

Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2033

A report to Colchester City Council

**David Kaiserman BA DipTP MRTPI
Independent Examiner**

June 2024

Executive summary

I was appointed by Colchester City Council on 11 April 2024, with the agreement of Great Tey Parish Council, to carry out the independent examination of the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2033.

The examination was completed solely on the basis of the written representations received, no public hearing appearing to me to be necessary. I made an unaccompanied visit to the area covered by the Plan on 1 May 2024.

The Plan relates to the Parish of Great Tey, which has a population of around 1000, is situated a short distance to the west of Colchester, and consists of the main village of Great Tey and a number of smaller hamlets. It has a long history of settlement, reflected in the varied character of its buildings; agriculture remains the predominant feature of the parish as a whole.

The Plan's objectives are to provide for an appropriate level of new development which will respect the important characteristics of the parish, and which will also enhance the range of services and other facilities to meet the needs of existing and future residents. No land is specifically identified for development beyond what is already provided for in the Colchester Local Plan.

Subject to a number of detailed recommendations, I have concluded that the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements at this stage of its preparation, and consequently am pleased to recommend that it should proceed to referendum.

Contents

Executive summary	1
Introduction.....	3
Procedural matters	3
A brief picture of the neighbourhood plan area	4
The basic conditions and the Basic Conditions Statement	5
Other statutory requirements.....	5
National policy.....	6
The existing development plan for the area.....	6
The consultation exercise (Regulation 14).....	7
General observations about the Plan	7
Representations received (Regulation 16).....	8
The policies.....	8
Policy GTTEY1: Design	8
Policy GTTEY2: Landscaping.....	9
Policy GTTEY3: Views	9
Policy GTTEY4: Access to the countryside	10
Policy GTTEY5: Wildlife-friendly development	10
Policy GTTEY6: Dark skies and lighting	11
Policy GTTEY7: Provision and enhancement of community and business facilities	11
Other matters	11
Conclusions on the basic conditions.....	11
Formal recommendation	12
APPENDIX 1 – SUMMARY TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13

Introduction

1. This report sets out the findings of my examination of the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan (the GTNP), submitted to Colchester City Council (CCC) by the Great Tey Parish Council in January 2024. The Neighbourhood Area for these purposes is the same as that of the Parish Council's boundaries.
2. Neighbourhood plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to help local communities shape the development and growth of their area, and this intention was given added weight in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), first published in 2012. The current edition of the NPPF is dated December 2023, and it continues to be the principal element of national planning policy. Detailed advice is provided by national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on neighbourhood planning, first published in March 2014.
3. The main purpose of the independent examination is to assess whether the Plan satisfies certain "basic conditions" which must be met before it can proceed to a local referendum, and whether it is generally legally compliant. In considering the content of the Plan, recommendations may be made concerning changes to both policies and any supporting text.
4. In the present case, my examination concludes with a recommendation that, subject to a number of amendments, the Plan should proceed to referendum. If this results in a positive outcome, the GTNP would ultimately become a part of the statutory development plan and thus a key consideration in the determination of planning applications relating to land lying within the GTNP area.
5. I am independent of the Parish Council and do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan. I have the necessary qualifications and experience to carry out the examination, having had 30 years' experience as a local authority planner (including as Acting Director of Planning and Environmental Health for the City of Manchester), followed by over 20 years' experience providing training in planning to both elected representatives and officers, for most of that time also working as a Planning Inspector. My appointment has been facilitated by the independent examination service provided by Penny O'Shea Consulting.

Procedural matters

6. I am required to recommend that the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan either
 - be submitted to a local referendum; or
 - that it should proceed to referendum, but as modified in the light of my recommendations; or
 - that it not be permitted to proceed to referendum, on the grounds that it does not meet the requirements referred to in paragraph 3 above.
7. In carrying out my assessment, I have had regard to the following principal documents:
 - the submitted GTNP (December 2023)
 - the Consultation Statement (December 2023)
 - the Basic Conditions Statement (December 2023)
 - the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report (June 2023)
 - the Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report (June 2023)
 - the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Determination (September 2023)
 - the representations made to the GTNP under Regulation 16
 - selected policies of the adopted development plan for the area
 - relevant paragraphs of the NPPF

- relevant paragraphs of national PPG.
8. I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the Plan area on 1 May 2024, when I looked at its overall character and appearance, its setting in the wider landscape, and those areas affected by specific policies or references in the Plan. Where appropriate, I refer to my visit in more detail elsewhere in this report.
 9. It is expected that the examination of a draft neighbourhood plan will not include a public hearing, and that the examiner should reach a view by considering written representations¹. In the present case, I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary. I should add that none of the representations received at the Regulation 16 stage included a request for a hearing.
 10. I have addressed the policies in the order that they appear in the submitted Plan. My recommendations for changes to the policies and any associated or free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are highlighted in ***bold italic print***.

