of life in the parish. Planning applications entailing an increase in traffic should continue to be opposed. Steps should be taken to reduce speeds and the bottleneck at Forge Hill should be examined for a safer solution.
5. We should encourage Leisure and social interaction. All 13 agreed. Progress had been made in recent years with the provision of facilities and initiatives undertaken by volunteers. This should continue to receive support. The plans for the Village Hall improvements, in particular, should be actively progressed.
6. We should protect open views as a defining aspect of the village character. All 13 agreed. The spread out nature of Pluckley is what makes it distinctive and the views enjoyed within the parish should be maintained. Development that threatens this should be opposed.
7. The ‘green heart’ of the village should be retained. All 13 agreed. A specific example of 6. above, this space with its fields, trees and ponds, should be protected.
8. Trees and woodland should be protected. All 13 agreed. The parish enjoys the amenity of many mature trees and woodlands which are seen as enhancing the environment and providing a leisure facility for residents and visitors alike.
9. Open spaces within groupings of houses should be retained. All 13 agreed. Examples quoted were Westfields, the Station, Thorne estate, Fir Toll.
10. Uniform layout of houses to be avoided. ‘Uniform’ was taken to mean either by appearance or configuration. All 13 agreed, with the proviso that for small developments, such as the recent Local Needs units at Westfields, it would be difficult to avoid some uniformity.
11. The scale and size of any development should fit into its surroundings. All 13 agreed, This applied both to new development and to extension of existing property. Disappointment was expressed at a couple of recent examples where over-development on the plot had been allowed.
12. Owners or developers should plant hedgerows, native trees or picket fences to soften impact on roadside frontages. All 13 agreed. Recent erection of wooden panelled fences by some residents was deplored as it was considered inappropriate in a rural setting.

The following issues were then raised:
13. Employment. All 13 agreed that the existing main branches of employment: agriculture, tourism and key local services, should be supported. There were mixed views about the benefit of employment provision in the parish. While its presence could offer work, the experience of current employment premises in the parish is that most employees are attracted from outside. This entails the negative impact of more traffic. On balance, 1 supported the need for more employment, 12 were against.
14. School. All 13 agreed that the primary school was a vital part of the community and that both should seek to work together. It was understood that the admissions policy is to prioritise Pluckley children and this was considered natural and important.

15. Shops and pubs. All 13 agreed that the three shops and the three public houses were seen as important to the community and should be supported and preserved.

16. Station. All 13 agreed this is a vital communication resource for the parish and preservation of the rail service was seen as important.

17. Parking. All 13 agreed that parking is a problem, both in the village centre and at the station. It was considered that the provision of the additional car park on the QEII Recreation Ground had helped and that there was little to be done as regards the centre. School drop off time is a problem countrywide. The station area, however, offered some possibility of improvement and, when the Plan process comes to considering sites for development, this should be addressed.

18. Street lighting. All 13 agreed that this was not appropriate for Pluckley and that the night sky was an attractive amenity. The suggestion was made that, should safety issues at any development demand lighting (e.g. Car park) then it should be of a nature not to impinge on views of the night sky.

19. Pavements. All 13 agreed that the state of certain pavements had deteriorated to an unacceptable level, particularly up Forge Hill and that this should be addressed with the appropriate authority and adjacent landowners as appropriate.

20. Publicity/advertising boards. All 13 accepted the need for local businesses to be able to advertise, but that restraint was necessary. The current Parish Council policy of limiting notices to two, and in the relative vicinity of their premises, to each business was appropriate.

21. Housing Need. A lengthy discussion was held as to how many new homes the parish needs and of what nature. All 13 agreed that the principle need was for elderly residents seeking to down-size, and a secondary requirement for young residents needing a first home. In both cases, all 13 agreed that 2-bedroom homes were the need. Older residents would require a second bedroom for family and visitors, or for a couple no longer sharing the same bedroom. First-time owners would be thinking of starting a family and need a second bedroom. There was no perceived need for 3 or 4 bedroom homes, particularly as applications are regularly made to extend existing properties. In considering the need for the next fifteen years, the point was made that, in the past fifteen years, fewer than ten homes had been built. The natural future need was seen to be similar. Each member of the workshop was asked to nominate what they considered Pluckley’s need to be, given their knowledge of the community and expressed aspirations of friends and neighbours. The response ranged from 0-15 homes, with most nominating around 10.

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – WORKSHOP 15 MAY 2015

Present: Steering Group members (Beattie, Newman, O’Connor)

13 residents: 5 centre, 2 Thorne/Fir Toll, 3 Station, 3 Outlying. Names/addresses collected.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan? This was explained, its significance in planning terms, the process required, how the Parish Plan (PP) and Parish Design Statement (PDS) fitted in, the timetable envisaged.

The aims of this workshop were expressed: to review/confirm the key points of the PP and the PDS; to build a vision for the parish looking to 2030; to explore the need for development.

The main findings of the Parish Plan 2009 and Update 2013 were considered:

1. Development should be small-scale and dispersed. All 13 agreed. P does not want housing estates.

2. Developments of 5 or more houses should be resisted. All 13 agreed as a general principle. It was suggested though that, should an advantageous site present itself, this could be relaxed and 7 supported this – provided it was capped at the total need identified for the parish (see 21 below).

3. Sheltered housing for elderly residents should be provided by the village cluster. A need was perceived. Given the practical requirement that any such provision demands a minimum of 30
dwellings in order to provide the desired facilities, all 13 agreed that the village cluster, in a
neighbouring community, was the best solution.
4. We should control the numbers and speed of traffic, particularly HGVs. All 13 agreed. This is
seen as a major issue impairing the quality of life in the parish. The Parish Council should continue
to work for a single 30mph limit.
5. We should encourage leisure and social interaction. All 13 agreed. Progress had been made in
recent years with the provision of facilities and initiatives undertaken by volunteers. This should
continue to receive support. The plans for the Village Hall improvements, in particular, should be
actively progressed.
6. We should protect open views as a defining aspect of the village character. All 13 agreed. The
spread out nature of Pluckley is what makes it distinctive and the views enjoyed within the parish
should be maintained. Development that threatens this should be opposed.
7. The ‘green heart’ of the village should be retained. This was explained, with maps, as the area
bounded by The Street, Station Road, Lambden Road and Smarden Road. All 13 agreed.
8. Trees and woodland should be protected. All 13 agreed.
9. Open spaces within groupings of houses should be retained. All 13 agreed. Examples quoted
were Westfields, the Station, Thorne estate, Fir Toll.
10. Uniform layout of houses to be avoided. ‘Uniform’ was taken to mean either by appearance or
configuration. All 13 agreed, with the proviso that for small developments, such as the recent Local
Needs units at Westfields, it would be difficult to avoid some uniformity.
11. The scale and size of any development should fit into its surroundings. All 13 agreed. This
applied both to new development and to extension of existing property.
12. Owners or developers should plant hedgerows, native trees or picket fences to soften impact on
roadside frontages. All 13 agreed.

