

# INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE HYTHE AND DIBDEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: Mary O'Rourke BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Stephanie Bennett  
Clerk to Hythe and Dibden Parish Council

Andrew Herring  
New Forest District Council

cc: David Illsley  
New Forest National Park Authority

Examination Ref: 01/MOR/HDNP

Via email

13 May 2019

Dear Ms Bennett, Mr Herring and Mr Illsley

## HYTHE AND DIBDEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINATION

Following the submission of the Hythe and Dibden Neighbourhood Plan (the draft Plan) for examination, I would like to clarify several initial procedural matters. I also have a number of preliminary questions and for the Parish Council and New Forest District Council.

### 1. Examination Documentation

I can confirm that I am satisfied that I have received a complete submission of the draft Plan and accompanying documentation, including the Basic Conditions Statement, the Consultation Statement and the Regulation 16 representations, to enable me to undertake the examination.

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

### 2. Site Visit

I intend to undertake a site visit to the neighbourhood plan area during the week commencing 13 May 2019. This will assist in my assessment of the draft Plan, including the issues identified in the representations.

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

### 3. Written Representations

At this stage, I consider the examination can be conducted solely by the written representations procedure, without the need for a hearing. However, I will reserve the option to convene a hearing should a matter(s) come to light where I consider that a hearing is necessary to ensure the adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case.

#### 4. Further Clarification

I have a number of initial questions seeking further clarification, which I have set out in the Annex to this letter. I would be grateful if you can seek to provide a written response within **2 weeks** of the date of this letter. It is possible that I may have further questions, following my site visit.

#### 5. Examination Timetable

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

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

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

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

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

*Mary O'Rourke*

Examiner

## Annex

From my initial reading of the Hythe and Dibden Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting evidence, I have the following questions in relation to the Plan. I would appreciate it if comments could be received by **two weeks** from the date of this letter.

### Questions on Hythe and Dibden Neighbourhood Plan

Questions 1 to 7 relate to the Consultation Statement and responses are requested from the Parish Council. Question 10 is also directed to the Parish Council and questions 8 and 9 might best be addressed by New Forest District Council (NFDC).

1. Section 4.1.5 of the Consultation Statement refers to a new 'Love It, Don't Love It, I Wish' survey. What was the date of the survey and the number and content of the responses made?
2. The penultimate paragraph of section 4.4.1 of the Consultation Statement states there was not the resources to do leaflet drops to every household. However, section 6.1, for example, describing the roadshows held in the summer of 2018, says events were publicised by leaflets. Please explain how this was done, for example where the leaflets were distributed, etc.
3. Re sections 6.1 and 8.1, please give an indication of the duration of these roadshows.
4. Sections 5.2, 6.2 and 8.2 refer to Google surveys. How were these publicised and how did local people, businesses and organisations access them?
5. Please provide the dates and durations of the Google surveys held in the summer 2018 (section 6.2) and winter 2018/19 (section 8.2).
6. Paragraph 8.78 of the Plan refers to initial public consultation in the summer of 2018 and that 88% of those who responded (44 out of 50) supported the Plan's approach in respect of the buffer zone. However, in the Consultation Statement at sections 6.2 and 8.2, no indication is given of the number of responses received in total or to individual questions. Please provide details on how many responses were received to these Google surveys? And whether those numbers include returned hard copy questionnaires?
7. Please advise as to what consultation was carried out with the local business community.
8. Please provide the NFDC response to the Parish Council of August 2018 referred to in its Regulation 16 consultation letter of 29 January 2019.
9. Please advise me as to where there is a clear plan showing the current operational boundaries of the port and the area referred to at page 64 of the Plan as the Dibden Bay reclaim.
10. I note that Aim 9 of the Plan is addressing the future event of major port development on Dibden Bay reclaim. Given that context, please confirm that the references to 'operational boundaries of the port' (in policy BZ1), 'operational port land' (in policy BZ2), and 'operational port boundary' (in policy BZ3) are not to the existing port area but refer to any future permitted port development on the Dibden Bay reclaim.