



Intelligent Plans
and examinations

Report on Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 First Review 2023

**An Examination undertaken for Dorset Council with the support of
Hazelbury Bryan Parish Council on the November 2023 submission
version of the Review Neighbourhood Plan.**

Independent Examiner: Andrew Mead BSc(Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Date of Report: 28 February 2024

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Contents

Main Findings - Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction and Context.....	3
Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031, First Review 2023	3
The Independent Examiner	4
Submitted Documents.....	4
Planning Policy Context	5
2. Procedural Considerations.....	5
Initial Determination.....	5
The Scope of the Examination	7
The Basic Conditions.....	7
Site Visit.....	8
Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	8
Examiner Modifications	8
3. Compliance Matters and Human Rights	9
Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	9
Plan Period.....	9
Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	9
Development and Use of Land	9
Excluded Development.....	9
Human Rights.....	10
4. Assessment of the Basic Conditions.....	10
EU Obligations	10
Main Issues.....	10
Policy Modifications (Policies HB2, HB5, HB13, HB15, HB17, HB18, HB20 & HB21)	11
Unchanged Policies (Policies HB1, HB3, HB4, HB6 – 12, HB16, HB22, HB23)...	13
Alterations to the Text	14
All Other Matters.....	14
5. Conclusions.....	14
Summary.....	14
Examiner Recommendation.....	15
Overview	15
Appendix: Examiner Modifications	16

Main Findings - Executive Summary

I made an initial determination on 22 January 2024 that the modifications contained in the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan 2018 -2031, First Review 2023 (the Review Plan) are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the extant Neighbourhood Plan which the Review Plan would replace.

From my examination of the Review Plan and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the Examiner Modifications (**EMs**) set out in this report, the Review Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- The Review Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Hazelbury Bryan Parish Council (HBPC);
- The Review Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – the parish of Hazelbury Bryan as shown at Figure 1 on page 2 of the Review Plan;
- The Review Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2018-2031; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

Therefore, I recommend that Dorset Council (DC) should make the Review Plan with the **EMs** specified in this report (there will be no statutory requirement for a referendum).

1. Introduction and Context

Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031, First Review 2023

- 1.1 Set within undulating rural countryside of winding narrow lanes and high hedges, located about 8 km south west of Sturminster Newton, the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area covers the parish of Hazelbury Bryan which comprises seven separate hamlets of Kingston, Wonston (and Pleck), Pidney, Partway, Woodrow, Droop and Park Gate. The parish population in 2021 was 1,074, a slight increase from the 2011 population of 1,059.¹ It is the subject of the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan which was “made” (approved and adopted) in March 2019 by North Dorset District Council (NDDC).
- 1.2 In the following years, the main source of Government planning policy, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been updated. This, together with the belief that the made Plan and its policies will carry less

¹ HBNP Review paragraph 9.1.

weight when it becomes more than five years old resulted in the decision of the Parish Council in January 2023 to review it.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.3 As the Review Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031, First Review 2023 by DC with the agreement of the HBPC.
- 1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with over thirty years' experience. I have worked in both the public and the private sectors. I am an independent examiner and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the Review Plan.

Submitted Documents

- 1.5 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:
- the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031, First Review 2023, as proposed to be modified (November 2023);
 - the summary of proposals and reasons for the modification as set out in the Plan²;
 - the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan Review Modifications Statement (November 2023);
 - the statement from Dorset Council on the nature of the proposed modifications (January 2024);
 - a map on page 2 of the Plan area, which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Plan relates;
 - a copy of the extant Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031, as made;
 - the Consultation Statement (November 2023);
 - the Basic Conditions Report (November 2023);
 - all the representations which have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
 - The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report (June 2023), including the SEA Screening Determination at paragraph 5.0.2 of the Report;
 - The Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)(December 2023);
 - Hazelbury Bryan – Housing Target Paper (November 2023);
 - Appeal decision – Land at Kingston Lane/Frizzel's Hill (September 2021): APP/D1265/W/21/3275130;
 - Appeal decision – Orchard Farm, Silly Hill to Kingston Lane (October 2022): APP/D1265/W/22/3296668; and
 - Appeal decision – Land West of The Causeway (August 2023): APP/D/1265/W/22/3312575.

² See paragraph 2.6 below.