The following issues were then raised:
13. Employment. All 13 agreed that the existing main branches of employment: agriculture,
tourism and key local services should be supported. There was some support for the provision of a
few, small nursery office units either in the station area or at Pivington.
14. School. All 13 agreed that the primary school was a vital part of the community and that both
should seek to work together. It was understood that the admissions policy is to prioritise Pluckley
children and this was considered natural and important.
15. Shops and pubs. All 13 agreed that the three shops and the three public houses were seen as
important to the community and should be supported and preserved.
16. Station. All 13 agreed this is a vital communication resource for the parish and preservation of
the rail service was seen as important.
17. Parking. All 13 agreed that parking is a problem, both in the village centre and at the station. It
was considered that the station area, however, offered some possibility of improvement and, when
the Plan process comes to considering sites for development, this should be addressed.
18. Street lighting. All 13 agreed that this was not appropriate for Pluckley and that the night sky
was an attractive amenity.
19. Pavements. All 13 agreed that the state of certain pavements had deteriorated to an unacceptable
level, particularly up Forge Hill and that this should be addressed with the appropriate authority
and adjacent landowners as appropriate. A suggestion was made for a new footpath down Station
Road to the station. The Steering Group agreed to investigate the implications and practicalities.
20. Publicity/advertising boards. All 13 accepted the need for local businesses to be able to
advertise, but that restraint was necessary. The current Parish Council policy of limiting notices to
two, and in the relative vicinity of their premises, to each business was appropriate.
21. Housing Need. A lengthy discussion was held as to how many new homes the parish needs and
of what nature. All 13 agreed that the principle need was for elderly residents seeking to down-
size, and a secondary requirement for young residents needing a first home. In both cases, all 13
agreed that 2-bedroom homes were the need. The comment was made that they did not though need
to be small homes but spacious enough for comfortable living.
In considering the need for the next fifteen years, the point was made that, in the past fifteen years, fewer than ten homes had been built. The natural future need was seen to be similar. Each member of the workshop was asked to nominate what they considered Pluckley’s need to be, given their knowledge of the community and expressed aspirations of friends and neighbours. The response ranged from 7-12 homes, giving an average of 9.

Regarding the process of consultation for the Plan, two suggestions were made: to hold one workshop on a Sunday afternoon so that working couples could more easily attend; and to boost responses by offering an on-line questionnaire to cover some issues. The Steering Group agreed to look at both of these suggestions.
PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – WORKSHOP 26 JUNE 2015

Present: Steering Group members (Beattie, Newman)
8 residents: 3 Thorne/Fir Toll, 3 Station, 2 Outlying. Names/addresses collected.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan? This was explained, its significance in planning terms, the process required, how the Parish Plan (PP) and Parish Design Statement (PDS) fitted in, the timetable envisaged.

The aims of this workshop were expressed: to review/confirm the key points of the PP and the PDS; to build a vision for the parish looking to 2030; to explore the need for development.

The main findings of the Parish Plan 2009 and Update 2013 were considered:
1. Development should be small-scale and dispersed. All 8 agreed. The one possible exception proposed by one resident was for the Brickworks. This is developed under 22 below.
2. Developments of 5 or more houses should be resisted. All 8 agreed as a general principle. Again, the Brickworks site was raised as a possible exception.
3. Sheltered housing for elderly residents should be provided by the village cluster. The need was recognised and agreed. Given the practical requirement that any such provision demands a minimum of 30 dwellings in order to provide the desired facilities, all agreed that the village cluster, in a neighbouring community – preferably Charing with its medical facilities and level walking, was the best solution.
4. We should control the numbers and speed of traffic, particularly HGVs. All 8 agreed. The Parish Council should continue to work for a single 30mph limit.
5. We should encourage Leisure and social interaction. All 8 agreed. Progress had been made in recent years with the provision of facilities and initiatives undertaken by volunteers. This should continue to receive support.
6. We should protect open views as a defining aspect of the village character. All 8 agreed. Development that threatens this should be opposed.
7. The ‘green heart’ of the village should be retained. This was explained, with maps, as the area bounded by The Street, Station Road, Lambden Road and Smarden Road. All 8 agreed. The possibility of more access to it, possibly even a footpath to the village centre was proposed.
8. Trees and woodland should be protected. All 8 agreed.
9. Open spaces within groupings of houses should be retained. All 8 agreed. Examples quoted were Westfields, the Station, Thorne estate, Fir Toll.
10. Uniform layout of houses to be avoided. ‘Uniform’ was taken to mean either by appearance or configuration. All 8 agreed.
11. The scale and size of any development should fit into its surroundings. All 8 agreed, This applied both to new development and to extension of existing property.
12. Owners or developers should plant hedgerows, native trees or picket fences to soften impact on roadside frontages. All 8 agreed. In particular, wooden fences should not be allowed.

The following issues were then raised:
13. Employment. All 8 agreed that the existing main branches of employment: agriculture, tourism (provided it is small-scale) and key local services should be supported.
14. School. All 8 agreed that the primary school was a vital part of the community and that both should seek to work together. It was understood that the admissions policy is to prioritise Pluckley children and this was considered natural and important.
15. Shops and pubs. All 8 agreed that the three shops were important to the community and should be supported and preserved. 6 of the 8 felt the same way about the three public houses.
16. Station. All 8 agreed this is a vital communication resource for the parish and preservation of the rail service was seen as important.
17. Parking. All 8 agreed that parking is a problem, both in the village centre and at the station. It was considered that the station area, however, offered some possibility of improvement and, when the Plan process comes to considering sites for development, this should be addressed. A specific car park, with reduced fees, for Pluckley residents only was proposed.
18. Street lighting. All 8 agreed strongly that this was not appropriate for Pluckley and that the night sky was an attractive amenity.

19. Pavements. All 8 agreed that the state of certain pavements had deteriorated to an unacceptable level, particularly up Forge Hill and that this should be addressed with the appropriate authority and adjacent landowners as appropriate. No other pavements were considered necessary – indeed there was opposition to pavements in a rural area.

20. Publicity/advertising boards. All 8 accepted the need for local businesses to be able to advertise, but that restraint was necessary. The current Parish Council policy of limiting notices to two, and in the relative vicinity of their premises, to each business was appropriate.

21. Green energy. Wind turbines were considered inappropriate, though small-scale ones business premises might be acceptable. Solar panels were acceptable on business premises and modern homes, but not on agricultural land or traditional homes.

22. Housing Need. A lengthy discussion was held as to how many new homes the parish needs and of what nature. All 8 agreed that the principle need was for elderly residents seeking to down-size, and a secondary requirement for young residents needing a first home. In both cases, all 8 agreed that 1-bedroom homes were not the answer and that 2-bedroom homes were the need.

In considering the need for the next fifteen years, the point was made that, in the past fifteen years, fewer than ten homes had been built. Each member of the workshop was asked to nominate what they considered Pluckley’s need to be, given their knowledge of the community and expressed aspirations of friends and neighbours. One person suggested 45, assuming that the Brickworks site was developed and took the majority. The other 7 proposed between 8 and 12 with an average of 10. 2 of these 7, however, said that if the Brickworks site was to be developed, 20 homes should be the maximum.

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – WORKSHOP 28 JUNE 2015

Present: Steering Group members (Beattie, Newman, O’Connor)
9 residents: 2 Thorne/Fir Toll, 3 Station, 4 Outlying. Names/addresses collected.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan? This was explained, its significance in planning terms, the process required, how the Parish Plan (PP) and Parish Design Statement (PDS) fitted in, the timetable envisaged.

