

Goodworth Clatford Neighbourhood Development Plan. Decision Statement: 31 January 2019

1. Introduction

1.1 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), the Test Valley Borough Council has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and orders and to take plans through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.

1.2 This statement confirms that the modifications proposed by the examiner's report have been accepted, the draft Goodworth Clatford Neighbourhood Development Plan will be altered as a result of it; and that this plan may now proceed to referendum.

2. Background

2.1 The Goodworth Clatford Neighbourhood Plan relates to the area that was designated by Test Valley Borough Council as a neighbourhood area on 10 May 2016. This area corresponds with the Goodworth Clatford Parish Council boundary that lies within the Test Valley Borough Council Area.

2.2 Following the submission of the Goodworth Clatford Neighbourhood Plan to the Borough Council, the plan was publicised and representations were invited. The publicity period ended on 6 November 2018.

2.3 Brian Dodd MRTPI was appointed by the Test Valley Borough Council with the consent of Goodworth Clatford Parish Council, to undertake the examination of the Neighbourhood Plan and to prepare a report of the independent examination.

2.4 The examiner's report concludes that subject to making the modifications recommended by the examiner, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

3. Decision

3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.

3.2 Having considered each of the modifications made by the examiner's report and the reasons for them, and the modifications to reflect comments made Test Valley Borough Council in consultation with Goodworth Clatford Parish Council has decided to accept all the modifications to the draft plan. Table 1 below outlines the alterations made to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of 2004 Act) in response to each of the Examiner's recommendations and the modifications required in response to comments made at the Regulation 16 consultation. This statement should be read alongside the Examiners report.

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	Historic England			
Policy BE2	We note the reference to other buildings of local interest being identified in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal, but is there an actual list of locally-important buildings and features throughout the parish ?	Agreed, the list will be inserted.	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
Policy NE2	We suggest that Policy NE2 be retitled "Natural features" (as in paragraphs 3.30 and 3.31), as the features identified can also make a significant contribution to the character and amenity of developed areas (indeed, paragraph 3.33 notes that the " <i>Goodworth Clatford Conservation Area Character Appraisal also points to the importance of features such as mature trees, hedges, open spaces and other natural elements.....</i> ").	Noted and appropriate - "natural features".	4.4.1 In response to a suggestion by Historic England, GCPC propose to re-title the policy `Natural features'. The supporting text suggests that this would be an appropriate change, and I so recommend. It follows that the word `rural' should be replaced by the word `natural' in the first line of the policy, and I so recommend. Change title to `Natural features' and replace `rural' by `natural' in the first line of the policy.	Accept Examiners Modification
Policy NE5	Policy NE5 could include "historic significance" alongside " <i>character, appearance or the use...</i> ".	Noted - acceptable addition - "historic significance"	4.5.1 In response to a suggestion by Historic England, GCPC propose to add the words `historic significance' to the second sentence of the policy, and I so recommend. Add the words `historic significance' to the second sentence of the policy.	Accept Examiners Modification

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
		Agreed	5.7 On page 28 of the GCNDP there is a fragment of text which says: `Please see full size versions of these footpath maps on pages 49 and 50'. It is not clear which footpath maps are being referred to, nor which document contains them. I recommend that either this situation should be remedied, or that the fragment should be deleted.	Accept Examiners Modification
Built environment title	We suggest that the section on the "Built Environment" be retitled "Built and Historic Environment", or there be a separate section for the Historic Environment – not all the historic environment, or even heritage assets are "built" and the National Planning Policy Framework recognises the built environment and historic environment as separate entities (in paragraph 8 c), 20 d), 28 and the Glossary).	Noted - acceptable - "built and historic environment" as heading.	In response to a suggestion by Historic England, GCPC propose to re-title the section heading on page 29 of the GCNDP `Built and Historic Environment Policies'. The supporting text suggests that this would be an appropriate change, and I so recommend. However, care will be required to ensure that consequential changes are made throughout the GCNDP (for example on the Contents page, and paragraphs 3.3 and 3.69) Re-title the section heading `Built and Historic EnvironmentPolicies', and make consequential changes throughout the GCNDP.	Accept Examiners Modification