A brief picture of the neighbourhood plan area

11. Great Tey lies roughly eight miles west of Colchester. It is a large rural parish with Great Tey village, sitting astride the road leading northwards from the A120, containing the only significant urban element; although there are one or two smaller hamlets. The rest of the parish consists largely of a gently undulating landscape of open fields, frequently separated by banks of woodland and hedgerows. The lanes which provide access to the scattering of farms and dwellings are usually narrow and winding; these sometimes provide extensive views, which in the north-eastern parts of the parish include occasional glimpses of the striking Romanesque tower of St Barnabas Church.
12. The area can trace its history back to Roman settlements, and before. There is a wide range of dwelling types, and I saw from my visit that many of these are of historical and architectural interest. There is a conservation area based around the village core, but it is also evident that much development is recent, being dominated by short residential culs-de-sac (some consisting primarily of bungalows) based on Greenfield Drive. There is a primary school (which the GTNP describes as “thriving”) with an attractive recreation ground adjoining open countryside; a busy village hall (which provides outreach Post Office services); and two pubs. The village does not have a shop.
13. The current population of the parish is about 1000. While there was significant enlargement in the 1970s, more recent development is described in the Plan as being organic and has been confined to sites within the designated village envelope. A housing development consisting of 15 units has recently been completed (and occupied) at the extreme south-eastern edge of the village, and another – for 30 dwellings on the western edge – has been granted outline planning permission. These two sites were allocated for housing in the Colchester Local Plan (CLP).
14. In addition to farms, there are a number of commercial enterprises providing local employment, mainly taking the form of offices and workshops. Unsurprisingly, many residents find work outside the parish, with some making use of Mark’s Tey station about three miles to the south-east of the village – this has frequent trains to London, Colchester and beyond.

¹ Paragraph 9(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The basic conditions and the Basic Conditions Statement

15. I am not required to come to a view about the ‘soundness’ of the Plan (in the way which applies to the examination of local plans). Instead, I must principally address whether or not it is appropriate to make it, having regard to certain “basic conditions”, as listed at paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The requirements are also set out in paragraph 065 of the relevant PPG. In brief, all neighbourhood plans must:
- have regard to national policy and guidance (Condition a);
 - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (Condition d);
 - be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area (Condition e);
 - not breach, and otherwise be compatible with, EU obligations, including human rights requirements (Condition f);
 - not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017; and
 - comply with any other prescribed matters.
16. The Basic Conditions Statement (BCS) is a crisp and accessible document that sets out the statutory framework governing the preparation of neighbourhood plans, before describing how the GTNP has sought to meet each of the basic conditions. In Part 2, its four over-arching objectives are related to the relevant goals set out in the NPPF, before each policy is assessed against individual NPPF paragraphs. Part 3 of the BCS explains how the Plan has taken into account the broad objective of achieving sustainable development (Condition d), concluding that “the policies in the Plan demonstrably contribute to sustainable development in respect of building a strong, responsive economy, supporting a strong, vibrant and healthy community and protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment”. Part 4 then assesses in tabular form how each GTNP policy relates to the relevant strategic policies in the development plan.

Other statutory requirements

17. A number of other statutory requirements apply to the preparation of neighbourhood plans, all of which I consider have been met in this case. These are:
- that the Parish Council is the appropriate qualifying body (Localism Act 2011) able to lead preparation of a neighbourhood plan;
 - that what has been prepared is a Neighbourhood Development Plan, as formally defined by the Localism Act; that the plan area does not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area; and that there are no other neighbourhood plans in place within the area covered by the plan;
 - that the plan period must be stated. In the case of the GTNP this is 2022 to 2033;
 - that no “excluded development” is involved (this primarily relates to development involving minerals and waste and nationally significant infrastructure projects).
18. I have also borne in mind the particular duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of “preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of any conservation area.
19. A screening report is required in order to determine whether a neighbourhood plan needs to be accompanied by a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), under the terms of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. It is the qualifying

body's responsibility to undertake any necessary environmental assessments, but it is the local planning authority's responsibility to engage with the statutory consultees.