The aims of this workshop were expressed: to review/confirm the key points of the PP and the PDS; to build a vision for the parish looking to 2030; to explore the need for development. The main findings of the Parish Plan 2009 and Update 2013 were considered:

1. Development should be small-scale and dispersed. 7 agreed. 2 felt that, if a specific site warranted it, a larger development could be accommodated.

2. Developments of 5 or more houses should be resisted. 6 agreed as a general principle. 3 considered this too restrictive.

3. Sheltered housing for elderly residents should be provided by the village cluster. The need was recognised and agreed. Given the practical requirement that any such provision demands a minimum of 30 dwellings in order to provide the desired facilities, all 9 agreed that the village cluster, in a neighbouring community – preferably Charing with its medical facilities and level walking, was the best solution. The question was raised as to the acreage/conditions demanded by such a development before ruling the possibility out for Pluckley.

4. We should control the numbers and speed of traffic, particularly HGVs. All 9 agreed.

5. We should encourage Leisure and social interaction. All 9 agreed.

6. We should protect open views as a defining aspect of the village character. All 9 agreed.

7. The ‘green heart’ of the village should be retained. This was explained, with maps, as the area bounded by The Street, Station Road, Lambden Road and Smarden Road. All 9 agreed. The possibility of more access to it, possibly even a footpath to the village centre was proposed and supported by 8.

8. Trees and woodland should be protected. All 9 agreed.
9. Open spaces within groupings of houses should be retained. All 9 agreed. Examples quoted were Westfields, the Station, Thorne estate, Fir Toll.

10. Uniform layout of houses to be avoided. ‘Uniform’ was taken to mean either by appearance or configuration. All 9 agreed for a development of any size but, for very small developments, this wasn’t seen as necessary – a row of four cottages could be uniform yet attractive.

11. The scale and size of any development should fit into its surroundings. All 9 agreed.

12. Owners or developers should plant hedgerows, native trees or picket fences to soften impact on roadside frontages. All 9 agreed.

The following issues were then covered:

13. Employment. There were mixed views as to the benefit to Pluckley of providing employment as most local employers do not employ Pluckley workers. All 9 agreed that the existing main branches of employment: agriculture, tourism (provided it is small) should be supported. 6 of the 9 were in favour of a few small nursery units. 8 of the 9 were against manufacturing and all 9 were against logistics/distribution.

14. School. All 9 agreed that the primary school was a vital part of the community and that both should seek to work together. It was understood that the admissions policy is to prioritise Pluckley children and this was considered natural and important.

15. Shops and pubs. All 9 agreed that the three shops and the pubs were important to the community and should be supported and preserved.

16. Station. All 9 agreed this is a vital communication resource for the parish and preservation of the rail service was seen as important.

17. Parking. All 9 agreed that parking is a problem, both in the village centre and at the station. It was considered that in the station area, however, the old coal yard on the south side of the line offered the possibility of additional car parking. Specific car parking, with reduced fees, perhaps along the road for Pluckley residents only was proposed.

18. Street lighting. All 9 agreed strongly that this was not appropriate for Pluckley and that the night sky was an attractive amenity. It was suggested that we register under the Dark Skies policy.

19. Pavements. All agreed that the state of certain pavements should be addressed with the appropriate authority and adjacent landowners as appropriate. No other pavements were considered necessary. Footpaths though were preferred, with a Type 1 surface ideally, and one running from Lambden Road to the centre of the village was favoured.

20. Publicity/advertising boards. All 9 agreed that these should be limited. The current Parish Council policy of limiting notices to two, and in the relative vicinity of their premises, to each business was supported.

21. Green energy. Wind turbines were considered inappropriate by all 9, though 2 felt small-scale ones on business premises might be acceptable. Solar panels were acceptable on business premises and modern homes, but not on agricultural land or traditional homes. Energy saving was put forward as a better means of conserving usage.

22. Housing Need. A lengthy discussion was held as to how many new homes the parish needs and of what nature. All 9 agreed that the principle need was for elderly residents seeking to down-size, with a secondary requirement for young residents needing a first home. In both cases, all 9 agreed that 1-bedroom homes were not the answer and that 2-bedroom homes were the need. The suggestion was made that starter homes should allow for a modest expansion in future years as families grew.

In considering the need for the next fifteen years, the point was made that, in the past fifteen years, fewer than ten homes had been built. Each member of the workshop was asked to nominate what they considered Pluckley’s need to be, given their knowledge of the community and expressed aspirations of friends and neighbours. One person, a landowner, felt that Pluckley could absorb 100 homes. The other 8 proposed between 5 and 30, with an average of 17. 8 said that if the Brickworks site was to be developed, it should take the bulk of new development with 20 homes the maximum.
PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – WORKSHOP 6 AUGUST 2015

Present: Steering Group members (Beattie, Newman, O’Connor, Smith)
13 residents: 5 Centre, 4 Thorne/Fir Toll, 3 Station, 1 Outlying. Names/addresses collected.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan? This was explained, its significance in planning terms, the process required, how the Parish Plan (PP) and Parish Design Statement (PDS) fitted in, the timetable envisaged.

The aims of this workshop were expressed: to review/confirm the key points of the PP and the PDS; to build a vision for the parish looking to 2030; to explore the need for development.

Given that all the participants had completed questionnaires (and had requested presence at a workshop) this workshop concentrated on the number and type of housing the parish should take.

1. All agreed that development should be small-scale and dispersed.
2. The prime need was seen as smaller homes for elderly residents downsizing. All agreed that single bedroom were not required and that ideally, two or perhaps three bedroom homes were required. These should be as 1. above spread around the parish.
3. One attendee thought that the parish lacked younger and middle-aged professionals and four-bedroom homes were needed to attract these.
4. In terms of design, it was agreed that there is a diversity in the parish and this should be encouraged but it was strongly felt by all present that any dwelling should fit in sympathetically with its surroundings.
5. Over-development of individual sites should not be allowed, retaining a sense of space. Where they exist, owners should be encouraged to plant hedges or trees in front.
6. Wooden fences along frontages were deplored.
7. The Brickworks site. Most agreed that housing was preferable to industry but fear was expressed that the number of houses could not be controlled if outline permission was granted. It was agreed that the Parish Council should endeavour to negotiate the smallest number of homes possible, with certain provisos: the rest of the land should be precluded from development and handed over to a trust; and that the homes should be larger, both to meet the needs of professionals and to keep the numbers down. The following points also should be checked: when the original brickworks licence was granted, it was under the condition that the land be returned to original state eventually; does this site constitute “suitable brownfield” in the Government’s terms; seepage from the land-fill site next door; proximity of the access road to the bungalow adjacent; the possibility of the developer funding a chicane to slow traffic along Station Road.

