

I have now had an initial look at the documentation for this examination, and the following questions have arisen from that. I would be grateful if you could get back to me on these at your earliest convenience. The questions are probably mostly addressed to the qualifying body, but you may both reply as you wish on them.

1. In the Reg14 version of the Plan para 7.16 refers to the SE corner of the field by the church as being "considered to have a lesser effect upon the view of the Church". Was this opinion based on a professional assessment from a heritage group or organisation? Or was it an opinion and assessment from the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Planning Group?
2. The Information about the Reg14 consultation and proposed alterations that I can find online (attached) does not state that the boundary of the Church Field Local Green Space (LGS) will be changed from that shown in the Proposals Map for Reg14. However as I read the Proposals Map in the Submission Version for Reg16 it has changed. Can you please let me know what the correct intention is, and offer an update to the documentation as appropriate.
3. Please confirm or correct my understanding that there is only one Parish Council for the Goodrich and Welsh Bicknor Group Parish?
4. A suggestion has been made at Reg16 that Policy GWB4 should refer to 'historic farmsteads and estate buildings' in criteria f), what is your view of this particularly with regard to the Historic England project? Is there an accepted list of Buildings of local heritage value not on the national list available from the LPA or other organisation? If not, was any work done on this during the Neighbourhood Plan process?

That's all for now,

Best wishes

Liz

Examiner Goodrich and Welsh Bicknor NDP

Ms L Beth BA (2.1 hon) MA MRTPI Dip Design in the Built Environment



Following on from my email yesterday, I have the following questions mostly dealing with clarity issues in certain policies:

Policy GWB6: Sustainable Design: The first paragraph does not read well – would the following meet your intent:

“Where appropriate, development proposals should include the following design measures:”

Policy GWB11: Community Facilities: The policy is proposed to deal with open space as well as buildings the supporting text suggests, but the actual policy does not specify either community facilities that are buildings or open space. This is too vague for the clarity required by the NPPF, and the policy should include a list of community facilities intended to be the subject of the policy. For buildings this can either name them (school for example) or give a name and street address. For open space, besides being listed in the policy, the space and its boundaries should be shown on the proposals map. I can add the need for proposals map additions as a modification in my report, it does not need to be done during the examination. But I do need a decision on what open space and community buildings to list within the policy.

Policy GWB17: Affordable and Intermediate Homes: The policy refers to ‘adjacent parishes’ but does not specify them. For clarity it needs to. Also criteria d) does not currently specify that the person would be a relative of the current resident – but the text assumes this. Please decide if the criteria is to do this, and if so whether the following revised wording meets the purpose:

“(d) Those with an essential need to support a close relative or be supported by a current resident who is a close relative within the Group Parish.

As before, please let me have your decisions and comments on the above at your earliest convenience. In both cases if you are not able to reply to me by the end of January my timeline of completion by mid-February will be in doubt.

Best wishes

Liz

Examiner Goodrich and Welsh Bicknor NDP

Ms L Beth BA (2.1 hon) MA MRTPI Dip Design in the Built Environment

