

Redgrave Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2037

Record of Independent Examination Correspondence

First published: 27 July 2021

Last updated: 2 August 2021

Introduction

This document will provide an on-going record of all general correspondence during the Redgrave Neighbourhood Plan examination period between the Examiner (Janet Cheesley), the Parish Council / NP Working Group, and Mid Suffolk District Council. It will also act as a record of matters raised and responses to these.

As required, specific documents will continue to be published on the district councils Redgrave NP webpage: www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/RedgraveNP

Copies of e-mails / letters appearing on the following pages:

- 1. E-mail from Examiner dated 26 July 2021 – Examination Start, Procedures, Questions and new NPPF [Focused 2-week consultation request]**
- 2. E-mail to Examiner dated 26 July 2021 - Response to initial questions from Mid Suffolk DC**
- 3. E-mail from Examiner dated 29 July 2021 and reply dated 2 August 2021 – Question re area of Policy RED2 Churchway site**

1. E-mail from Examiner dated 26 July 2021 – Examination Start, Procedures, Questions and new NPPF [Focused 2-week consultation request]

Dated: 26 July 2021
From: Janet Cheesley
To: Paul Bryant (BMSDC), Redgrave NP Group, Andrea Long (NP Consultant)
Subject: Redgrave Neighbourhood Plan Examination
Attach: [NPIERS Guidance to Service Users and Examiners 030418.pdf](#)

I am writing to set out how I intend to undertake the examination of the Redgrave Neighbourhood Plan. My role is to determine whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I intend to ensure that the Parish Council feels part of the process. As such, I will copy the Parish Council into all correspondence, apart from contractual matters that are dealt with direct with the local planning authority. Likewise, please can you ensure that any correspondence from you is copied to the other party. This will ensure fairness and transparency throughout the process.

Paul will be my main point of contact. Once I have read all the papers, I may ask for any missing documents or seek clarification on some matters. It may be appropriate for me to seek clarification on matters from the Parish Council. I must emphasise very strongly that this does not mean that I will accept new evidence. In the interest of fairness to other parties, I cannot accept new evidence other than in exceptional circumstances. If the Parish Council is unsure as to whether information it is submitting may constitute new evidence, may I suggest that you send it to Paul in the first instance for his opinion.

It may be that there is very little correspondence from me during the examination. I will endeavour to keep you both up to date on the progress of the examination. The default is for an examination to be conducted without a hearing. If I feel one is necessary, I will inform you both as early as possible, but this is likely to be near the end of the examination process. If I do intend to hold a hearing, I will inform you of the procedure at that time.

I will be visiting the Parish during the examination. I will not need to be accompanied during my visit. If I am 'spotted', I would appreciate it if I were not approached.

I will issue a draft report for fact checking by both parties. I will ask you both to check my report for factual errors such as dates, sequence of events, names and so on that might need to be corrected. The report will be confidential and must not be presented to a public meeting. I must emphasise that this is not an opportunity to make comments on the report other than those that relate to factual errors. In particular, I will not be inviting, and will not accept, comment on any suggested modifications. The draft report will only be published as the final version if there are no factual errors found and if there is no other reason, such as a sudden change in national policy, that could be significant to my recommendations. I will endeavour to issue my final report shortly after the fact checking stage.

I enclose the NPIERS Guidance to Service Users and Examiners, which may be of interest regarding the examination process. [\[MSDC note: See weblink provided at top of this page\]](#)

I confirm that I have received the documents from Mid Suffolk District Council, including the Regulation 16 representations. I understand that Paul has given the Parish Council the opportunity to comment on these representations. I must emphasise that the Parish Council is not obliged to

make comments and I am not inviting new evidence. I will take any comments into consideration when I receive them, which I understand will be by 13 August.

Please can this email be placed on the District Council's website. If there is future correspondence regarding matters of clarification, I will ask for those to be similarly made available.

If this has not already happened, please can it be mentioned on the District Council's web site that I have started the examination.