Attendees were then asked if there were any other issues they wished to raise:
8. We should control the numbers and speed of traffic, particularly HGVs. All agreed and supported the current PC policy of opposing planning applications that would generate more HGV traffic.
9. Parking. To relieve the station parking problem, it was felt that the site on the south side could be used for parking.
10. Pavements. All agreed that the state of certain pavements should be addressed with the appropriate authority and adjacent landowners as appropriate.
11. Hedgerows. Many have become very overgrown, both over the highway and pavements. It is the obligation of landowners to cut them back and a firmer line should be taken by the PC to encourage this.
13. Village handyman. This possibility was welcomed and would alleviate 10 and 11 above.
21. Green energy. Solar panels were acceptable on business premises but not on agricultural land. Well-designed panels could be acceptable on homes but other energy saving means could be more effective. The PC was encouraged to discuss with ABC what energy saving means are available and to formulate a policy for the Neighbourhood Plan.
A.3 Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan – Questionnaire

Please indicate how far you agree with the following from the Parish Plan and Design Statement. 10 = completely agree to 1 = completely disagree.

1. Any development in Pluckley should be small-scale (i.e. 1 – 4 houses) and dispersed.  
   Avg. Score 8.2
2. Developments of 5 or more houses should be resisted.  
   Avg. Score 7.9
3. Sheltered housing for elderly residents should be provided by the village cluster (The village cluster is an agreement by six neighbouring villages to cluster together to find a site able to take the minimum 30 dwelling units necessary).  
   Avg. Score 7.5
4. We should seek to control the volume and speed of traffic, particularly HGVs.  
   Avg. Score 9.5
5. We should encourage Leisure and social interaction.  
   Avg. Score 8.6
6. We should protect open views as a defining aspect of the village character.  
   Avg. Score 9.4
7. The ‘green heart’ of the village should be retained, i.e. area of fields/ woodland at the heart of the village, bounded by The Street, Station Rd, Lambden, Smarden Rd.  
   Avg. Score 8.9
8. Trees and woodland should be protected.  
   Avg. Score 9.5
9. Open spaces within groupings of houses should be retained e.g. the triangles of green by the station car park, Fir Toll, and the land at the end of the Thorne estate.  
   Avg. Score 9.0
10. Uniform layout of houses is to be avoided.  
    Avg. Score 8.9
11. The scale and size of any development should fit into its surroundings.  
    Avg. Score 9.6
12. Owners or developers should plant hedgerows, native trees or picket fences to soften impact on roadside frontages.  
    Avg. Score 9.1
13. Should the village encourage commercial activity? (tick all you agree with)  
    - Manufacturing 12%
    - Agriculture 71%
    - Logistics/wholesale/distribution 5%
    - Business Services (accountancy, marketing, legal firms etc.) 43%
    - Tourism 64%
    - Retail 51%
    - Other please specify… 2%
14. To what extent do you think it is critical for the village to retain the following? Please answer using a scale of 1 – 10 where 10 is critical and 1 is not important at all.  
    - Shops Avg. score 9.9
24.08.16

- Pubs Avg. Score 9.6
- Post office Avg. score 9.8

15. Do you think the on road parking around the station is a problem for the village?
- Yes 76%
- No 13%
- Not sure 10%

16. You’ve indicated that you consider on road parking is a problem for the village. Which of the following would you like to see introduced to help address the problem? (tick all you agree with)
- Additional “charged for” parking facilities 53%
- Double yellow lines Station Rd 33%
- Single yellow lines Station Rd 32%

17. Would you like to see street lights installed in the village?
- Yes 8%
- No 79%
- Not sure 14%

18. Do you think that the maintenance of pavements in the parish needs to be improved?
- Yes 50%
- No 25%
- Not sure 23%

19. Over the last 15 years Pluckley has seen about 10 new dwellings in the village. Over the next 15 years do you think there should be: more, fewer, or about the same number of new dwellings built?
- More 22%
- Fewer 21%
- About the same 57%

20. How many houses would you like to see built over the next 15 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 +</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. score 11.3

Pluckley Parish Plan Questionnaire 2012
In preparation for Pluckley’s Parish Plan Update 2013, questionnaires were distributed to all homes in the parish in the autumn of 2012. This is the section covering the topic of development.
Part 2 - Development in Pluckley
This section will contribute towards Pluckley’s Neighbourhood Plan. All aged 16 and over who wish to answer the following questions should do so.

Q.9 Do you think Pluckley can accommodate more new housing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.10 If Yes to Q.9, what kind of accommodation? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small family homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large family homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Needs homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered housing for elderly or disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No further homes are needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.11 What type of housing development would be acceptable in Pluckley? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single dwellings in controlled locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small groups of less than 5 houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of redundant dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.12 Should the following be encouraged in and around Pluckley? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small business development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large business development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism developments/attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.13 Should there be development of? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites for touring caravans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites for permanent holiday caravans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed &amp; breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open spaces/nature reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Steering Group has been formed to research, develop and make recommendations with a view to establishing a Neighbourhood Plan addressing the future needs of Pluckley Parish.

The membership of the Steering Group is formed initially from current Parish Councillors. In addition, the Steering Group will be supplemented by representation...
from Ashford Borough Council and guidance will be given to the Group through a neighbourhood planning consultant.

The Steering Group may also co-opt further representation from any other person or organisation that is likely to bring additional benefit to the project. Details of any assistance offered by such parties must be declared publicly and should not be seen to compromise the integrity of the direction of the plan.

All members of the Steering Group must declare any personal interest that may be perceived as being relevant to the recommendations made by the group. This may include membership of an organisation, ownership of interest in land or business or indeed any other matter likely to be relevant to the work undertaken by the Steering Group.

In undertaking this role the principal terms of reference of the Steering Group will be as follows:

- The Steering Group will be responsible for drawing up a Draft Neighbourhood Plan and any revisions as a result of an on-going consultation process
- The Steering Group will report to the Parish Council at its regular monthly meetings
- The Steering Group shall not have the power to exercise, on behalf of the Parish Council, any authority, nor to incur expenditure without prior authority from the Parish Council
- The Steering Group will elect one of its members to chair meetings
- The Steering Group task meetings will be informal and can be held anywhere without public notice
- Notes will be taken to facilitate reporting back to the Parish Council on a monthly basis and these will be published on the Parish Council website
- Recommendations made as a result of Community Engagement shall be referred back to the Parish Council for decision making, such that the Draft Neighbourhood Plan when presented should have the full backing of the Parish Council and not the Steering Group alone
- The Group will work together with the Parish Council such that the Final Plan meets the needs of the community as driven by the on-going community consultation process
- The ultimate objective is to deliver a Neighbourhood Plan that is robust and that reflects as fully as possible the views and aspirations of Pluckley Parish residents.

In seeking to fulfil its role the Steering Group will aim to progress as follows:

- Suggest a timetable for the project
- Establish the future housing and business needs of the area, having regard for the wider social, economic and welfare considerations of the area, e.g. health,
education

- Develop policies to inform the future development and use of land in the area, including Infrastructure policies that go hand in hand with development
- Identify sites for development in line with the requirements laid down in the Ashford Borough Council Local Plan, including sites that may be suitable for further development
- Take note and include in the Plan non-land orientated projects that are of importance to the community and identified through Community Engagement
- Ensure the Neighbourhood Plan is supported by an effective on-going programme of communication and consultation with the community, Ashford Borough Council, developers, adjoining parishes and other key third parties
- Have regard to relevant national policies and be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the district council, EU and Human Rights legislation when developing the plan
- Conduct a sustainability assessment to support the Neighbourhood Plan if required, including Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) or Habitat Regulation Assessments (HEA)
- Support the Parish Council in taking the plan through the examination
- Support the Parish Council in finding consensus through the referendum process and ultimately securing community endorsement of the Neighbourhood Plan
- Have a comprehensive Evidence base to support the Neighbourhood Plan Policies through Community Engagement and research, including communication where relevant with Parish Councillors, Ashford Borough Council Officers and Kent County Council Officers.

