

## INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF PIMPERNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW

EXAMINER: Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Ms Jan Fairman  
Clerk to Pimperne Parish Council

Ed Gerry  
Dorset Council

Examination Ref: 01/AM/PNP

26 August 2022

Via email

Dear Ms Fairman and Mr Gerry

### PIMPERNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW EXAMINATION

Following the submission for examination of the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan Review (the Plan), I would like to clarify several initial procedural matters and I also have a small number of preliminary questions for the Pimperne Parish Council (PPC) and Dorset Council (DC). These are attached as the Annex to this letter. I would like to receive a written response(s) by **Tuesday, 13 September 2022**.

#### 1. Examination Documentation

I can confirm that I am satisfied that I have received a complete submission of the review of the Plan, including the draft Plan (as proposed to be reviewed); the Basic Conditions and Consultation Statements; the Regulation 16 representations; and the statements from both PPC and DC in relation to whether the modifications contained in the draft Plan are so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the neighbourhood development plan which the draft Plan would replace, giving reasons why.

This has provided sufficient information to undertake my initial determination under paragraph 10(1) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).

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

#### 2. Determination under Paragraph 10(1) of Schedule A2

I am required determine to whether the modifications contained in the draft Plan are so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the neighbourhood development plan which the draft Plan would replace. The purpose of this determination is to establish the appropriate examination process for the draft Plan which will, amongst other things, affect whether or not the draft Plan will need to be the subject of a referendum if it is to be made.

The Pimperne Parish Council state in their Modifications Statement and within the Plan that it has been modified by minor changes to Policies LDC (Locally Distinct Character), MHN (Meeting Housing Needs), CF (Community Facilities), DC (Developer Contributions ) and SB (Settlement Boundary) together with factual updates since the Plan was first drafted. The Modification Statement (page 2) states that the PPC “considers that the proposed modifications are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan”.

Dorset Council has compared the policies in the made Plan with those of the submitted review and concluded that the changes constitute material modifications which do not change the nature of the Plan and would require examination but not a referendum.

Having assessed all the written documents submitted, including the representations and relevant statements, I am content that the modifications proposed in the draft Plan are material but do not change the nature of the made Plan.

Therefore, the examination can proceed under the terms of Schedule A2 and, as a consequence, should I recommend that the draft Plan be made (with or without examiner modifications), a referendum stage will not be a necessary part of the statutory process.

### 3. Site Visit

I intend to undertake a site visit to the neighbourhood plan area during the week commencing 29 August. This will assist in my assessment of the draft Plan, including the issues identified in the representations.

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

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

### 4. Written Representations

At this stage, I consider the examination can be conducted solely by the written representations procedure, without the need for a hearing. However, I will reserve the option to convene a hearing should I consider there are exceptional reasons for doing so.

### 5. Further Clarification

I have a number of questions seeking further clarification, which I have set out in the Annex to this letter. I would be grateful if you can aim to provide a written response by **Tuesday, 13 September 2022**.

### 6. Examination Timetable

As you will be aware, the intention is to examine the draft Plan (including conduct of the site visit) with a view to providing a draft report (for 'fact checking') within 4-6 weeks of submission of the draft Plan.

As I have raised a number of questions, I must provide you with sufficient opportunity to reply. Consequentially, the examination timetable will be extended. Please be assured that I will endeavour to mitigate any delay as far as is practicable. The IPe office team will seek to keep you updated on the anticipated delivery date of the draft report.

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

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure a copy of this letter and any respective responses are placed on the Parish Council and Dorset Council websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

*Andy Mead*

Examiner

## **Annex 1**

From my initial reading of the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan Review and the supporting documents, I have a number of questions for Dorset Council and Pimperne Parish Council. I would be grateful for the submission of a response by **Tuesday, 13 September 2022** if this is practicable.

### **Questions to Dorset Council and Pimperne Parish Council**

1. The Plan (paragraph 76) indicates a housing target of at least 61 dwellings in the period 2016 – 2031. The Regulation 16 Consultation response from Barton Willmore (Stantec) comments that the Plan should meet the identified housing requirement of 276 (16.2 dwellings per annum as compared to the implied Neighbourhood Plan rate of 4.1 dwellings per annum), otherwise it would fail to meet the terms of paragraph 14 of the NPPF. Do both Councils have any comments?
2. Paragraph 1.2 of the Barton Willmore (Stantec) representation refers to the planning application P/OUT/2020/0006. I am unsure whether this reference includes a typing error, but I was unable to locate the application on the Dorset Council system. I would be grateful for a link to the application or the correct reference number.
3. Policy SB is proposed to be amended by the addition of “Development outside this boundary will be treated as ‘countryside’ in respect of Local Plan policies”. Which Local Plan policies would then apply to the ‘countryside’?

### **Questions to Pimperne Parish Council**

4. The Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership Board made two editorial suggestions in their Regulation 16 consultation response. Does the Parish Council agree with these suggestions?