20. An SEA Screening Determination statement was published by CCC in September 2023, following the publication of a screening report in June 2023. In the formal determination, CCC concludes that the GTNP "is effectively a minor modification to the Colchester Local Plan" and that it is unlikely to have any significant environmental impacts, meaning that an SEA is not required. The same applies in relation to the Habitat Regulations. Full details of the considerations which support the assessment are set out in the statement, and I have been given no reasons to question any of the conclusions reached. They are also supported by Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency, as statutory consultees in the process.
21. It is a requirement under the Planning Acts that policies in neighbourhood plans must relate to "the development and use of land", whether within the Plan area as a whole or in some specified part(s) of it. I am satisfied that that requirement is met.

National policy

22. National policy is set out primarily in the NPPF, a key theme being the need to achieve sustainable development. The NPPF is supported by PPG on neighbourhood planning, an online resource which is continually updated by Government. I have borne particularly in mind the advice in paragraph 041 of the PPG that a policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous, concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. In addition is the requirement set out in the NPPF itself, at paragraph 16f), that "plans should ... serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area" [for example, those already in place in the relevant local plan]. In this respect, I have noted the helpful explanation of the relationship with the CLP set out in the GTNP at paragraph 3.3.

The existing development plan for the area

23. The principal element of the current development plan for the area is in two parts. Section 1 is a Strategic Plan for North Essex that has been prepared jointly by Colchester with Braintree and Tendring District Councils to form the strategic element of their respective local plans for the period 2013-2033. It was formally adopted by the then Colchester Borough Council on 1 February 2021.
24. CLP Section 2, while also containing some strategic elements, primarily consists of the detailed development management policies and site allocations specific to Colchester, and this was adopted in July 2022. The spatial hierarchy for Colchester is set out in Policy SG1, in which Great Tey is identified as a sustainable settlement where an appropriate level of growth should occur and, reflecting that, Policy SG2 allocates 45 new dwellings for the parish for the period to 2033.
25. Paragraphs 6.171 to 6.175 contain further detail, including mention of a Rural Housing Needs Survey carried out in 2012 (which at that time concluded that there was a need for four affordable units) and recognition by the Parish Council that further sustainable growth would be appropriate. CLP Policy SS8 gives effect to this by the allocation of land at Brook Road and off Greenfield Drive for 10 and 30 new dwellings respectively (the first scheme having now been completed), in each case with some design guidelines. The policy also provides protection for the employment uses at Tey Brook Farm (described as a "local economic area" in table SG4).

26. I have noted that CCC has commenced work on a review of the current Local Plan, but I am satisfied that this is of no significance in terms of my examination.

The consultation exercise (Regulation 14)

27. Regulation 14 requires the Parish Council to publicise details of their proposals “in a way that is likely to bring [them] to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the area”, and to provide details of how representations about them can be made. Regulation 15 requires the submission to the local planning authority of a statement setting out the details of what was done in this respect, and how the qualifying body responded to any matters which arose as a result of the consultation process.
28. The Consultation Statement is an account of the work done on the Plan from 2017 onwards. It begins by summarising the statutory context for involving residents and other interests. It then explains how the NP Committee was formed and what efforts were made to ensure that everyone living and working within the parish was encouraged to get involved in the process of plan preparation. Appendix 1 to the document summarises the representations received and the Parish Council’s response to them, where necessary. One important conclusion of these earlier stages of engagement was that no land would need to be allocated for housing beyond that already provided for in the Local Plan.
29. The statement is a comprehensive and readable document, and I am satisfied that the requirements of Regulations 14 and 15 have been fully met.