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	<p>We also suggest that the policy be slightly rephrased to say <i>“Development proposals within or adjacent to the Goodworth Clatford Conservation Area or likely to affect the significance of other heritage assets will be permitted provided they:.....”</i> to be consistent with paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework that plans should <i>“contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”</i>. Clause 2 should include <i>“special interest”</i> as well as <i>“character and appearance”</i> as this is the basis on which conservation areas are designated.</p>	<p>noted. "special interest" to be added to character and appearance in para2</p>	<p>4.7.1 Historic England suggest re-wording of parts of this policy. GCPC propose to accept some of the changes but not others. The insertion of `special interest' into clause 2 of the policy would be unexceptionable, and I recommend it. However, in my judgement the other changes accepted by GCPC would not result in an improved policy. Replacing the final paragraph of the policy with the suggested text would have the, presumably unintended, effect of requiring that all development proposals within or adjacent to the Conservation Area should provide public benefits. This would clearly be an unreasonable requirement. The provision of public benefits might be a consideration to be weighed in the balance in the case of an otherwise unacceptable proposal, but it is not something which can be required in every case.Insert `special interest' into clause 2 of the policy.</p>	<p>Accept Examiners Modification</p>
	<p>We therefore suggest that the last paragraph of Policy BE2 be rewritten as a new clause 6: <i>“provide public benefits that could not otherwise be provided that are considered to override any harm to the significance, special interest, character or appearance of designated or non-designated heritage assets in a manner appropriate to the significance of the assets affected as set out in national planning policy and TVBLP policy E9.”</i></p>	<p>We consider such an addition to be appropriate.</p>	<p>4.1.1 As it stands the policy might not be elegant, but it is intelligible and complies with the basic conditions.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	Test Valley Borough Council			
Section 1 – Setting the Scene	This section gives an overview of the Parish to give the reader a better understanding of the area and what gives its sense of place. The map in Figure one whilst it shows the GCNP designated area, it also has the parish boundaries of Upper Clatford and Wherwell shown, which is confusing. The Council suggests that the map be replaced with a map that only shows the boundary of the designated area for Goodworth Clatford. The Council are able to provide this map to the steering group.	We agree that this should help and we welcome the new map provided by TVBC	5.1 Figure 1 on page 4 of the GCNDP purports to show the boundary of the Neighbourhood Area. However, it does not do so clearly and unambiguously. It appears to show the boundaries of several parishes, and indeed it omits part of Goodworth Clatford parish. I recommend that this Figure be amended to show only the boundary of the Neighbourhood Area, and that it should show the whole of that boundary. Amend Figure 1 to show only the boundary of the Neighbourhood Area, and to show the whole of that boundary.	Accept Examiners Modification
	The map in Figure 2 would benefit from being consistent with the other OS base maps in the plan, so as to aid clarity. The Council can help with the mapping in the final document.	We agree that this should help and we welcome the new map provided by TVBC	5.3 Figure 2, on page 7 of the GCNDP, purports to show 'Features and communications'. However, I found the fonts used in this figure to be so small as to be unreadable, except when greatly magnified by accessing the on-line version of the plan. In my opinion the plan should be accessible to and useable by those who wish to use it in its printed form, as well as by those who wish to use it in its electronic form. I recommend that the figure should be amended to allow this. Amend Figure 2 so that it is readable in hard copy.	Accept Examiners Modification

