



3/12 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

West Somerset Council
Toby Clempson – Planning Officer
West Somerset House
Killick Way
Williton
Taunton
TA4 4QA

Our Ref: PINS/H3320/429/1

Date: 28 August 2015

Dear Mr Clempson,

WEST SOMERSET LOCAL PLAN TO 2032

Introduction

1. The Plan (SD4) was submitted for examination by letter dated 25 July 2015 (SD1). As you know, I have been appointed under s20 of the 2004 Act to conduct the examination of the Plan. In accordance with that section I have to determine whether or not the Plan meets the legal requirements set out in the statute, is sound and complies with the Duty to Co-operate set out in s33A of the 2004 Act. The tests of soundness are set out in paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
2. I have now completed my initial review of the submission documents that you sent to the Secretary of State. I have a number of observations on those and other documents within the evidence base which are set out below.

The nature of the Plan

3. It is clear from the evidence that preparation of the Plan began a considerable time ago. It was intended to be the Core Strategy with further development plan documents from the suite established by the 2004 Act to follow. Statute, policy and guidance have changed considerably since as set out in sections 1.2 and 1.3 of the Plan. However, Framework paragraph 153 sets out a clear expectation that a single local plan will now be prepared for the local planning authority's area. 'Local Plan' is defined in regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (the 2012 Regs).
4. Pragmatically, submission of what amounts to a 'part 1' plan that sets out strategic principles can be acceptable notwithstanding the apparent conflict with national planning policy that has been in place for more than three years.

However, in this case several factors cause some concern with the way this approach has been followed.

5. First, the second part of section 1.2 of SD4 is quite confusing regarding the status of the saved policies in the adopted Local Plan from 2006 which will continue to be used for development management purposes. While Appendix 2 (SD6) sets out the saved policies that will be replaced on adoption of the Plan, I am not aware of any document that sets out the saved policies referred to as being not consistent with the Framework and therefore subject to Framework paragraph 216. Anyone wishing to submit a development proposal will not therefore know whether it is this Plan, the 2006 Local Plan or the Framework or some combination of the three that is relevant to their proposal.
6. Second, there are numerous references by the Council in the various documents and in the responses to the representations made under regulation 20 of the 2012 Regs (SD2) that some issues will be resolved by/deferred to the forthcoming site allocations and development management policies local plans. However, neither is included in the submitted Local Development Scheme (LDS) (SD16), although I acknowledge that this covers the period to March 2016 only.
7. Third, there are some references in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (EB5) and other documents to an 'interim release of sites' through a mechanism outside of the local plan process.
8. Fourth, the LDS states that at April 2013 there had been no requests for the designation of a Neighbourhood Development Area in the Plan area. Is that still the position?
9. Finally and following on from the first point, the Plan includes a number of development management policies, some of which I will return to later.
10. Can the Council therefore explain the nature of the Plan which appears to be more than the simple re-badging of the Core Strategy stated in section 1.2 of it but less than the local plan envisaged by the Framework and the 2012 Regs?

The evidence base

11. It is important that all have access to the evidence base that informed the Plan. On the web site this is in two places; the 'submission' tab and the 'evidence base information' tab. However, each policy is followed by three brief sections; purpose, assumptions and justification including references. The latter are references to documents, many of which are not in either of the tabs referred to above. The Council will need to consider how many of these documents truly influenced the content of the Plan and make them available if they did.
12. Furthermore, the references are generally to entire documents, some of which are quite lengthy. When the Council prepares the further papers that will be required as the examination progresses it will need to reference the relevant part of those documents.

Objectively assessed housing need

13. The first bullet of Framework paragraph 47 is now very familiar. However, a key phrase is 'in the housing market area' (my emphasis). The Duty to Co-operate Statement (SD17) confirms that West Somerset local planning authority area (LPA) is part of two strategic housing market areas (SHMA); the Northern Peninsular SHMA (NPSHMA) and the Taunton and South Somerset HMA. The NPSHMA includes West Somerset, Torridge and North Devon District Councils and Exmoor National Park Authority (ENPA).
14. I have not been able to identify anywhere in the evidence base that has been submitted what contribution, if any, is proposed to meet the needs of the Taunton and South Somerset HMA.
15. It seems to me that the last NPSHMA was that published in December 2008 (EB1). The November 2013 Update (EB2) was for West Somerset, not the SHMA as a whole. A further factor arising from this document is that it presents data for two areas; the administrative area of West Somerset which includes that part of Exmoor National Park lying within its boundary and the LPA of West Somerset which does not. As I understand it, the OAHN of 2900 dwellings does not therefore appear to be that for the NPSHMA but that for West Somerset LPA. This may therefore equate to the stage 2 rather than the stage 1 assessment required by Framework paragraph 47, first bullet; or it may not. The Council will need to explain.
16. The January 2015 Update (EB3) is for the NPSHMA. Its purpose was to provide a comprehensive review and appraisal of the implications of the ONS 2012 subnational population projections on future housing requirements across the partner LPAs. However, it does not appear to come to any conclusion on the continuing robustness of the OAHN in either of the previous two reports. Moreover, at several points it highlights issues that it argues cannot either be resolved or better understood until the release of the 2012-based household projections. These were published in February 2015 and have been the subject of correspondence between us (ED1 and ED2). Furthermore and in any event, it is not clear how this Update has been taken into account in the submission Plan.
17. The Council will therefore need to satisfy itself that the Plan is informed by the latest available information as required by that part of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) referred to in my earlier letter (ED2). I therefore welcome your confirmation on 20 August 2015 (ED3) that you will be participating in the further work being commissioned to understand the implications, if any, of the 2012-based household projections for the NPSHMA. Nevertheless, there are other issues in this section of the letter that the Council will wish to consider.