General observations about the Plan

30. The Plan document is logically set out and contains clear maps and colour photographs, which add to its attractiveness to the general reader. The policies stand out clearly from the supporting text by being highlighted in green boxes, and each is accompanied by a crisp contextual explanation, with cross-references to CLP policies where appropriate. Overall, I consider it to be an easily accessible resource for local residents and other interests in setting out the detailed planning framework for decision-making.
31. After introducing the statutory context, the broad purpose of the Plan and the relationship with the other elements of the development plan for the area, the document summarises the main stages in the GTNP’s progress; describes the history of the parish; and sets out its key physical and social characteristics. Six “issues and challenges” are identified, before a vision for Great Tey is set out:
- In 2033, Great Tey parish will remain a friendly, community-spirited, rural parish, enhanced by more contemporary facilities that appeal to all ages. The rural landscape, environment and safety of the parish’s residents will be maintained and will have been enhanced through well designed, characterful and sustainable development, supported by movement networks and multifunctional green infrastructure which perpetuate the rural nature of the parish. The setting of Great Tey village will have been preserved, avoiding sprawl and amalgamation with other villages.*
32. Four broad objectives are then set out, followed by seven specific policies, which I deal with in turn below.

Representations received (Regulation 16)

33. Only one local resident made a representation, which I comment briefly on in paragraph 48 below. Essex Bridleways Association also made a representation, which I comment on under Policy GTTEY2. Of the statutory consultees, no specific comments were offered by National Highways or Natural England. Anglian Water were supportive of the Plan's ambitions governing greater water efficiency and related matters. I will deal with Historic England's observations under Policy GTTEY3.
34. Colchester City Council support the Plan as it stands, having noted a close working relationship with the NP Working Group in the earlier stages of its preparation, which has resulted in their advice/recommendations being taken fully into account.
35. Essex County Council submitted a large number of observations about the Plan. The bulk of these relate to the Great Tey Design Guidelines and Codes (see below), and so are not relevant for my examination. Of those that deal with the GTNP itself, several suggest that certain policies (or perhaps supporting material) should include reference to ECC's own guidelines on a wide range of planning-related matters. Given that none of this has any direct implications for the basic conditions, I am content that the Parish Council respond to them as they see fit (although I make further comment on the issue when looking at Policies GTTEY1 and GTTEY7). The same applies to observations ECC makes in relation to the way infrastructure provision is referred to in Non-Policy Action D.

The policies

36. Before the policies themselves, the Plan draws attention to the Great Tey Design Guidelines and Codes report, which was commissioned by the Parish Council in order to gain a better understanding of the design issues that need to be considered when new development proposals emerge. In all, 33 design codes have been established, grouped under five themes. Paragraphs 3.4 to 3.9 of the Plan set these out and explain clearly their intended relevance for the decision-making process, including their relationship to policies in the Neighbourhood Plan itself.

Policy GTTEY1: Design

37. This policy seeks to ensure that development is of a high quality which respects the character of the area. In achieving this, regard is to be had to the Design Codes, an appropriately non-prescriptive requirement. Part B of the policy sets out six principles which designs are expected to take into account: these include the need for schemes to integrate satisfactorily with their context (including consideration of density, building heights, materials etc); a mix of house types where appropriate; and steps to achieve a high degree of sustainability in relation to energy, water use etc. Part C sets out broad expectations for the design and appearance of domestic extensions; and Part D requires all major residential schemes to include proportionate information to show how the Design Guidelines and Codes have been taken into account.
38. Paragraphs 4.3 to 4.8, accompanied by relevant illustrations, briefly expand on some of the main issues raised in the policy, and also include succinct explanations of the need for more detail to be added in policies covering similar ground in the Local Plan.
39. ECC suggests that Part A of Policy GTTEY1 include reference to the Essex Design Guide. Given my observations in paragraph 35 above, ***I recommend as an alternative that this be handled***

by adding the following to paragraph 3.7 of the Plan: “It should also be borne in mind that development proposals generally will be expected to have regard to the Essex Design Guide”. The Parish Council may wish to add a brief explanation of the status and scope of this long-established document as it relates to the decision-making process.