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Section 2 – A Vision for Goodworth Clatford.	Vision and Objectives The GCNP contains a vision and 11 objectives. Given the importance of the vision in the document, it would raise the profile of the vision if it were to be in a text box. Although this is a presentation matter, it would help elevate the importance of the vision within the Plan.	We can see that this may benefit the presentation	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
	Paragraph 3.1 of the plan states that <i>'the policies in the NDP set out the types of development that will and will not be permitted'</i> (authors emphasis). This is not the case as the policies set out the criteria new developments will need to conform to, to be in accordance with the policies. None of the policies in the plan categorically set out what will and will not be permitted. The Council suggests that this paragraph be removed.	We propose that 'and will not' be removed	4.1.4 Paragraph 3.1 of the Introduction to the policies of the GCNDP is inaccurate when it says that the policies set out the types of development which will and will not be permitted. In fact the policies set out criteria against which development proposals will be judged. I recommend that paragraph 3.1 should be amended accordingly. Replace `types of development that will and will not be permitted' with `criteria against which development proposals will be judged'.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiners recommendation	Paragraph 3.3	Agreed	5.4 In the interests of clarity and consistency, I recommend that the word `and' should be removed from the end of the second bullet point of paragraph 3.3, and that the full stop at the end of the third bullet point should be replaced by a semi-colon. Remove the word `and' from the end of the second bullet point; replace the full stop at the end of the third bullet point by a semi- colon.	Accept Examiners Modification

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	Paragraph 3.5 includes the words ' <i>inter alia</i> ' and phrases like this should be avoided so that the plan is easy to read and understand.	Replace 'inter alia' with 'among other things'	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
	Paragraph 3.7 refers to ' <i>a number of evidence base documents</i> ' and these should be referenced in the footnotes.	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
	It would also help the reader if a map showing the landscape character areas accompanied the text in this part of the plan.	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
Policy SP2	although a strategic policy, the policy and text would be better located with the Community and Business Policies, as it would avoid repetition. The Council is also concerned over how a proposal could be assessed against ' <i>enhance and improve the quality of life</i> '	As this is a Strategic component we believe its impact would be reduced by embedding it into another section. Quality of life is clarified within the Policy enabling objective assessments to be made. As agreed we agree that 'enhance and improve' should be replaced with 'maintain'	TVBC suggest the re-location of the policy within the GCNDP, to avoid repetition. Given the strategic importance of the policy in implementing the vision and objectives of the GCNDP, I consider that it is appropriately located. Replace 'enhance and improve' by 'maintain or improve'.	Accept Examiners Modification

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Policy NE1	lists seven sites that are to be designated as Local Green Spaces. It would be helpful if the map showing the green spaces was included in this part of the plan. The rationale for their selection at Appendix E could also be moved into the evidence base, as if the plan is made the rationale will not be needed in the final plan. With this in mind, the Local Green Space Assessment should be added to the bullet list showing the evidence for the policy in paragraph 3.29.	Agreed.	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify text to reflect comments made, but maps and supporting evidence to remain in Appendices
Examiners recommendation	Paragraphs 1.8, 3.20, 3.35 and 3.46, and footnotes 4 and 32	Agreed.	Replace `TVLP' by `TVBLP'.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiners recommendation	Policy NE1, Policy NE3 and paragraphs 3.10,3.19, 3.26, 3.36,3.42 and 3.57.	Agreed.	5.5 In several places in the policies and supporting text, there are references to maps labelled `A.1', `A.2', `A.3' and so on. It is not immediately obvious that these maps are to be found at Appendix A.1, Appendix A.2 and so on. In the interests of usability and clarity, I recommend that the word `Appendix' should be inserted in every case. There are occurrences in paragraphs 3.10, 3.19, policy NE1, paragraph 3.26, Policy NE3, and paragraphs 3.36, 3.42, and 3.57. Insert the word `Appendix' before the map references in each case.	Accept Examiners Modification