Affordable housing

18. Paragraph 50 of the Strategy and Housing Topic Paper (SHTP) dated January 2015 (EB7) confirms that both the original NPSHMA and the West Somerset November 2013 Update of it found that the largest component of the future housing requirement was the need for social housing. Indeed, it is put at around 60%. The extreme degree of disparity between average house prices

and average earnings and the consequent high level of unmet affordable housing need is therefore identified as one of the 'critical' issues for the Plan area.

19. This appears to raise a number of issues in relation to the Plan strategy, the extent to which the evidence base supports that strategy and the Duty to Co-operate. My understanding of the chronology of events in relation to these issues is as follows.
20. Paragraphs 28 to 38 of the SHTP explain that the strategy Options were consulted upon in 2010. Three were put forward. Document SD14 sets out in table 3.1B a summary of these three Options. Briefly, Option 1 was a continuation of the existing strategy to focus the majority of new development on the three largest settlements of Minehead, Watchet and Williton. Option 2 added a fourth main focus for future development at Stogursey which could be developed as a higher order centre having regard to the consequences for the area of the construction of Hinkley Point C. Option 3 recognised the roles and functions of the larger villages and sought to include them as part of the potential locations for development regulated to their existing size, role and function; a more dispersed pattern of development therefore.
21. Table 3.1B also sets out in summary form the results of both the strategy Options consultation and the sustainability appraisal (SA) of them. This was carried out in 2010. The wording of the SA results summary for each Option is very similar.
22. In August 2010 the Council's Local Development Panel selected Strategy Option 1. The implication of paragraph 35 of the SHTP is that this was on the basis of the consultation responses. It is not clear from this paragraph what account was taken of the SA. The final section of Table 3.1B 'How the results of the SA have been taken into account' says this: *'Option 1 has been taken forward and the Local Plan has been developed around this strategy. Option 1 performed very strongly as part of the SA and it is the strategy that best maintains and strengthens the current service role of West Somerset settlements. The SA recognised that Option 1 had many sustainability benefits but also indicated areas which could be strengthened. These areas have now been developed into Local Plan policies.'*
23. Maintaining and strengthening the current service role of West Somerset settlements is not among the critical issues for the Plan area set out in section 4.8 of the Plan. The extract given above does not say that SA revealed Option 1 to be the best of the three. It is not clear therefore how the SA informed the choice of the preferred strategy Option.
24. The November 2013 Update for West Somerset set out some robust conclusions and recommendations in section 7 regarding the key issues and problems facing the housing market in the District (so including that part of the National Park within the administrative boundary) and the interventions appropriate to responding to them. With regards to affordable housing, paragraph 7.13 notes that even in times of strong economic performance, conventional approaches to securing supply have produced relatively low rates of affordable housing production. It then recommends a number of less conventional approaches that could be explored with registered providers and private landlords.

