Report on the Bradford Abbas & Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan 2024 to 2039

An Examination undertaken for Dorset Council with the support of the Bradford Abbas Parish Council on the April 2026 submission version of the Plan.

Independent Examiner: Andrew Mead BSc(Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Date of Report: 4 November 2026

Contents

Main Findings - Executive Summary 4
1. Introduction and Background 4
Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan 2024 to 2039 4
The Independent Examiner 4
The Scope of the Examination 5
The Basic Conditions 6
2. Approach to the Examination 7
Planning Policy Context 7
Submitted Documents 7
Site Visit 8
Written Representations with or without Public Hearing 8
Modifications 8
3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights 8
Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area 8
Plan Period 9
Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation 9
Development and Use of Land 9
Excluded Development 10
Local Nature Recovery Strategy 10
Climate Change 10
Human Rights 10
4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions 10
Assimilated Obligations 10
Main Issues 11
Policy 1. Local Landscape Character 12
Policy 2. Locally Important Views 12
Policy 3. Dark Night Skies 12
Policy 4. The importance of recreational access to the countryside 12
Policy 5. Protecting our historic environment 12
Policy 6. Important Local Green Spaces 13
Gollops Ground 13
Field opposite pub 13
Rose and Crown Pub Garden 14
Policy 7. Flooding considerations 14
Policy 8. Important Community Facilities 14

Policy 9. Meeting Local Housing Need 14
Policy 10. Local employment opportunities 15
Policy 11. Support a safer highway network 15
Policy 12. Design Guidance 15
Alterations to the Text 15
Community Projects 16
5. Conclusions 16
Summary 16
The Referendum and its Area 16
Final comments 16
Appendix: Modifications 18

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan/the BACMNP) and its supporting documentation including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – the Bradford Abbas Parish Council;
- The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated as shown on Map 1 on page 2 of the Plan;
- The Plan specifies the period during which it is to take effect: 2024 to 2039; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

1. Introduction and Background

Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan 2024 to 2039

1.1 The charming village of Bradford Abbas lies in open countryside, about 3km south-east of Yeovil. Clifton Maybank, within in its own Parish, but without a Parish Council, is a small hamlet adjacent to the south-west side of Bradford Abbas. The combined population of the Parishes in 2021 was about 975.[1]

1.2 The preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan began with an inaugural meeting in 2021. The Plan was submitted to Dorset Council (DC) in May 2026 and represents nearly five years of work by the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.

The Independent Examiner

1.3 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan by DC, with the agreement of the Bradford Abbas Parish Council (BAPC).

[1] Census 2021 – See paragraph 1.2.1 of the Plan.

1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector, with many years' experience in planning and with extensive experience of examining neighbourhood plans. I am an independent examiner, and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

1.5 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:

(a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or

(b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or

(c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

1.6 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)('the 1990 Act'). The examiner must consider:

- Whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions.
- Whether the plan complies with provisions under s.38A and s.38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ('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 and does not go beyond the scope of what may be included in a draft plan[2];
  - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
  - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;
  - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development';
  - so far as the qualifying body considers appropriate, and having regard to the subject matter of the plan, it is designed to secure that the development and use of land in the neighbourhood area

[2] See s.38B(A1) and s.38B(2C)(a) of the 2004 Act.

contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change[3]; and

- so far as the qualifying body considers appropriate, and having regard to the subject matter of the plan, it takes account of any local nature recovery strategy, under section 104 of the Environment Act 2021, that relates to all or part of the neighbourhood area.[4]

- Whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the plan proceed to referendum.

- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)('the 2012 Regulations').

1.7 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

1.8 The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood 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;

- Not result in the development plan for the area of the authority proposing that less housing is provided by means of development taking place in that area than if the neighbourhood development plan were not to be made[5];

- be compatible with, and not breach, assimilated obligations[6]; and

[3] This additional requirement was commenced on 25 March 2026 by virtue of *The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026*, which brought into force section 98 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023.
[4] See footnote above.
[5] This Basic Condition applies from 25 March 2026 by virtue of *The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026*, which brought into force section 99 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023. This replaces the former Basic Condition which required a neighbourhood plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area.
[6] See: The Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 (Consequential Amendment) Regulations 2023, which replaced the previous reference to 'EU' obligations.

- Meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

1.9 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.[7]

2. Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Dorset, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (WDWPLP) adopted in 2015. The WDWPLP is being replaced by the Dorset Council Local Plan (DCLP). DC has agreed that the DCLP will now be prepared in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2026. The next step will be a scoping consultation, which involves asking people what the new Local Plan should cover and how they would like to be involved. The scoping consultation is currently taking place until 26 October 2026. Gateway 1 (self-assessment) is expected on 30 November 2026. Adoption is not expected until 2029.

2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. A revised NPPF was published in December 2024 and a new NPPF was published in August 2026. However, the new version does not apply for the purposes of this examination.[8] Unless otherwise stated, all references in the report are to the December 2024 NPPF and the accompanying PPG.

Submitted Documents

2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including:

- the draft Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan 2024 to 2039 (April 2026);
- Map 1 on page 2 of the Plan which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates;

[7] 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.

[8] See the transitional arrangements provided by Annex A, Paragraph 6 of the August 2026 NPPF: National Planning Policy Framework - GOV.UK

- the Consultation Statement (April 2026)[9];
- the Basic Conditions Statement (April 2026);
- the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report (February 2025);
- the Habitats Regulations Assessment (June 2026);
- Design Guidance and Codes (December 2023);
- all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation; and
- the joint response dated 8 October 2026 from BAPC and DC to my letter of 23 September 2026.[10]

Site Visit

2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 23 September 2026 to familiarise myself with it and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered a hearing session to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

Modifications

2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

3.1 The Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by the Bradford Abbas Parish Council, which is the qualifying body for an area that was designated by Dorset Council on 20 September 2022.

[9] Appendices 1 – 5 of the Consultation Statement were also supplied and they can be viewed at: https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/bradford-abbas-and-clifton-maybank-neighbourhood-plan

[10] View at: https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/bradford-abbas-and-clifton-maybank-neighbourhood-plan

3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for the Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Parishes and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

3.3 The Plan specifies the period during which it is to take effect, which is from 2024 to 2039.

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

3.4 Details of the preparation of and the consultation on the Plan are contained in the Consultation Statement (CS) submitted with the Plan. Work commenced in 2022 after the initial public meeting in Bradford Abbas in November 2021. A Working Group was formed and the adjoining Parish of Clifton Maybank was invited to join in the Plan prior to the application to DC for the designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The timeline for consultation events and community engagement is summarised in the Overview on page 1 of the CS. Details are appended to the CS describing consultation with local businesses, services and landowners.

3.5 The Regulation 14 consultation took place between 23 September 2025 and 1 December 2025. The consultation period was publicised in The Pennant, the monthly Parish magazine delivered to all households in the area. Two drop-in sessions were held. Facebook was also used to publicise the event as well as the Parish Council web site. A full list of statutory consultees is at paragraph 4.5 of the CS (page 8). Comments from consultees and members of the public, the responses from the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group and any consequent changes to the Plan are described at pages 8 – 18 of the CS.

3.6 Consultation under Regulation 16 took place between 20 July 2026 and 31 August 2026. 11 responses were received, including one from DC. 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

3.7 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with s.38A of the 2004 Act and does not exceed the appropriate scope of a neighbourhood plan.[11]

[11] See s.38B(A1) and s.38B(2C)(a) of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

3.8 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'.[12]

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

3.9 The Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) was adopted in December 2025, so it was not available to inform the Regulation 14 draft of the Plan. Nevertheless, the Basic Conditions Statement (BCS) states that the Plan is broadly in accord with the LNRS policy and no clear conflicts have been identified. DC agree with that conclusion and I also consider that none of the Plan's policies are in direct conflict with the LNRS strategy.

Climate Change

3.10 DC agree with the statement in the BCS that climate change has been considered throughout the preparation of the Plan and that this is reflected in a number of policies. I am satisfied that overall, the Plan policies do not conflict with the aims of securing development which contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change.