Planning Policy Context

- 1.6 The Development Plan for this part of Dorset Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, includes the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (NDLP) adopted in 2016. The Local Plan was produced by the former North Dorset District Council. The NDLP is being replaced by the Dorset Council Local Plan (DCLP) consultation on the first draft of which closed in March 2021.
- 1.7 Planning policy for England is set out principally in the NPPF and is accompanied by the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. A revised NPPF was published in December 2023. All references in this report are to the latest iteration of the NPPF and the accompanying PPG.

2. Procedural Considerations

Initial Determination

- 2.1 As the proposal has been submitted as a modification of the made Neighbourhood Plan, I undertook an initial determination under Paragraph 10(1) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"). This concerned whether the modifications contained in the Review Plan are so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the Neighbourhood Development Plan which the Review Plan would replace.
- 2.2 If there is no change to the nature of the made Plan, the modification proposal can be examined under the streamlined process set out in Schedule A2 of the 2004 Act (no referendum). Otherwise, the examination would proceed under Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), whereby an examination and referendum would be required.
- 2.3 HBPC and DC are required to publish statements setting out their reasoned views on this matter. For HBPC, the provision is contained in Regulation 15(1)(f) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ("the 2012 Regulations"). For DC, the provision is at Regulation 17(e)(ii).
- 2.4 The views of HBPC are also to be publicised at the Regulation 14 stage³ and which were included in the pre-submission version of the Review Plan (See Basic Conditions Report Section 2). This indicates that the modifications made require examination but not a referendum.

³ Regulation 14(a)(v).

- 2.5 To inform the determination, I considered all the relevant submitted documents and representations. In particular:
- the Consultation Statement, which demonstrates that HBPC alerted respondents to the nature of the changes being made to the Plan through the Review;
 - paragraphs 2.18 – 2.23 of the submission draft Plan (Regulation 15) within the section “How the Neighbourhood Plan has been reviewed”, which explains the reasons for reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan, stating that some modest changes have been made, along with the more detailed Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan Review Modifications Statement, November 2023⁴; and
 - the written statement on this matter provided by Dorset Council to comply with Regulation 17(e)(ii).
- 2.6 The draft Plan does not propose any significant changes, the main ones being focused changes to Policies HB2 (Protecting and Enhancing Local Biodiversity), HB5 (Locally Distinctive Development), HB13 (Settlement Boundaries and Important Gaps), HB15 (Meeting Housing Needs – Amount and Location of New Dwellings, HB17 (Site 11), HB18 (Site 7), HB20 (Economic Development Opportunities) and Policy HB21 (Site 12), together with factual updates since the Plan was first drafted and occasional improvements to the clarity of phrasing. In its Modifications Statement, HBPC considers that the proposed modifications are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the Plan. Similarly, Dorset Council has compared the policies in the made Plan with those of the Review Plan 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.
- 2.7 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. I set out my determination in my procedural letter of 22 January 2024 to Dorset Council and Hazelbury Bryan Parish Council. Therefore, the examination can proceed under the terms of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act which I set out below 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.
- 2.8 I note that the made Neighbourhood Plan identified a clear succinct vision and two broad objectives which supported the policy areas. The vision is unaltered by the Review Plan and the objectives remain. The Review Plan maintains the same organisational structure albeit some policies have been amended, incorporating new content with necessary updates to the

⁴ I consider, in essence, HBPC has sought to substantially comply with the requirements of Regulations 14(a)(v) and 15(1)(f).

supporting text of the Review Plan to assist in clarifying the approach. The overall nature of the Review Plan including its scope, issues, aims and policy context is similar to the made Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 2.9 As the independent examiner, I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the local planning authority should make the draft plan; or
 - (b) that the local planning authority should make the draft plan with the modifications specified in this report; or
 - (c) that the local planning authority should not make the draft plan.
- 2.10 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 11(1) of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act. The examiner must consider:
- Whether the draft plan meets the Basic Conditions.
 - Whether the draft plan complies with the provisions made by or under Section 38A and Section 38B of the 2004 Act. These are:
 - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
 - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
 - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
 - it does not include provisions and policies for “excluded development”; and
 - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.
 - Such matters as prescribed in the 2012 Regulations.
- 2.11 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 11(1) of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the draft Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

- 2.12 The “Basic Conditions” are set out in Paragraph 11(2) of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the draft plan must:
- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;

- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations (under retained EU law)⁵; and
- meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

2.13 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the Neighbourhood Development Plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.⁶

Site Visit

2.14 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 19 January 2024 to familiarise myself with the Plan area and visit relevant sites and locations referenced in the Review Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

2.15 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. At the Regulation 16 stage, no representors suggested that a hearing would be necessary. Sufficient written evidence has been provided which I have supplemented by my site visit. In all respects, the representations clearly articulate their submissions to the Review Plan. There are no exceptional reasons to justify convening a public hearing.⁷

Examiner Modifications

2.16 Where necessary, I have specified Examiner Modifications (**EMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have included this modification separately in an Appendix.