Steering Group Meetings

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP
Meeting 26.1.2015
Present: Sue Beattie, Martin Newman, Paul Smith, Chris Warricker

1. All present confirmed that they were happy to be members of this Steering Group.
2. MN would confirm with Tim O’Connor that he too would be happy to join.
3. Notice had been lodged with ABC that the Parish Council had agreed to seek Neighbourhood Area status with a view to preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. The Consultation period had started and would end 2 March.
4. All agreed to study government guidelines, and examples of other village NPs, as well as Pluckley’s existing Parish Plan and Parish Design Statement.
5. Given the expertise available within the village, it was not felt necessary at this stage to seek advice from external consultants. MN would though speak with Bethersden about their experience.
6. All agreed to consider whether we needed separate Working Groups to look at Development, Transport, Leisure & Environment.
7. As a questionnaire had been completed in the village just two years ago, it was agreed that this exercise need not be repeated but should be updated and developed through workshops.
8. PS would check the planning status of the Brickworks site.

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP
Minutes 9.2.2015
Present: Sue Beattie, Martin Newman, Tim O’Connor, Paul Smith, Chris Warricker
1. It was agreed that the Plan needed to embrace Housing, Employment, Getting around, Leisure & Environment. Some of these areas may already have been adequately covered by the Parish Plan Update 2013.
2. MN would draft the structure of the Plan and introductory sections by next meeting, 9 March.

Next meeting: 9 March 2015

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP
Meeting 9.3.2015
Present: Martin Newman, Tim O'Connor, Paul Smith, Chris Warricker
1. MN updated PS and CW as to the meeting with S Cole and D Carter of ABC.
2. No indication had yet been received from ABC that Pluckley is now an accepted Neighbourhood Area.
3. Given ABC's Local Plan timetable, it was agreed we should try to submit our draft Neighbourhood Plan by end October 2015.
4. MN agreed to circulate Minutes of our meetings so far.
5. It was agreed that, as soon as we hear from ABC (2. Above) we should timetable Workshop meetings in the village. Late April/early May was favoured. MN would draft publicity and invitations to residents.
6. Development of Housing and Employment would be the key topics for the Workshops. Getting Around and Leisure & Environment had received developed coverage in the Parish Plan Update 2013.
7. It was agreed we would also need to meet with developers and landowners. ABC can supply a list.
8. MN had drafted the structure of the Plan and the introductory sections and would circulate these.

Pnp sg minutes 12.5.15
Present: Sue Beattie, Tim O’Connor, Paul Smith, Martin Newman
1. Dan Carter’s helpful note was absorbed and the response to his questions agreed. MN to do.
2. The professional advice received by PS was digested and the programme for preparing the plan agreed.
3. The workshop content was agreed as follows:
   i. to review the Parish Plan and Design Statement to confirm the vision for the village
   ii. to establish views on housing, employment, traffic and social issues. Housing, to examine the need.
   iii. to explore some of the qualitative aspects of the Design Statement.
   iv. it was agreed that it was premature to consider sites at this stage until the need was established, hopefully by end June.
4. To arrange further workshops in June.
5. To consider sites once need was established.
6. To communicate with landowners prior to 5.
7. The response to P Ellard, as a landowner, was agreed.

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
STEERING GROUP MEETING 13 OCTOBER 2015
Present: Sue Beattie, Martin Newman, Paul Smith. Apologies: Tim O’Connor
1. Red Lining
   The three maps prepared by SB were gone over carefully and minor adjustments made to reflect the ambitions expressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.
2. Policies
   Each of the policies included in the draft Neighbourhood Plan was considered in turn and minor adjustments to wording were made. It was agreed to await any further comments from our retained consultant, Clare Wright.
3. Brickworks
   The note received the day before from M.Drury was considered. It was agreed to await the outcome of ABC’s consultants’ review of the Viability Report and raise our issues at the subsequent meeting.
envisaged with ABC. These are: number of houses; management agreement; and green field off Chambers Green Road.

4. Presentation to village 21 October
SB agreed to prepare enlarged maps of the Neighbourhood Area, the sites, and the red line areas. We would seek advice from Clare Wright on Monday 19th as to whether we should cover the red lining at this meeting. CW would also be attending the meeting on 21st.

The content of the presentation to residents was otherwise discussed and agreed as follows:
- Explanation of NP
- Process
- The development sites: 10 sites, village response, proviso of brickworks, sustainability appraisal, selected sites, brickworks on-going discussion, old coal yard.
- What happens next

5. Siteowners
It was agreed that MN would write to all 8 siteowners appraising them of our decisions on Thursday 15th.

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
STEERING GROUP MEETING 19 October 2015
Present: Clare Wright consultant, SG members Sue Beattie, Martin Newman and Paul Smith
PS introduced CW to the other members and CW explained her qualifications and experience and how she felt she could best help on the Pluckley NP. Her brief was agreed as that set out in the correspondence between her and PS.

CW had done a quick over scan of the draft NP and advised that it seemed to be well-constructed and that the correct procedures had been followed. She advised that some restructuring and drafting would be required as far as the appendices were concerned. There are three documents that are obligatory, including
1. Consultation Statement setting out the process and nature of the consultation within the parish.
2. Basic Conditions Statement. This explains how the Plan fits within the surrounding planning framework.
   The Sustainability Report is optional. This could include a written resume of the site selection process, explaining why the supported sites were selected and why the non-supported sites were not. This could show the scores and include details of site visits.
   CW pointed us to the regulations governing NPs, particularly Regulations 14-16 which govern the next stages of the NP.
   The forthcoming public meeting in the parish was discussed and CW advised on the items to display: Progress so far’ Site assessment criteria; Supported sites map; non-supported sites map; Redlining.
   CW undertook to come back once she had studied the draft NP with further comments

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
STEERING GROUP MEETING 31 OCTOBER 2015
Present: Sue Beattie, Martin Newman, Tim O’Connor, Paul Smith
The meeting was convened to consider how to respond to KCC Highways acceptance of two sites but rejection of the Parsonage Cottage site supported by the Parish Council for development, on the grounds that the sight lines were inadequate.

The options available were considered:
1. To question the assessment by KCCH and establish whether the site would be acceptable with just one or two additional dwellings.
2. To approach the owners of the Lambden Rd site ‘approved’ by KCCH to see if they might take an additional dwelling.
3. To revisit the sites that were not supported by the assessment
4. To accept that the number of small/medium homes requested by the parish would be 7 rather than 11.
5. To raise the possibility of the smaller/medium homes lost being included in the Brickworks development.

It was unanimously agreed that we should appraise all three site owners of KCCH response.