25. Sometime in 2014 (the month is not given) the commissioned West Somerset: Strategic Housing Viability Assessment (EB4) was published. Of relevance to the delivery of affordable housing are recommendations 1, 3 and 4.
26. Recommendation 1 noted that if 35% affordable housing remains the priority then for the very largest sites there is no residual balance to support the cumulative costs of other policy requirements. It advises that the Council will need therefore to make important choices about policy priorities. Other housing sites however do retain viability to deliver the 35% threshold and some contributions to other policy requirements.
27. Recommendation 3 notes that for the first five years of the Plan period sites will need to be in locations where dwellings readily sell and there are no high infrastructure costs. No national house builders currently operate in the area and the capability of the regional and medium-sized operators to deliver the scale and pace of development required is likely to be constrained by limits to their capital/risk exposure.
28. Recommendation 4 echoes the November 2013 Update in calling for some consideration of new and innovative mechanisms to deliver the affordable housing requirements off-site.
29. In December 2014 the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SD18) was published. This does not cost any of the infrastructure that it considers. It notes that all of the key strategic sites allocated in the Plan are of insufficient size to require advance planning of major infrastructure to facilitate their delivery independent of the development itself. Paragraph 1.5 confirms that the mitigation measures required that include such as affordable housing, local highway works, surface water and foul drainage management measures, green infrastructure provision and other appropriate matters will need to be secured through agreements under s106 of the Act.
30. The January 2015 NPSHMA Update includes references to and extracts from what it refers to as the National Parks Circular which is also referenced in the Natural Environment-Landscape section of the PPG (ID: 8-002-20140306). This draws attention to the important role that National Park planning authorities can play in the delivery of affordable housing. In its representations on the pre-submission publication draft Plan (at regulation 19 stage) ENPA seem to draw on this and their interpretation of the 2015 Update.
31. This is not reflected in the Duty to Co-operate Statement (SD17) which actually dates from December 2014. Although it is not very clear, I take the comments of ENPA as suggesting some form of co-operation between the two LPAs on the provision of the needed market and affordable housing.
32. In July 2015 the Land Availability Update for the West Somerset LPA area (EB5) confirms at paragraph 3.5 that the assumptions used in the original report (dating from March 2010) are still deemed relevant and effective in the current market conditions. In summary these assumptions are that only unconstrained sites are likely to come forward pending a considerable market recovery; when that happens, 20 dwellings per annum is possible on sites in the three towns but significantly lower rates will be achieved in smaller more rural settlements; rates are independent of affordable housing and multiple developer sites would see a diminishing yield per developer; flats and apartments are not being marketed at present in weak conditions; and sites

isolated from settlements are not considered developable while large scale sites will not be developed in full.

33. Appendix 3 lists those organisations that made up the Panel. It includes a number of national and local housing developers and housing associations.
34. Finally, the submission Plan is also dated July 2015. With respect to housing, the development of policies in the submitted Plan to implement strategy Option 1 has led to the allocation of three sites (MD2, WA2 and WI2), one in each of the three towns, capable of accommodating some 1450 dwellings or some 50% of the requirement. Under policy LT1 further sites are allocated for an unspecified number of dwellings to come forward post 2026. Policy SC1 limits development in the defined primary and secondary villages to a maximum of 10% of the settlement's base year dwelling stock. Policy SC4 addresses affordable housing provision. In essence, it requires on-site provision of at least 35% affordable homes where 11 or more dwellings are proposed and a financial contribution from sites of between 6 and 10 dwellings in policy SC1 villages. Outside these villages enabling market housing may be acceptable in the circumstances defined.
35. Having regard to the totality of the evidence base set out, the following questions would appear to arise:
 - i. How was the choice of strategy Option 1 influenced by the SA process?
 - ii. What consideration was then given to the conclusions and recommendations of the 2013 Update with respect to affordable housing provision?
 - iii. As the evidence base emerged during 2014 and 2015 (which, at first sight, appears to cast doubt on the ability of strategic scale sites to deliver both affordable housing at the required level and the infrastructure to facilitate the development), what steps, if any, were taken to review the strategy?
 - iv. Would policy SC1 inhibit the bringing forward of residential and especially affordable housing development through neighbourhood plans?
 - v. How has the Council engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with the ENPA in particular on this issue up to the date of submission of the Plan (evidence that the Duty has been complied with may be presented up to but not beyond the date of submission. The Council's evidence on this matter does not go beyond December 2014)?
 - vi. Does the Council consider that policy SC1 remains in accordance with the PPG as it now stands following the judgement in *West Berkshire District Council and Reading Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2015] EWHC 2222 (Admin)?
 - vii. Is the Council intending to align its approach through the Duty to Co-operate to that being taken by the other authorities in the NPSHMA?

Meeting the full OAHN for market and affordable housing

36. In some senses this is a culmination of the matters raised under the 'the nature of the Plan', 'objectively assessed housing need' and 'affordable housing' sections above. Framework paragraph 47 stipulates this requirement 'as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework'.

37. As a number of those making representations have observed, the Plan make specific provision for no more than 50% of the 2900 dwellings required. The Council will need to explain how it intends to bring forward the other 50% and, in particular, how the other specific sites that are indicated are to come forward through the local plan process. A housing trajectory showing for each year, or period for later years, the contribution expected from strategic sites, windfalls, etc. could usefully be provided.