⁵ The existing body of environmental regulation is retained in UK law.

⁶ This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

⁷ See Paragraph 12(2)(a) of Schedule A2.

3. Compliance Matters and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

- 3.1 The Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031, First Review 2023, has been prepared and submitted for examination by HBPC, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by the former NDDC in June 2014. NDDC was replaced by Dorset Council on 1 April 2019 which carries over the statutory designation.
- 3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

- 3.3 The Review Plan clearly specifies the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2018 to 2031 and is unaltered from the existing made Plan.

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

- 3.4 Details of the Review Plan preparation, events, activities and consultation are set out in the HBPC Consultation Statement (CS), as submitted to DC.
- 3.5 Regulation 14 consultation took place between 10 August 2023 and 30 September 2023. 151 responses were submitted on the consultation form, mainly from residents. Further comments were received from statutory consultees. The main issues and concerns raised and how they were considered by the HBPC are included as a table on pages 3-9 of the CS.
- 3.6 At the Regulation 16 stage, between 24 November 2023 and 12 January 2024, 4 representations were received, including one from Dorset Council, and are provided in the submitted Regulation 16 Consultation Schedule.
- 3.7 I confirm that the legal requirements have been met by the consultation process. In addition, there has been regard to the advice in the PPG on plan preparation and engagement.

Development and Use of Land

- 3.8 The Review Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with Section 38A of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

- 3.9 The Review Plan does not include provisions and policies for "excluded development".⁸

⁸ The meaning of 'excluded development' is set out in s.61K of the 1990 Act.
Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Human Rights

- 3.10 The Basic Conditions Report (BCR)⁹ advises that no issues have been raised in relation to the possible contravention of Human Rights in the preceding consultations and given the conclusions on the Plan's general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and regard to national planning policy, it is reasonable to conclude that the making of the Plan should not breach human rights. I have considered this matter independently and I have found no reason to disagree with the statement in the BCR and I am satisfied that the policies will not have a discriminatory impact on any particular group of individuals.

4. Assessment of the Basic Conditions

EU Obligations

- 4.1 The Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan Review was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by Dorset Council, which found that it was unnecessary to undertake a full SEA. Having read the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report, June 2023, I support this conclusion.
- 4.2 The Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening Report did not identify any likely significant adverse environmental effects which would result from the Review Plan. The statutory consultees raised no objections to the Review Plan. From my independent assessment of this matter and having read the Review Plan, the supporting information and the summaries of the representations, I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, I am satisfied that the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan Review is compatible with EU obligations.

Main Issues

- 4.3 Having considered whether the Review Plan complies with various procedural and legal requirements, it is now necessary to deal with whether it complies with the remaining Basic Conditions, particularly the regard it pays to national policy and guidance, the contribution it makes to the achievement of sustainable development and whether it is in general conformity with strategic development plan policies. I test the Review Plan against the Basic Conditions by considering specific issues of compliance of all the Plan's policies.
- 4.4 As part of that assessment, I consider whether the policies are sufficiently clear and unambiguous, having regard to advice in the PPG. A neighbourhood plan policy should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when

⁹ This is intended to fulfil the statutory requirement for a Basic Conditions Statement.
Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.¹⁰

- 4.5 Accordingly, having regard to the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan Review, the consultation responses, other evidence and the site visit, I consider that the main issues in this examination are whether the draft Plan's policies: (i) have regard to national policy and guidance; (ii) are in general conformity with the adopted strategic planning policies; and (iii) would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. I shall consider firstly the modified policies and, secondly, the unchanged policies to ensure they remain compliant.