We should ask the owner of the Parsonage Cottage site whether they would consider just one or two dwellings and, if so, ascertain whether this would gain KCCH approval.
We should ask the owner of the Lambden Road site if they would accept an additional dwelling.
We should not revisit the non-supported sites. They had failed to satisfy the assessment and they and the village had been notified accordingly.

We should consider whether the ‘lost’ dwellings could be accommodated within the Brickworks site in our negotiations with the applicant. This approach to be cleared by the Parish Council.
Failing all, replacement possibilities, we would accept that the number of homes meeting the small/medium requirement would be reduced but the total number of homes required was being more than met. This to be cleared by the Parish Council.

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
STEERING GROUP MEETING 2.11.2015

Present; Sue Beattie, Martin Newman, Paul Smith plus invitees Chris Housman, Carol Washer, Mike Whatman

The meeting was called to discuss the red lining proposals for the Neighbourhood Plan.

MN explained how the location of the red lines had been arrived at:
the consultation process had called for 11 homes (plus Brickworks) spread across sites, and no more;
the sites had been assessed and three (plus Brickworks) identified as suitable. These had been approved by the Parish Council. All the sites are outside what ABC call the core of the village so, in effect, are red-lined out as far as development is concerned currently;
the SG believed they now needed to be red-lined in to receive development. Advice had been received from Simon Cole and consultant Clare Wright and red lines had been drawn around the traditional village core and the Thorne/Fir Toll areas (plus the development area within the Brickworks site);
the lines had been drawn through the middle of gardens. This is because a line across the back wall of properties (as offered by SC) was considered too restrictive and could cause confusion re extensions. A line across the bottom of gardens is too loose in that it opens up the possibility of development over and above what the consultation process called for. The half-way down gardens was seen as the sensible compromise, and the possibility of exceptional minor development in gardens, where beneficial to the parish, would be explained in the NP text;
in preparing for the residents meeting on 15 October, the SG had reached the above conclusion on 13th and our consultant had concurred and suggested it should be presented at the residents’ meeting.

Seeing the red lines as the natural consequence of the already agreed policies, the SG overlooked the fact that the PC would not have seen the red line map before it was presented to residents. This oversight was regretted and this meeting was called to explain how it had happened, prior to seeking approval at the next PC meeting.

CH and CW accepted the oversight was an honest mistake. MW did not.

CH and MW considered that the red lining was contentious and had the potential not to be supported by residents. It was acknowledged that residents had had little time to absorb the implications of the red lining and this would be re-visited.
It was agreed therefore that the SG would check with CW and SC the following:
1. Are red lines needed/advisable?
2. Could just the four supported sites be red lined?
3. Could we have 2. above plus the traditional village core?
4. If Thorne/Fir Toll should be red-lined, where?
PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
STEERING GROUP MINUTES 8.1.16  
Present: Sue Beattie, Martin Newman, Tim O’Connor, Paul Smith  
1. Simon Cole’s response to the pre-submission of the draft NP was discussed. It was agreed that we would ask our consultant Clare Wright to work on the draft to inject the necessary Planning terminology. This would be cleared with the PC Chairman.  
2. Before briefing CW, MN would contact SC to clarify where he felt the draft was deficient.  
3. A meeting with ABC would be set up once the redraft was submitted to SC.  
4. The Brickworks applicant had communicated to ABC that the terms agreed between the PC and ABC were acceptable and that the application should now be considered on this basis. The PC should confirm its stance at its meeting on 18 January. It should also communicate to ABC which projects it wished to benefit from the Contribution that ABC are insisting the applicant makes. The SG suggested that the cladding of the Village Hall and traffic calming measures were the most likely options.  
5. The SG considered which issues should be raised at the Public Meeting on 10 February to ascertain support. The following were proposed: red lining, green areas, community spaces, open views, windfall development, the village cluster, local needs housing, traffic calming, parking at the station, house design, employment, HGV weight.  
6. The draft NP would be made available before the 10 February meeting. It was agreed copies would be available on the website, in local shops, pubs, Charing surgery, the school, the church and the station waiting room.  
7. The draft Consultation Statement had been read by all and considered a good start. Wealden Wheels needed to be added (and included in the draft NP) as did Kent Wildlife Trust.

PLUCKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
STEERING GROUP MINUTES 3.2.16  
Present: Clare Wright (Consultant), Sue Beattie, Martin Newman, Tim O’Connor, Paul Smith  
The draft Plan was reviewed in the light of comments made by Simon Cole/Danielle Dunn at 29 January meeting.  
Most comments had been accepted and absorbed already into a redraft. CW’s views were sought on the following:  
Policy R2 Views. CW agreed it would be better to amalgamate the 17 views where possible. It was agreed that they could be reduced to six. CW suggested changing the icons on the map to better reflect the views.  
R3 Local Green Spaces. After discussion, CW suggested we retain all three, but develop the Justifications for each with reference to NPPF guidelines. In due course, we will need to check Fir Toll triangle with KCC Highways.  
R4 Community Spaces. CW suggested justifying each one individually with the activities undertaken.  
Housing. Paras 7.4 to 7.9 could usefully be dropped and used in the Basic Conditions Statement.  
H2 Sites. CW agreed these should be listed separately as A, B and C with Justification and a Map for each. The Basic Conditions Statement should be referred to in the Justification.  
H2C. Brickworks site. The submission from Kent Wildlife Trust should be added to the rationale for restricting further development at this site.  
H4 Old Coal Yard site. The poor access meant that Highways would be most unlikely to support and this Policy was likely to be unachievable as it stood. It was agreed to change it from Policy to Community Project as an aspiration, pending discussions with the site owner.  
E2. Commercial Development. It was agreed that support for New development should be taken out as this had not been called for. Re-development of existing commercial premises should stay in.  
E4. Traffic Management. SG felt strongly this should be retained as a Policy rather than as a Project. CW supported its retention as there are planning aspects to it.
C2 Protection of Community Facilities. To avoid opening up unintended possibilities the words “subject to the other policies in this Plan” should be added.
C1, 2 and 3 need justifications added.
C4 is subject to the PC identifying any asset but this should be left in the draft for the moment.
MN would try to introduce bullet points in the policies, wherever possible, for ease of reading.
Public Meeting 10 February. This would now be a launch meeting, starting the 6 week consultation period within the parish.
The agenda would be;
Introduce the NP and its importance
Progress to date, including consultation, and future timetable
Explanation of display and where draft NP will be viewable
Tea break to review displays
Q and A
How to comment.
It was agreed that the following visuals would be displayed:
Vision for Pluckley
List of Policies
List of Community Projects
Map of supported housing sites
How the sites were selected
Map of Views
Map of green spaces
Projected timetable
Where the draft Plan will be viewable.
It was agreed that a further Public Meeting would be appropriate, three to four weeks into the six week consultation period to allow residents the opportunity to comment on the Plan in public should they wish.
Responses would be gathered by use of post-it notes at the meetings, and by e-mail. The general question would be posed “Is the Plan in sufficient form for you to be able to vote Yes in a referendum?”
Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

STEERING GROUP MINUTES 7.4.16

Present: Sue Beattie, Martin Newman, Paul Smith. Apologies: Tim O’Connor

1. The final date for responses from the parish to the Regulation 14 pre-submission document was 26 March. The responses received were considered.