Policy GTTEY2: Landscaping

40. This policy includes the requirement for any major new development on land next to the existing built-up area of the village to avoid creating a “hard edge” and, where possible, to allow for the retention of a green buffer which is wide enough to accommodate appropriate recreational activities. ***I recommend a minor amendment here: the second sentence of Part B of the policy should read “A green buffer should be sufficiently wide to accommodate, where appropriate to its location, some or all of the following features:”.*** The list which follows includes reference to pedestrian and cycling use, but not horse riding (as the Essex Bridleway Association points out). ***I recommend that Part B(iv) of the policy be amended to include bridleways.***
41. The policy generally seeks the retention of those landscape features which make a positive contribution to the character of the area and requires any potential negative impacts on heritage assets to be mitigated by the use of green screening.
42. On the second point, Historic England say that while the Plan contains a number of references to the historic environment, it should include a specific section to deal with the area’s designated and non-designated heritage assets, as advised in paragraph 190² of the NPPF and in several places in the PPG (for example, at paragraph 005). Although this is not mentioned by Historic England, CLP Policy DM16 deals quite comprehensively with the historic environment (including mention of assets of local importance); and given the stated intention of the Parish Council to avoid duplication with Local Plan policies, which I strongly support, I consider that no further reference is needed.
43. That said, Part D of Policy GTTEY2 addresses the issue only partially, since it might give the impression that adequate landscaping would generally be sufficient to mitigate any potential harm to heritage assets. To avoid such an interpretation of the policy, ***I recommend that Part D be replaced with the following: “Development which might affect a heritage asset and its setting, and/or the Conservation Area, must demonstrate how this has been adequately mitigated (for example, by the use of appropriate green screening), in accordance with Colchester Local Plan Policy DM17.”***
44. Historic England also recommends the inclusion of a glossary of relevant historic environment terminology, and more detail about legislative and policy protections for heritage assets and the historic environment in general. This seems to me an unnecessary refinement, and it is therefore not subject to any recommendation from me.

Policy GTTEY3: Views

45. Four locations within the parish are identified as offering views of particular value: these are clearly shown on Figure 4.1. and a photograph and brief description of each is included within the text. In addition, the policy refers to the general importance of protecting the setting of St Barnabas Church (grade 1 listed) and the views of open countryside to be had between buildings.

² (erroneously referred to by HE as paragraph 196)

46. Part D of Policy GTTEY3 says that, “Development adjacent to existing green open space in Great Tey should ensure that its setting is preserved”. This requirement is somewhat vague as it stands, and it would benefit from picking up the fuller explanation contained in paragraph 4.19. ***I therefore recommend that Part D be replaced with the following: “Development adjacent to existing green open spaces in, or close to, Great Tey village will be required to take into account the role such spaces might play in allowing appreciation of the historic form and pattern of development in the village.”.***
47. Paragraph 4.19 includes a potentially misleading comment where it says, “More generally, development should preserve existing open spaces in Great Tey...”. As worded, this appears to carry the weight of a policy requirement, and for that reason, it runs the risk of being interpreted as such. As it stands, Policy GTTEY3 restricts itself to the desire to protect the *setting* of green spaces, rather than the spaces themselves – something which is frequently done in neighbourhood plans by the designation of “Local Green Space” in the terms set out in NPPF paragraphs 101-103, but which the GTNP does not include. This is not a criticism of that fact, but the potential anomaly needs to be addressed. ***I therefore recommend that the opening of paragraph 4.19 be amended slightly to read, “More generally, development should preserve the setting of existing open spaces in Great Tey...”.***
48. I visited each of the valued viewpoints identified in Policy GTTEY3, and I have no reason to question the justification for their protection. One representation (I presume from a local resident) refers to the importance of the view of the church from along Coggeshall Road, the precise location presumably not being the same as that shown on Figure 4.1. They do not ask for an addition to be made to the viewpoints listed for protection; views of the church more generally are in any event the subject of Part B of the policy and paragraph 4.17.

Policy GTTEY4: Access to the countryside

49. Maintaining and improving access to the surrounding countryside is an important objective of the Plan. This policy, taken as a whole, seeks to ensure that the existing comprehensive network of public rights of way (including bridleways), which is clearly shown in Figure 5.1, is protected and, where possible, enhanced. The policy is cross-referenced to Policy DM11 of the Essex County Council Development Management Policies document of 2011.
50. Part C of the policy requires “all” development to provide pedestrian and cycle connections to the existing network: ***I recommend that it be modified slightly so as to read, “Where appropriate to its location and scale, new development will be required to provide.....”.***
51. I have noted that this part of the Plan includes reference to the Parish Council’s intention to seek improvements to local bus services. This is under “Non-policy Action A”, and so is properly separated from land-use policies. The same is the case with Non-policy Action B, which refers to working with partners to explore ways of improving traffic safety, particularly through the village itself.