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Policy NE2	covers Rural Features. The policy states that <i>'proposals will not be supported where they result in the loss or deterioration of the best and most versatile agricultural land'</i> Is this an issue for the plan area. Does the plan area have any land in grades 1, 2 or 3a?	You are correct that we only have a small area that would fit this description. As agreed the text 'the best and most versatile' should be removed.	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
Policy NE3	deals with Biodiversity and nature conservation. The policy mainly repeats Local Plan Policy E5, therefore the Council suggests that the policy could be slimmed down so as not to repeat the requirements as already set out in Policy E5.	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Text as written complies with the basic conditions, so no change required.
	It would also aid the reader if the map showing the local SINCs was included in this section of the plan.	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Maps to remain in Appendices – No change required.
Policy NE4	deals with the issues of Water Management and Pollution. Bullet 2 states that <i>'development proposals should protect the environment by contributing to the environmental works ..'</i> It is not clear from the policy or the text what form this contribution would take, and the Council suggests that this requires clarification. The third bullet states <i>'foul sewer infrastructure rather than'</i> whereas the supporting text at paragraph 3.51 states <i>'in preference to'</i> . It would be helpful if the same phrase	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	was used in both the text and policy to avoid confusion.			
Policy NE5	covers the topic of Rights of Way. The policy states that <i>'development proposals should maintain or enhance ..'</i> The addition of the wording <i>'where appropriate'</i> would add clarity to the policy as not all development proposals will be required to maintain or enhance the footpaths and Rights of Way.	We feel the current Policy wording provides the most appropriate solution.	4.5.2 Not all development proposals will have an impact upon rights of way, and therefore I recommend that the words <i>'where appropriate'</i> should be inserted at the beginning of the first sentence of the policy. Insert the words <i>'where appropriate'</i> at the beginning of the first sentence of the policy.	Accept Examiners Modification
	It would also aid the reader and the flow of the plan if a consolidated map showing the Rights of Ways and permissive paths was included in this section of the plan.	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
Policy BE1	covers the issue of Design. Bullet 2 would benefit from having the word <i>'users'</i> added to the policy, as this will also deal with non residential buildings. The wording could read <i>'all existing and future users or occupants'</i> Bullet 5 states that <i>'where appropriate, ..comply with the VDS'</i> . Given the status of the Village Design Statement, most development should comply with the document, therefore the Council suggests removing the wording <i>'where appropriate'</i>	Both Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	It would be helpful to the reader if there was a footnote reference in paragraph 3.73 to the Conservation Area Character Appraisal referred to in the text.	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
	It would also be helpful if the relevant building regulations were cited in the evidence for this policy section, to support the inclusion of the rainwater harvesting to reduce water consumption.	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
Policy BE2	covers the issue of the Conservation Area and other heritage assets and bullet 1 states that development should, ' <i>respect the historic fabric and plan form of the locality</i> '. For improved clarity this would benefit from having the word 'historic' added so that the wording would read ' <i>respect the historic fabric and historic plan form of the locality</i> '	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
	Bullet 2 of the policy follows on stating that development should ' <i>respect important views into and out of the Conservation Area as identified in the Character Appraisal</i> ' this would be clearer if the following was added ' <i>respect important views including, but not restricted to those into and out of the Conservation Area as identified in the Character Appraisal</i> '	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	<p>The final paragraph of the policy goes on to say : <i>'Development proposals should conserve and enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets throughout the Neighbourhood Area. These comprise listed buildings, buildings of local interest, archaeological sites and the historic landscape.'</i> It would be helpful if these non designated assets and buildings of local interest were referenced in the supporting text.</p>	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
	<p>Paragraph 3.77 sets out the key characteristics that give the Area its distinct and unique character, with bullet 8 listing the Major key buildings. Of this list, only The Lawns fall within the neighbourhood area, and so as a factual correction, the others should be removed from the bullet. However, St Peter's Church, Goodworth Clatford could be included as could the Village Club and Queen Anne Cottage which are other notable buildings in the village.</p>	Agreed	<p>5.8 The final bullet point in paragraph 3.77 is confusing. It lists a number of `major key buildings'. The first of these is within Goodworth Clatford; the remainder are in Upper Clatford and are not relevant in the context of the NDP. It appears that a bullet point from page 13 of the Goodworth Clatford and Upper Clatford Conservation Area Character Appraisal has been incorrectly copied. In the interests of accuracy and clarity I recommend that the final bullet point in paragraph 3.77 should be corrected. The bullet point refers only to the Conservation Area, and it would therefore be inappropriate to add the names of buildings which lie outside the Conservation Area (as suggested by TVBC). Correct the list of buildings.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	It would also aid the reader and the flow of the plan if the maps referenced in the supporting text are included in this section of the plan.	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Maps to remain in Appendices – No change required.
	Notwithstanding this, the Council has the following comments on the policy. The policy as written would apply to all development proposals. However, an extension to an existing building and other small scale development would not require a Transport Assessment or Statement, nor due to their locations may not be accessible by a range of transport modes.	Agreed that an edit is required.	4.8.2 Not all development proposals would justify a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement. Indeed Paragraph 9.9 of the TVLP says that only developments which generate a significant amount of movement will require a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment to be produced. I recommend that Policy CB1 and the supporting text (paragraph 3.84) should be reworded to recognise this. The precise wording should be agreed between GCPC and TVBC. Reword the policy and supporting text to recognise that not all development proposals will justify a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement.	Accept Examiners Modification
	Bullet 3 of the policy goes on to state ' <i>enhanced connectivity to existing transport, travel and other community facilities</i> ' It is not clear what the difference is between 'travel' and 'transport' in this context , however it is acknowledged that connectivity to existing transport routes and other services and facilities in the village is important.	We see Travel referring to being on a journey, often for pleasure or business whereas Transport is all about the act of going from one place to another	4.8.3 TVBC query the use of `transport' and `travel' in paragraph 2 of policy CB1. In my view there is a distinction between `travel' (the act of moving from one place to another) and `transport' (the means of doing so). On that basis, the use of the word `travel' in the third line of paragraph 2 of Policy CB1 is inappropriate, and I recommend that the word should be deleted. Delete the word `travel'.	Accept Examiners Modification