2. Three responses had been received:
   i. Historic England had expressed encouraging support for the plan overall. They had three specific comments: to add weight to protection of views by explaining what is to be protected and the use of photographs; to add weight to the “Green Heart” designation by reference to historic, conservation area and listed properties; and to add a sentence to Policy H2B (Lambden Road development site) to ensure design of new dwellings does not impact adversely on the nearby listed properties. All these points were accepted and it was agreed to communicate this to Historic England.
   ii. Mr and Mrs. Dunn objected to the proposed site H2B, Lambden Road which is immediately behind their property. Martin Newman absented himself from this discussion as he is a friend of the site owners.
   The objections were: loss of agricultural land; loss of trees and hedgerows; loss of amenity of views; disturbance; sight lines at entrance. These were considered and it was decided to leave the proposed site in the plan. The Dunn’s objections would be responded to as follows: the loss of agricultural land is regretted and is something the SG tried to avoid. It was a feature of the scoring matrix. 29 of the proposed 33 dwellings in the parish will not mean loss of agricultural land. However, in a rural parish, it is inevitable that future development will mean such loss. The development put to the SG would not result in loss of trees and hedgerows. One small tree might come out but, otherwise, additional planting was envisaged. Views are not an entitlement in planning considerations and the proposed dwellings are some distance removed. Disturbance would be only temporary while development was taking place. KCC Highways have already advised the sight lines are adequate. Mr and Mrs. Dunn also advised they were in negotiation with the site owners to acquire a strip of land to extend their garden over the site. The SG was not aware of this and will need to adjust the site and red lining maps accordingly.
   iii. Ashford Borough Council. Danielle Dunn responded with several points. None of them materially affected the Policies or Projects in the plan. Mostly, the points made are to clarify and strengthen the wording of the plan. The SG was happy to accept most of the points. One or two, it wished to check with consultant Clare Wright, as it was her draft text that DD was suggesting be altered. The one critical comment from ABC was that the draft has not been consulted enough widely to meet Regulation 14. The SG has now had sight of a list of statutory bodies. The draft needs to be made available to them. It was agreed to send the draft unaltered (i.e. not reflecting the comments received) and extend our current pre-submission stage by six weeks in order to do this. The alternative of redrafting would produce a more finished document but, to meet regulations, this would again have to be opened to consultation within the parish. This would be confirmed with the Parish Council.
Appendix 5. List of Pre-submission Consultees

The residents of Pluckley parish
Kent county Council
Ashford Borough Council
Bethersden Parish Council
Charing Parish Council
Egerton Parish Council
Hothfield Parish Council
Little Chart Parish Council
Smarden Parish Council
The Homes and Communities Agency
Natural England
The Environment Agency
The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
The Highways Agency
Owners or controllers of electronic apparatus: EE, Hutchinson 3G, 02, Orange, Three, T-Mobile (UK) Limited, Vodafone, Vodafone and 02.
The Primary Care Trust
Persons to whom a licence has been granted under section 6 (1)(b)(c) of the Electricity Act 1989(8):
EDF, National Grid, UK Power Networks
A person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986(9): SGN
Southern Water, Veolia Water, South East Water
Voluntary bodies: Wealden Wheels
Bodies representing religious groups: Pluckley Parochial Church Council
Bodies representing those carrying on business in the neighbourhood area: Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce, National Farmers Union
Bodies representing disabled persons: Kent Association for Disabled People
Dear Pluckley Parish Council,

- Re: ABC’s representation on the draft Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for consulting Ashford Borough Council on your draft Neighbourhood Plan. Please find attached the Council’s formal response which is made up of three parts:

- Part 1 – considers whether the policies contained within the draft Wye Neighbourhood Plan meet the basic conditions, notably if the policies conform to national and local planning policy.
- Part 2 – provides recommendations on the draft in ABC’s capacity as a critical friend and focuses on recommendations / changes that are not critical to meeting the basic conditions.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Danielle Dunn
Pluckley Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group
Pluckley Parish Council
23rd March 2016
Part 1- Ashford Borough Council Response to the Draft Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan

A neighbourhood plan is a planning document which sets out the vision for the neighbourhood area, and contains policies for the development and use of land in that area. Neighbourhood Plans must be consistent with the prevailing adopted local plan (in this case, the Core Strategy, Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD and saved Borough Local Plan 2000 policies), the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and be subject to an independent examination. This will ensure that proper legal processes have been followed and the plan meets the ‘basic conditions’ including general conformity with strategic local policy. If found to meet the ‘basic conditions’, it will then be subject to a local referendum.

The ‘basic conditions’ are:

1. Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;
2. The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievements of sustainable development
3. The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the areas of the authority (or any part of that area);
4. The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations
5. prescribed conditions are met in relation to the plan and prescribed matters have been compiled with in the connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan.

This part of the representation considers whether the process and policies contained within the draft Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan meet the basic conditions, notably if the policies conform to national and local policy:

The text in italics in the second column is the PNP responses to the points made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process or policy</th>
<th>Does it meet the basic conditions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Page 54 of 60
| The Consultation process | I have concerns that this pre-submission consultation does not meet the basic regulations set out by Government, Regulation 14. This is because there is no consultation statement setting out how the consultation has been carried out. *Now provided*

For example, where was this consultation advertised? Who received official notification of the start and end dates of the consultation (I only received an informal email)? Did this consultation get sent to statutory consultation bodies and Neighbouring Parish Councils? Where were hard copies of the document located for people to view? *Included*