Human Rights

3.11 The BCS noted 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 regard to National Planning Policy, it is reasonable to conclude that the making of the Plan should not breach human rights. Therefore, BAPC are satisfied that the Plan does not breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998) and, from my independent assessment, I see no reason to disagree.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

Assimilated Obligations

4.1 A draft SEA Screening opinion was produced in February 2025, based on the objectives and draft policies likely to form part of the Regulation 14 Plan. The report concluded that "the Bradford Abbas Neighbourhood Plan is not likely to have significant environmental effects and therefore a full SEA is not required". The three statutory consultees were sent the screening report on 3 March 2025 and agreed with the conclusions with Natural England (NE) advising that *"on the basis of the material supplied with the consultation … significant effects on Habitats sites, either alone or in combination, are unlikely."*

[12] The meaning of 'excluded development' is set out in s.61K of the 1990 Act.

4.2 However, an HRA was carried out which identified a likely significant effect from water pollution upon the Somerset Levels & Moors Ramsar site, given the potential for new additional residential development resulting from policies in the Plan. The subsequent Appropriate Assessment (AA) (pages 15 and 16) concluded that adverse effects upon the integrity of the Somerset Levels & Moors Ramsar Site from water quality can be avoided by inserting wording at the end of Policy 9 (Meeting Local Housing Need) in the Plan stating that *"Housing development will only be supported if it can achieve phosphate neutrality in respect of the Somerset Levels & Moor Ramsar Site".* It can only then be concluded that the Plan will not result in an adverse effect upon the integrity of a European Site.

4.3 This revision to the policy was not made and I commented that I should remedy this by recommending an appropriate modification to the Plan. Both Councils agreed with this action, but with BAPC also stating there should be a separate paragraph in the policy and not an additional bullet point, as the requirement to achieve phosphate neutrality should apply to any new housing within the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) and any affordable housing sites outside the DDB. I address this in paragraph 4.22 and **PM2**. Subject to **PM2** below, having read the SEA, the HRA, including the AA, I support these conclusions[13] and consider the Plan is compatible with the relevant assimilated obligations.

Main Issues

4.4 Having considered whether the 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 and the contribution it makes to the achievement of sustainable development. I test the Plan against the Basic Conditions by considering specific issues of compliance of all the Plan's policies.

4.5 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 determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.[14]

4.6 Accordingly, having regard to the Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan, 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;

[13] Natural England responded to the SEA Screening (14 March 2025), alongside Historic England (19 March 2025) and the Environment Agency (7 April 2025). Natural England responded to the HRA/AA (29 July 2026). Responses to the Regulation 16 consultation included those from the Environment Agency(31 August 2026), Historic England (29 August 2026) and Natural England (26 August 2026).
[14] PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

(ii) do not result in the development plan for the area proposing less housing development than would have been the case if the plan were not to be made; and (iii) would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

Vision and Objectives

4.7 The vision for the Plan is based on issues raised by the community during the initial stages of the consultation process. The succinct vision is stated in paragraph 1.3 on page 3 of the Plan. The vision is then used to describe detailed objectives which are used to introduce the twelve land use based policies within the Chapters: Environment and Heritage; Climate Change; Community Services and Facilities; Housing; Business Services and the Economy; Traffic Road Safety and Transport; and Design Guidance.

Policy 1. Local Landscape Character

4.8 Policy 1 aims for development to respect and, where possible, enhance the landscape with several landscape characteristics listed to be retained.

Policy 2. Locally Important Views

4.9 Policy 2 aims to safeguard important views described in Table 1 and shown on Map 3.

Policy 3. Dark Night Skies

4.10 Policy 3 aims to safeguard dark night skies.

Policy 4. The importance of recreational access to the countryside

4.11 Policy 4 encourages the improvement and enhancement of the existing public rights of way network, permissive paths and open access land.

Policy 5. Protecting our historic environment

4.12 Policy 5 aims to protect the historic character of the area, having regard to the findings of the Bradford Abbas Conservation Area Appraisal and the significance of the many designated and non-designated heritage assets.