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	Paragraph 3.84 states that 'proposals should include appropriate information ...'. Not all development will require a TA, therefore the words 'where required' should be inserted, as well as in Bullet 1 for clarity. It should also be noted, that there could be some permitted development in relation to highways works, and therefore this policy would not apply.	Agreed.	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
Policy CB2	deals with Community Facilities. The policy identifies the community facilities that the policy would apply to, however the first half of the policy repeats policy COM14 in the Local Plan. The Council suggests rewriting the policy so that it identifies the community facilities that COM14 would apply to in the village of Goodworth Clatford. It would also be helpful if both the village pubs are named in the list for the avoidance of doubt.	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify text to include reference to the pubs. Remainder of text as written complies with the basic conditions, so no change required.

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
	<p>The catchment area of the primary school is mentioned in paragraph 3.88, and it states its very large. The catchment area is in fact the Parish of Saint Peters in Goodworth Clatford and All Saints in Upper Clatford, and could not be described as being large. If there are any pupils in the school from outside the catchment area, if new families arrive in the village, over time in accordance with the admission policy, there would not be spaces to accommodate out of catchment children. The Council suggests that this is reworded.</p>	Agreed	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
Examiners recommendation	policy CB2 paragraph a)	Agreed	5.10 In the interest of accuracy, I recommend that in paragraph a) of Policy CB2, the word`amenities` should be replaced by the word `amenity`. Replace `amenities` by `amenity`.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiners recommendation	policy CB2	Agreed	5.9 Policy CB2 lists a number of community facilities. They are identified by numbers, which in turn relate to a map, Appendix A.7. However, it is not clear from the policy itself that the numbers relate to the map; that information is not given until paragraph 3.86 in the supporting text. In the interests of clarity, I recommend that a reference to Appendix A.7 be inserted into the policy itself. Insert a reference to Appendix A.7 into the policy.	Accept Examiners Modification