Policy GTTEY5: Wildlife-friendly development

52. This policy is preceded by a short explanation of some of the key environmental policies contained in the CLP (both parts), which the GTNP seeks to support and amplify. Biodiversity is one of the main elements in this agenda, and is the focus of Policy GTTEY5, which has three parts to it and reflects the current national approach to biodiversity net gain. ***For additional clarity, I recommend (a) that the first line of Part A read “All development proposals requiring planning permission should deliver...”; and (b) that the first line of Part C read “Where appropriate and practicable, development should be designed to retain...”.***

53. Paragraph 6.8 of the Plan notes that CLP Policy DM24 already sets out the planning approach to sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS), and that there is therefore no need for the GTNP to address the issue separately.

Policy GTTEY6: Dark skies and lighting

54. The Plan notes that, as a rural community, Great Tey has relatively dark skies, and that the village has no street lighting. This policy seeks to ensure, by a number of related actions, that light pollution continues to be controlled, one benefit of this being its importance in relation to bat activity.

Policy GTTEY7: Provision and enhancement of community and business facilities

55. The Village Hall is the only public building in the parish and is well used for a wide range of activities, as well as providing access to Post Office services. Non-policy action C includes an intention on the part of the Parish Council to ensure that it and other public premises and spaces remain fit for purpose. While paragraph 7.3 explains that the intention is to ensure that the Village Hall be “allowed to adapt and grow as necessary”, no specific proposals (for example, to safeguard any land that might be needed for that purpose) are included in the Plan.
56. Tey Brook Farm is designated a Local Economic Area in the CLP, with Policy SS8 protecting it for employment uses. GTTEY7 supports in principle the provision and enhancement of community facilities and services generally, and specifically the flexible use and/or expansion of office and workshop space in locations in addition to Tey Brook Farm.
57. ECC recommends an addition to this policy, designed to ensure that digital connectivity and high-quality mobile coverage are provided for in new developments or expanded properties. I have noted that SP6 Part D of Strategic Section 1 of the Local Plan already deals with this (albeit in more general terms); and when account is taken of the Essex Design Guide and its related documents, I consider that sufficient policy guidance already exists without the additional material proposed by the County Council.

Other matters

58. It is the practice in many neighbourhood plans for clear guidance to be given on the circumstances where (or when) a review might be undertaken. However, this is not a statutory requirement, nor is it the subject of Government policy beyond guidance that communities are encouraged to keep plans up to date. In this case, the Parish Council simply commits itself (in paragraph 1.16) to “maintaining and periodically revisiting the Plan to ensure relevance and to monitor delivery throughout the period of the plan to 2033”. ***I recommend that this intention be given rather more prominence by including it as a new Section 8 at the end of the document.***

Conclusions on the basic conditions

59. I am satisfied that the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan makes appropriate provision for sustainable development. I conclude that in this and in all other material respects, subject to my recommended modifications, it has appropriate regard to national policy and is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the Plan is not compatible with EU obligations, including human rights requirements.

Formal recommendation

60. I have concluded that, provided that the recommendations set out above are followed, the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan would meet the basic conditions, and therefore recommend that, as modified, it should proceed to a referendum. Finally, I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the neighbourhood plan area, but I have been given no reason to think this is necessary.

David Kaiserman

David Kaiserman BA DipTP MRTPI
Independent Examiner

12 June 2024

APPENDIX 1 – SUMMARY TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Examiner's report paragraph	NP reference	Recommendation
39	GTTEY1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add suggested note, regarding the Essex Design Guide, to paragraph 3.7.
40	GTTEY2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend second sentence of Part B of the policy as suggested. • Amend Part B(iv) to include bridleways.
43	GTTEY2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace Part D of the policy as suggested.
46	GTTEY3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace Part D of the policy as suggested.
47	GTTEY3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend the opening of paragraph 4.19 as suggested.
50	GTTEY4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Part C of the policy as suggested.
52	GTTEY5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend first line of Part A of the policy as suggested. • Amend first line of Part C of the policy as suggested.
58	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include intention to review the Plan and monitor its delivery as a new Section 8 at the end of the Plan.