4.13 All the above policies (Policy 1 – 5) have regard to national guidance[15] as listed in the footnote and meet the Basic Conditions.

[15] NPPF: Policies 1 & 2 - paragraph 187; Policy 3 – paragraph 198; Policy 4 – paragraph 105; and Policy 5 – paragraphs 212 & 216.

Policy 6. Important Local Green Spaces

4.14 Policy 6 defines the Local Green Spaces (LGS). LGS designation should only be used where the green space is:

a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.[16]

LGS should also be capable of enduring beyond the end of the Plan period.[17] I agree that St Mary's Churchyard; the School Playing Field; the Recreation Ground; and the Sports Club Field satisfy the national designation criteria.

4.15 However, although accepting that Gollops Ground (land to the South of The Grange), the Field opposite (the) pub and the Rose and Crown Pub Garden are in close proximity to the community they serve and are local in character, I questioned BAPC about whether the sites are demonstrably special to the local community and hold a particular local significance. The landowners of all three sites objected to the LGS designation.

Gollops Ground

4.16 Gollops Ground (land south of The Grange) is in agricultural use, enjoys public access and has recent history where a public right of way has been confirmed alongside the bank of the River Yeo. The evidence of public enjoyment of the field and footpath is anecdotal but realistic because of the location close the village and also due to the proximity of the extremely attractive riverbank. However, I consider that the attraction and pleasure derived from this area of land is mostly because of the view of the river from the nearby footpath and the agricultural use of the field which will not be diminished whether the land is designated a LGS or not. Therefore, I consider that the field is not so demonstrably special to the local community that it should be designated as LGS and shall recommend its deletion from Policy 6.

Field opposite pub

4.17 The Field opposite (the) pub (Rose and Crown) is privately owned and there is no public access. The land may form part of an attractive green corridor between the village centre and the River Yeo and the open nature of the field in this central location plays an important role in protecting the open, spacious and rural character of the village. But the site is within the Conservation Area and contributes to the setting of the nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets. Therefore, the site already enjoys

[16] NPPF: paragraph 107.
[17] NPPF: paragraph 106.

protection from development because of national and local planning policies as shown by the planning history, including the dismissed appeal. Accordingly, I do not accept that the site is so demonstrably special to the local community that it should be designated as LGS and shall recommend its deletion from Policy 6.

Rose and Crown Pub Garden

4.18 I note the Rose & Crown Pub Garden has hosted a significant number of community events and that the pub and garden are popular with local families and tourists. However, in my opinion, that is more of a sign of a currently thriving pub business. There may well be long views out from the raised garden over the field opposite and beyond for customers. However, views into the garden for passers-by on the adjoining footpath, unless unusually tall, are limited to glimpses from each end by the adjacent high wall. I do not accept that the pub garden has a strong visual connection with the public right of way alongside it.

4.19 I also recognise that the pub is probably perceived, quite rightly, and as identified in Policy 8, as an important community asset and I would not wish that asset to be put at risk by restricting choices which may be future commercial considerations. Therefore, I do not agree that the Rose and Crown Pub Garden is so demonstrably special to the local community that it should be designated as LGS and I am recommending that it should be deleted from Policy 6. Subject to the deletion of these three proposed LGS, the policy would have regard to national guidance[18] and meet the Basic Conditions. **(PM1)**

Policy 7. Flooding considerations

4.20 Policy 7 requires all new development to be located and designed in line with national policy to avoid exacerbating existing, or creating new, flood risk. The policy has regard to national guidance[19] and meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy 8. Important Community Facilities

4.21 Policy 8 aims to safeguard important community facilities listed in Section 4.2 of the Plan and identified on Maps 6 and 7. The policy has regard to national guidance[20] and meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy 9. Meeting Local Housing Need

4.22 Policy 9 addresses local needs for housing. In accordance with the reasons in paragraphs 4.1 – 4.3 above, I shall recommend that the policy is modified by adding *"Housing development will only be supported if it can*