Policy Modifications (Policies HB2, HB5, HB13, HB15, HB17, HB18, HB20 & HB21)

- 4.6 **Policy HB2** seeks to protect and enhance local biodiversity. Focused additions are proposed to the policy and revisions to the map at Figure 5 to reflect the latest available data on ecology. The policy continues to have regard to national guidance¹¹, to generally conform with Policy 4 of the NDLP and to meet the Basic Conditions subject to the clarification of clause a) by the inclusion of the phrase "... should be submitted with the planning application". **(EM1)** In their Regulation 16 consultation response, DC indicated a misplaced "or" linking clauses b) and c) which can be corrected as a minor (non-material) alteration.¹² DC also suggested clarifying the nature of the wildlife to pass through fencing proposed in new residential gardens, but I am satisfied that such details can be adequately dealt with on a case by case basis in development management, especially as, in my experience, mammals such as deer, foxes and badgers appear to need no encouragement to gain access into and across gardens.
- 4.7 **Policy HB5** aims to reinforce the locally distinctive character of the settlement and has focused additions proposed to update references to climate change measures. The policy continues to have regard to national guidance¹³, to generally conform with Policies 3 and 7 of the NDLP and to meet the Basic Conditions.
- 4.8 **Policy HB13** defines settlement boundaries and important gaps on Figure 9. The text of the policy is unchanged but there are two proposed alterations to Figure 9: (i) the increase of the defined gap between Wonston (and Pleck) and Droop to reflect a recent appeal decision; and (ii) the reduction of the defined gap between Partway and Pidney due to the implementation of a planning permission granted prior to the making of the current Plan. I consider that both the focused alterations are justified updates and Policy HB13 would continue to have regard to

¹⁰ PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

¹¹ NPPF: paragraphs 180 & 185.

¹² See footnote 23 below.

¹³ NPPF: paragraph 158.

national guidance¹⁴, to generally conform with Policy 2 of the NDLP and to meet the Basic Conditions.

- 4.9 **Policy HB14** aims to support community facilities. Two focused amendments are proposed to the list within the policy. At item e), Hazelbury Bryan Methodist Church is now described as vacant and at item g), the Sports Pavilion has been added, both to reflect the updated position. I consider that both the focused alterations are justified updates and Policy HB14 would continue to have regard to national guidance¹⁵, to generally conform with Policy 14 of the NDLP and to meet the Basic Conditions.
- 4.10 **Policy HB15** considers meeting housing needs and allocates amounts and locations of new dwellings within the Plan period. The Review Plan proposes focused alterations to the text which are factual updates, including those from the housing needs assessment in the Housing Target Paper. I consider that Policy HB15 would continue to have regard to national guidance¹⁶, to generally conform with Policies 2, 6 and 20 of the NDLP and to meet the Basic Conditions.
- 4.11 **Policy HB17 Site 11** and **Policy HB18 Site 7** each delineate allocations for residential development. The Review Plan proposes to amend both site requirements by the addition of a clause requiring the inclusion of a drainage strategy to ensure that flood risk is not increased. Additionally, it is proposed to exclude the requirement to investigate evidence of any contamination and agree remediation at Site 11. I consider that the focused alterations to Policies HB17 and HB18 would continue to have regard to national guidance¹⁷, to generally conform with Policies 2, 3 and 6 of the NDLP and to meet the Basic Conditions.
- 4.12 An addition of “net” to the wording of **Policy HB19 Site 13** is a focused clarification and I consider that the policy would continue to have regard to national guidance¹⁸, generally conform with Policies 2 and 6 of the NDLP and to meet the Basic Conditions.
- 4.13 **Policy HB20** aims to retain or allocate small scale extensions to employment sites shown on Figure 11 of the Plan. Minor (nonetheless material) adjustments to the boundaries of the employment sites shown on the Plan are proposed. DC raised the issue of the clarity of the boundaries. Although the differences in the delineations between the made Plan and the Review Plan are hard to discern due to the scale of the map, I found that viewed online the boundaries appear relatively well defined. Indeed, the same comments apply to other allocations on the figures and the Policies Map which have been in use since the Plan was made in 2019. Therefore, I consider the map based data are adequate for

¹⁴ NPPF: paragraph 180.

¹⁵ NPPF: paragraph 88.

¹⁶ NPPF: paragraph 60.

¹⁷ NPPF: paragraphs 60, 158 & 167.

¹⁸ NPPF: paragraphs 60 & 71.

the purposes for which they have been drafted and I consider that Policy HB20 continues to have regard to national guidance¹⁹, to generally conform with Policy 11 of the NDLP and to meet the Basic Conditions.

4.14 **Policy HB21 Site 12** proposes alterations to reflect the planning permission which has been granted on the site. The changes are focused updates and I consider that Policy HB21 would continue to have regard to national guidance²⁰, to generally conform with Policy 11 of the NDLP and to meet the Basic Conditions.