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Examiners recommendation	Examiners recommendation Paragraph 3.77,final bullet point	Agreed	5.8 The final bullet point in paragraph 3.77 is confusing. It lists a number of `major key buildings'. The first of these is within Goodworth Clatford; the remainder are in Upper Clatford and are not relevant in the context of the NDP. It appears that a bullet point from page 13 of the Goodworth Clatford and Upper Clatford Conservation Area Character Appraisal has been incorrectly copied. In the interests of accuracy and clarity I recommend that the final bullet point in paragraph 3.77 should be corrected. The bullet point refers only to the Conservation Area, and it would therefore be inappropriate to add the names of buildings which lie outside the Conservation Area (as suggested by TVBC). Correct the list of buildings.	Accept Examiners Modification
Policy CB3	concerns the Loss of Commercial Premises and Land. This is a negatively worded policy, that repeats much of Policy LE10 in the Local Plan and does not add any locally distinctive dimension. The policy also states that sites would need to be marketed for a period of 12 months, but there is no evidence put forward to suggest why 12 months is an appropriate time frame. The Council suggest that the policy is removed.	We would prefer to reword this Policy rather than remove it to become more locally distinctive. We agree that it should be more positively worded and the duration reduced from 12 to 6 months.	4.9.1 TVBC say that the policy duplicates a local plan policy and is unnecessary. However, the inclusion of the policy develops the ideas set out in the vision and objectives, and thereby makes the GCNDP a more coherent and locally relevant document. In my view the wording of the policy is clear and logical as it stands. Nevertheless, GCPC propose to amend the policy, and I see no reason why their proposed amendments should not accord with the basic conditions.	Modify to reflect comments made

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Section 4 – Delivering the NDP	This section of the plan deals with those non use planning matters that are of importance to the local community. They are therefore expressed as ‘Community Actions’ in this section. The Council has no comments to make on this section, however, they could be included below each relevant policy that they refer to, so that the plan is read as a whole.	Noted	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	No change required
Appendix A	As previously commented in the preceding sections, it is suggested that the plans in Appendix A are placed within the document in the section that relates to each plan.	We were advised by our External Planning Consultant that these documents should go in an Appendix!	5.11 In a number of cases TVBC recommend that maps and other information should be moved from the Appendices into the body of the GCNDP, closer to the policies to which they relate. This is a matter of presentation which can be decided by discussion between the GDPC and the TVBC. It does not have a bearing upon my consideration of the basic conditions.	Modify to reflect comments made
	The Council also suggests that some of the plans could be merged. For example there could be one map showing the Settlement Boundary, Conservation Area, Local Green Spaces and Listed Buildings, A second map could show the SINCS, Rights of Way and Permissive Footpath and Bridleway. This is a presentation issue that can be dealt with for the final version of the plan, and the Council would be happy to assist in the production of these plans.	noted	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Appendix B	This is the parish profile for the area, and for the final version this could be relocated to the evidence base for the plan.	Agreed.	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	No change required
Appendix D	This contains the perspectives connecting the Built and Natural Environments. Again this is valuable information, that could sit within the evidence base that supports the policy. It would be useful to include the photographs within the supporting text of Policy SP3, along with the maps showing where the views are.	Noted	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
Appendix E	This houses a table listing the Local Green Spaces. The title of this would benefit from having the word 'assessment' added, as this is a better description. This again could be moved to the evidence base, as it justifies the sites included in the policies.	Noted	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made
	It would also be helpful if the table explained how and why the sites have been identified, and if any other sites were considered and rejected with the reasons why clearly explained.	Agreed.	1.7 No reason for objecting to the changes being made.	Modify to reflect comments made

Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Goodworth Clatford Response	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Examiners recommendation	Appendix E	Agreed	5.6 In the interest of accuracy, I recommend that In Appendix E (fifth column, second line of first entry), the word `respectfully' should be replaced by the word `respectively'. In the fifth column, second line of first entry, the word `respectfully' should be replaced by the word `respectively'.	Accept Examiners Modification