[18] NPPF: paragraphs 106 – 108.
[19] NPPF: paragraphs 162 & 182.
[20] NPPF: paragraphs 88 & 98.

achieve phosphate neutrality in respect of the Somerset Levels & Moors Ramsar Site" as a separate sentence. This amendment would ensure that the mitigation identified through the Habitats Regulations Assessment forms part of the policy framework and align the Plan with the conclusions of the Appropriate Assessment. Subject to that modification, the policy would have regard to national guidance[21] and meet the Basic Conditions. **(PM2)**

Policy 10. Local employment opportunities

4.23 Policy 10 seeks to improve employment opportunities and supports appropriate types of development one of which is the extension of existing homes and the provision of outbuildings, and which is subject to three criteria. So as not to restrict the use of household extensions for their primary use, DC suggest rephrasing the second criterion (second bullet point) of the second paragraph of the policy to: *"any business use must remain ancillary and incidental to the occupation of the dwellinghouse."* BAPC agreed to this revised wording of Policy 10 which I shall recommend as a modification. **(PM3)** The policy would then have regard to national guidance[22] and would meet the Basic Conditions.

Policy 11. Support a safer highway network

4.24 Policy 11 supports a safer highway network for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. The policy has regard to national guidance[23] and meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy 12. Design Guidance

4.25 Policy 12 aims to preserve the traditional character of the two Parishes. The policy has regard to national guidance[24] and meets the Basic Conditions.

Alterations to the Text

4.26 The acceptance of the modifications will require minor consequential amendments to be made to the explanation within the Plan in order to make it logical. Other amendments might also include minor contextual updates, such as adding LNRS references in appropriate places in the supporting text as suggested by DC, correcting minor inaccuracies or typographical errors, 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.[25]

---

[21] NPPF: paragraphs 30, 61, 63, 69 – 70 & 82 – 84.
[22] NPPF: paragraphs 85 & 88.
[23] NPPF: paragraphs 109 & 111.
[24] NPPF: paragraphs 132, 135 & 139.
[25] PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509.

Community Projects

4.27 The Plan includes 10 projects to be carried out by the Parish Council. These worthwhile projects are listed following Policies 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 in the Plan. These are items which the community is seeking but cannot be delivered through planning policies, which are not considered as part of the examination and which will not form part of the statutory Development Plan. Nevertheless, they represent aspirations or actions which would benefit the community and demonstrate one of the valuable associated attributes of the neighbourhood planning process.[26]

5. Conclusions

Summary

5.1 The Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard to all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, and the evidence documents submitted with it.

5.2 I have made recommendations to modify three of the twelve policies, to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

The Referendum and its Area

5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Plan as modified has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary and which would require the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Final comments

5.4 The Bradford Abbas Parish Council, the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group and other voluntary contributors are to be commended for producing a succinct, comprehensive and well-illustrated Plan. I enjoyed examining the Plan and visiting Bradford Abbas and its neighbour, Clifton Maybank. The Plan benefitted greatly from the constructive and cooperative responses by BAPC and DC in answering my questions.

[26] PPG Reference ID: 41-004-20190509.

Subject to the recommended modifications, the Neighbourhood Plan will make a positive contribution to the Development Plan for the area.

Andrew Mead

Examiner

Appendix: Modifications

Proposed Modification number (PM)	Policy/other reference	Modification
PM1	Policy 6	Delete from the list in the policy: - "~~Gollops Ground~~"; - "….~~and field opposite pub~~"; and - "~~Rose and Crown Pub Garden~~". Remove the above three proposed LGS from Map 4. Note: Minor consequential amendments may be made to reflect these deletions e.g. updates to Table 2. In this regard, see paragraph 4.26 of the main report.
PM2	Policy 9	Add as a separate sentence: ***"Housing development will only be supported if it can achieve phosphate neutrality in respect of the Somerset Levels & Moors Ramsar Site."***
PM3	Policy 10	Amend the second bullet point of the second paragraph to: ***"any business use must remain ancillary and incidental to the occupation of the dwellinghouse."***