Unchanged Policies (Policies HB1, HB3, HB4, HB6 – 12, HB16, HB22, HB23)

4.15 Aside from the ten policies proposed to be modified, thirteen other policies in the made Plan remain unchanged and, with one exception (Policy HB3), each has regard to national guidance, generally conforms with the strategic policies of the NDLP, would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and meet the Basic Conditions.

4.16 The following table sets out the details of how these twelve policies have regard to national guidance and with which policy in the NDLP they generally conforms to enable the Basic Conditions to be met.

Table 1.

Policy	Subject	National guidance (NPPF paragraph number)	NDLP Policy
HB1	Reinforcing Local Landscape Character	180.	Policy 4.
HB4	Key Rural Views	180.	Policy 4.
HB6 - 12	Distinctive Character of the hamlets	135.	Policy 7.
HB16	Meeting Housing Needs – Dwelling Types	60.	Policy 7.
HB22	Parking Provision	111.	Policy 13.
HB23	Supporting Highway Infrastructure Improvements	57 & 58.	Policy 13.

4.17 **Policy HB3** Local Green Spaces provides that "...no development will be permitted within or immediately adjoining them that would harm their green character, etc..". Notwithstanding the fact that the policy has been included in the made Plan since 2019 and has not been the subject of

¹⁹ NPPF: paragraph 88.

²⁰ NPPF: paragraph 88.

representations in the Review Plan, it does not in my view have regard to national policy. Firstly, because adjoining land is not subject to Local Green Space restrictions; secondly, because inappropriate development may be permitted in very special circumstances²¹; and thirdly, because no evidence has been provided to justify this departure from national policy. In this respect, I am mindful of the judgement handed down by the Court of Appeal in October 2020²² (i.e. postdating the made Plan) in relation to departures from the NPPF, specifically where it related to a Local Green Space policy in a neighbourhood plan. Therefore, I shall modify Policy HB3 so that it has regard to national policy, generally conforms with Policy 15 of the NDLP and meets the Basic Conditions. **(EM2)**

Alterations to the Text

4.18 A consequence of the acceptance of the recommended modifications would be that amendments might have to be made to the explanation within the Plan in order to make it logical. Other amendments might also include minor contextual updates (for example, paragraph 2.20 of the Review Plan) correcting minor inaccuracies, cross referencing and any renumbering of paragraphs and policies. None of these alterations would affect the ability of the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions and could be undertaken as minor, non-material changes.²³

All Other Matters

4.19 In this examination, I have focussed on differences in the policies between the made Neighbourhood Plan and the Review Plan. Nevertheless, I have considered afresh the whole of the draft Plan. I have reviewed each policy in terms of its consistency with national policy and guidance and general conformity with the strategic policies in the Development Plan. Other than the issues that are discussed above, I am satisfied that there are no other matters which affect the Basic Conditions.

5. Conclusions

Summary

5.1 The Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 First Review 2023 has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has assessed whether the Review Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Review Plan and the evidence documents submitted with it.

²¹ NPPF, paragraphs 107 and 152.

²² *R on the Application of Lochailort Investments Limited v Mendip District Council*. Case Number: C1/2020/0812.

²³ PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509.

- 5.2 I have set out modifications to Policies HB2 and HB3 to ensure the Review Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements.

Examiner Recommendation

- 5.3 I recommend that DC should make the Review Plan with the modifications specified in the Appendix to this report.

Overview

- 5.4 Inevitably, considerable time and effort has been devoted to the development and production of this Review Plan and I congratulate those who have been involved. I enjoyed examining it, visiting the area and appreciated the comprehensive documentation which was submitted from both Councils. The Review Plan should continue to prove to be a useful tool for future planning and change within Hazelbury Bryan over the coming years.

Andy Mead

Examiner

Appendix: Examiner Modifications

Examiner Modification number (EM)	Policy/other reference	Modification
EM1	Policy HB2	Amend third sentence to: "To demonstrate this is achieved, a certified Biodiversity Plan for developments likely to impact on an area in excess of 0.1ha should be submitted with the planning application. "
EM2	Policy HB3	Amend first sentence to: "The following sites (as shown in Figure 7) are designated as Local Green Spaces, and other than in very special circumstances, no inappropriate development will be permitted within or immediately adjoining them that would harm their green character and reason for designation."