Please can Paul confirm whether or not any area of the Parish is a designated rural area re paragraph 64 in the National Planning Policy Framework. [MSDC note: See response below]

Please can Paul provide a link to the Joint Babergh Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (August 2015). [MSDC note: See response below]

A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published on 21 July 2021. I would like to draw to the attention of the Parish Council the new paragraph 131 in the Framework regarding tree-lined streets. In the interest of fairness, please can Paul arrange for a 2 week consultation period inviting comments from interested parties on how the revised version of the Framework affects the neighbourhood plan meeting the Basic Conditions. The consultation, whilst open to any interested party, should include directly consulting all those parties that made representations at the Regulation 16 stage. It should be made clear that there is no need to repeat any representations already received at the Regulation 16 consultation stage. I am inviting Mid Suffolk District Council and Redgrave Parish Council to make representations if they so wish. The Parish Council should then be given the opportunity to comment on any representations received. I must emphasise that the Parish Council is not obliged to make comments and I am not inviting new evidence. I suggest a period of 2 weeks is given to the Parish Council to consider any new representations.

[MSDC note: Consultation underway from 27 July to 11 August 2021. Details are published on our website at: www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/RedgraveNP]

Regards
Janet Cheesley

2. E-mail to Examiner dated 26 July 2021 - Response to initial questions from Mid Suffolk DC

Dated: 26 July 2021
From: Paul Bryant (BMSDC),
To: Janet Cheesley
Cc: Redgrave NP Group, Andrea Long

Dear Janet, (All)

Thank you for confirming the start of this Examination. We will keep our [Redgrave NP](#) webpage updated as requested and will also action the additional consultation.

In response to you two initial questions:

1. With reference to NPPF paragraph 64 (July 2021), we can confirm that **the parish of Redgrave does not meet any of definitions of a designated a rural area**. More specifically, it is not designated as a rural area under Section 157 of the Housing Act 1985.
2. The **Joint Babergh Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (August 2015)** can be accessed via the link below. A word search shows that Redgrave is referred to eight times, with Redgrave & Lopham Fen mentioned in particular on pg 106 (PDF pg 107).

<https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Current-Evidence-Base/Joint-Landscape-Guidance-Aug-2015.pdf>

Kind regards

Paul Bryant
N'hood Planning Officer | BMSDC

[Ends]

3. E-mail from Examiner dated 29 July 2021 and reply dated 2 August 2021 – Question re area of Policy RED2 Churchway site.

Dated: 29 July 2021
From: Janet Cheesley
To: Redgrave NP Group, Andrea Long (NP Consultant), Paul Bryant (BMSDC),
Subject: *Request for clarification – Policy RED2*

As part of my examination of a neighbourhood plan I am able to seek clarification on matters.

Policy RED2 states that the site at Churchway is *approximately 1 acre (0.5 hectares)*. However, 1 acre is actually less than 0.5 hectares. This is relevant to the provision of affordable housing as paragraph 64 in the National Planning Policy Framework states that provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments (defined in the glossary as 10 or more dwellings or a site area of 0.5 hectares or more). It is not possible for me to accurately measure the size of the site.

I am seeking clarification from the Parish Council as to whether the site at Churchway is large enough to be defined as a major development site. If it is 1 acre then it is not classed as a major development site. If it is 0.5 hectares or more then an affordable housing contribution can be sought.

Kind Regards

Janet Cheesley

* * * * *

Dated: 2 Aug 2021
From: Andrea Long (NP Consultant)
To: Janet Cheesley
cc: *Paul Bryant (BMSDC), Redgrave NP Group*
Subject: *Request for clarification – Policy RED2*

Dear Janet,

My apologies for this error.

The site as indicated in the Neighbourhood Plan when measured using the Parish-on-line software is 5378.4610m² - or 0.53 hectares. The reference to the 1 acre in Policy RED2 is therefore incorrect and should be 1.3 acres.

I hope this clarifies the matter for you.

Best Wishes

Andrea Long
Consultant on behalf of Redgrave NP Group

[Ends]