Please consider the above points and draft a consultation statement, this will then form part of the background |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Analysis/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Documents to the consultation</td>
<td>None of the background documents were available during the Regulation 14 consultation. Please see note above. <strong>Now available</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy justifications throughout the document</td>
<td>Some of the policy justifications are very weak. They should refer to the evidence base wherever possible and also cross refer to National Policy. <strong>Re-drafted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1. Landscape Character and Design</td>
<td>In conformity with the basic conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2. Protection of Views and Rural Setting</td>
<td>In conformity with the basic conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3. Designation of Local Green Spaces</td>
<td>In conformity with the basic conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 4. Recreation and Community Use</td>
<td>In conformity with the basic conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R 5. Energy                                  | In its current state this policy doesn’t meet the basic conditions. The policy is not drafted in a way which provides clarity to readers and doesn’t accord with paragraph 154 of the NPPF.  
<br>  If the policy is reworded I do feel this could be overcome. Please refer to the informal recommendations below. |
| H 1. New Residential Development             | In its current state there is no evidence shown to support the selection of the sites and therefore it does not meet the basic condition on sustainability.  
<br> Evidence should be used, referenced and available so that it can be identified that sites have been selected using sustainability criteria.  
<br> Please also refer to the informal recommendations below and the point above regarding the background documents.  
<br> **Site selection appendix added** |
| H 2. Housing Site Allocations:               |                                                                                                                                                           |
| H 2A. Site at Pluckley Thorne                |                                                                                                                                                           |
| H 2B. Site off Lambden Road                  |                                                                                                                                                           |
| H 2C. Site at Pluckley Brickworks            |                                                                                                                                                           |
| Policy H2- Windfall Policy                   | I was not sure if the section dealing with 'windfalls', was in fact a separate policy. It reads like a policy, but is not written in bold text like the other policies in the plan.  
<br> Assuming that the windfall policy is a separate policy, in its current state it does not meet the basic conditions.  
<br> Because the criteria identified are not in accordance with the overarching Borough plan on windfall development.  
<br> For example, the existing Borough windfall policy is not explicit in stating whether the development is for self-build |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Policy Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H 3A. Design Standards</td>
<td>In conformity with the basic conditions, but please also refer to informal recommendations below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 3B. Encouraging Sustainable Development</td>
<td>With specific regard to the Sustainable Drainage section of this policy, the justification is weak and it is not in conformity with the existing Core Strategy policy CS20 and the adopted Sustainable Drainage SPD. Therefore, this policy is not in conformity with the overarching plan and doesn’t meet basic condition 3. It is recommended that this policy is removed. Re-drafted to conform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 3C. Materials</td>
<td>Although this policy meets the basic conditions please refer to the informal recommendations below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 3D. Lighting</td>
<td>The justification of this policy is weak and it doesn’t refer to the existing Dark Sky SPD adopted by Ashford Borough Council. Therefore, this policy is not in conformity with the existing plan and only repeats its position. It is recommended that this policy is removed. Re-drafted, as it is important to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1. Agriculture and Tourism Development</td>
<td>The Tourism section of this policy is a replication of policy CS17 in the Core Strategy and therefore it can be removed as it not considered necessary. Retained for completeness sake for residents to see</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its current form the second paragraph of the policy does not meet the basic conditions, as the policy is asking for improvements to the economy, environment and landscape, but does not provide a way in which these improvements could be measured. This is against Government policy in the NPPF, see paragraph 154. Re-drafted
thought as currently some agricultural development does not need planning permission under the new Permitted Development rights. You could consider redrafting the policy to state, ‘where planning permission is required…’ *done*

Therefore, It is recommended that the guidance on permitted development rights and prior approval is looked at in more detail and the policy is amended where necessary. *Re-drafted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E 2. Commercial Development</th>
<th>This policy is not needed as it repeats the Government position on permitted development rights. It is recommended that this policy is removed. <em>Removed</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E 3. Better Communications</td>
<td>Meets the basic conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  The second paragraph of the policy repeats National Planning Policy Guidance paragraph 45 and therefore is not necessary and can be deleted. *Done*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E 4. Traffic Management throughout the Parish</th>
<th>Meets the basic conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 1. Social interaction and Community Life</td>
<td>Plan meets the basic conditions, but please refer to informal guidance below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2. Protection of Community Facilities</td>
<td>C2 and C3 Meets the basic conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3. Retention of Community Facilities</td>
<td>C4 does not meet the conditions because the policy does not provide a list of Assets of Community value and therefore in its current state the policy is not sustainable. Please provide a list of assets either in the policy or as an appendix to the document so that the policy is sustainable. <em>List added</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Assets of Community Value</td>
<td>Permitted Development rights should be considered in more detail for this policy. Please also refer to the informal notes below for additional guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| C 5. Recreation Spaces                       | The majority of the policy meets the basic conditions. However, the reference to environmental quality and biodiversity are already adopted national policy or local planning policy. It is recommended to remove these references from the policy. *Done* |
- Part 2 - Recommendations on the draft:
  This section of the representation provides comments on the draft in ABCs capacity as a critical friend and focuses on recommendations / changes that are not critical to meeting the basic condition, but would help to provide clarity and an improved plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole document</td>
<td>There are no page numbers in the document</td>
<td>Add page numbers to ensure that the document can be effectively examined by an Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Policies</td>
<td>There are no page numbers for the policies</td>
<td>Ensure each policy can be referenced to a page number so that it can be effectively examined by an Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 3.5</td>
<td>Paragraph 3.5 is an exact replication of the text in section 11.</td>
<td>Remove para 3.5 as it is not necessary. Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy R5 and H3B</td>
<td>Energy saving technologies and proposals for new renewable energy structures are two very different issues. Energy ‘saving’ refers to retrofitting and ensuring developing, both new and existing doesn’t use as much energy. Provision of renewable energy structures, provides new energy technology. Therefore this policy is confused and doesn’t provide clarity to the reader. Is this policy trying to prevent solar farms? Or trying to protect the most versatile agricultural land or is it trying to support the provision of new renewable energy infrastructure? This policy also sits uncomfortably with policy H3B, which also deals with the issue if energy generation technologies.</td>
<td>Consider the separate issues in policy R5 and re draft in a more appropriate manner. Done Please see below for additional comments on policy H3B Re-drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H1 and H2</td>
<td>These two policies do not need separate numbering as they are dealing with the same issue</td>
<td>Consider revising the numbering of the policies to provide clarity to the reader. Policies merged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H2a</td>
<td>It is very difficult to determine who is going to purchase a house when they are being sold on the open market, i.e How can you state in policy that homes are designed to be suitable for young people? Are they going to be designated Starter Homes under the new Government Scheme. If so If not officially starter homes, remove reference to ‘be designed to be suitable for young people’ or rephrase to state ‘ these homes have the potential to be suitable for young...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>This would need additional wording.</td>
<td>people'.Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H3A</td>
<td>The final paragraph of policy H3a includes elements that are already covered in other policies, for example ‘pay inadequate regard to issues of renewable technologies, landscape and biodiversity and vehicle management (highway and parking) will be refused”. It is not necessary to repeat these elements in a design policy and in fact ‘water-down’ what the design policy is trying to achieve.</td>
<td>Recommend removing the last paragraph of policy H3A. Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H3B</td>
<td>This policy sits uncomfortable with Policy R5 as it seems like it is trying to deal with energy generation technologies as well as sustainable drainage systems. This is confusing and they are separate issues</td>
<td>Consider what both policies R5 and H3B are trying to achieve and whether they are both necessary. Redraft accordingly. Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H3C</td>
<td>Policy H3C replicates the design standards in H3A, policy regarding appropriate materials only needs to be in the plan once</td>
<td>Remove Policy H3C. Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy C1</td>
<td>This policy should be rethought as it is going to be almost impossible to demonstrate that you can deliver ‘social interaction’. Consider whether this policy is necessary or whether it should be reworded.</td>
<td>Remove Policy C1 or consider redrafting to provide clarity. Re-drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy C2, C3 and C4</td>
<td>Policies C2 and C3 policies should be merged into one single policy as they are stating exactly the same thing in a different way. It could also be argued that C4 could be merged into the same policy. However, without a list of what constitutes an Asset of Community Value it is difficult to know if this is covering the same issue or not.</td>
<td>Merge Policy C2 and C3 into a single policy. Done Consider the relation of policy C4 into the policies above once a list of ACVs has been drafted. List now provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy C5</td>
<td>Consider rephrasing how the policy is written. Are ‘a-c’, criteria or exceptions to the policy? This is not clear and makes it difficult to read and identify what you are allowed and not allowed to do. Are ‘a-c’ necessary?</td>
<td>Consider re-drafting the policy to make it clearer what is trying to be achieved. Policy removed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>