Policies that appear not to be in accordance with national planning policy

38. Policies EN2 and CC1 both address renewable and low carbon energy proposals. Although EN2 deals with 'major' energy generating proposals and CC1 is concerned only with 'small scale' schemes, there is no guidance as to where the boundary between the two lies. When reduced to its basics CC1 simply says that, so long as the proposal is small scale and assists the development of a low or zero carbon economy it will be supported which I take to mean approved. The second part of the policy merely describes some proposals that may fall within the scope of the policy. To the extent that the policy is almost wholly permissive and lacking in any meaningful criteria the following three paragraphs may not apply. The Council may nevertheless wish to consider if the policy is likely to be effective.
39. Policy EN2 is clearly a criteria-based policy that applies, among other things, to on-shore wind energy proposals. It is not therefore consistent with the 'Local Planning' Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) issued on 18 June 2015 and the consequential changes to the PPG. It would appear to be unsound on this test.
40. The Council's evidence base includes the Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study which itself includes an assessment of the potential wind resource in West Somerset. To be consistent with both the WMS and Framework paragraph 97, third bullet the Plan should identify suitable areas where such proposals would be acceptable.
41. The Council should consider how it wishes to proceed on this matter without causing undue delay to the examination. One possibility that it may wish to consider would be a modification to policy EN2 (and CC1 if appropriate) to make it clear that it does not apply to wind turbine proposals. These would be considered against the national policy described above pending the identification of suitable areas through a single issue development plan document, a site allocation local plan or an early review of this Plan. Which is pursued may depend on the Council's response to the points raised under 'the nature of the Plan'.
42. Historic England (HE) has made representations on a number of policies including those that allocate the strategic housing development sites. The gist of the concern raised is that the Plan has not correctly interpreted Framework paragraphs 128 to 141. In particular, HE asserts that the Plan accepts or assumes that there will be some level of harm as the starting point in several policies. HE says that this is incorrect and suggested several changes to policy and text.

43. Apart from one change to policy EN2, which in any event is not quite that suggested by HE, no modifications have been proposed to the Plan. In general, the Council's response is that these are matters of detail either to be resolved through master planning of the sites or appropriate to a development management policy document.
44. However, the first could influence the deliverability of the housing numbers assumed for the site if not the site itself while the second comes back to the 'nature of the Plan' issue already raised. The Council will need to consider how it will wish to address this soundness issue.
45. The Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment (GTAA) Update (EB6) is dated October 2013 and covers the County of Somerset. SD17 says that it was prepared jointly by the Somerset Local Authorities but without the ENPA. Although both provision and need within West Somerset is modest, there is no evidence within the document of any planning permissions having been granted for this use of land. Across the County as a whole only 37 of the required 130 pitches for the 2010 to 2015 period had been approved by July 2013. The need within West Somerset to 2032 is for 10 pitches including the under provision from the 2010 to 2015 period. It is not clear whether or not West Somerset includes the ENPA area in this case. That raises a potential Duty issue that does not appear to have been addressed in the way the West Somerset requirement might be met.
46. Policy GT1 says that appropriate provision will be made to meet a need for 'up to' 10 pitches during the Plan period. The justification however is not so positive. This refers to a potential for 10 additional pitches having been identified but then says that in view of the relative uncertainty as to both the exact quantum and timing of the additional requirement, the policy '...seeks to enable the provision of the pitches as and when the need actually arises'.
47. There is therefore no clear commitment to provide 10 pitches within the Plan period. As such, the statement in the Equalities Impact Assessment (SD20) that the policy will help to ensure that (the gypsy and travellers') individual needs are identified and met (my emphasis) does not appear to be well founded. Moreover, apart from what is said on page 9 of SD17, there is no indication that a site or sites will be identified in a forthcoming local plan nor is there any policy that I am aware of in the evidence base that establishes the criteria against which any proposal coming forward would be judged. I have already observed that the LDS does not include provision for any further local plans to be prepared. The Council will wish to consider how this matter should be addressed.
48. In seeking to replace only lost recreational facilities the second paragraph of the policy, CF1 does not appear to be consistent with Framework paragraph 70, second bullet. The Theatre Trust raised this issue in its regulation 20 representation. The Council's response was that this was a matter for detailed development management policy. Is not CF1 such a policy?
49. In its response to the representation by the Quantock Hills AONB Service on policy NH2 the Council rejected the policy wording suggested on the basis that, in effect, it was not needed since Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are protected by virtue of their national statutory designated status. The Plan is therefore silent on the approach to proposals that would be within or would affect the setting of the Quantock Hills AONB. The Council will wish to review

the advice in the Landscape section of the Natural Environment chapter of the PPG and consider whether its approach is consistent with national planning policy and guidance.

50. Policy NH5 appears to apply a different approach to the best and most versatile agricultural land (BMVA) to that in Framework paragraph 112. While the approach with respect to significant development accords with that set out in the Framework, the introduction of a 10 hectare threshold below which the policy would not apply may not be. The Council will need to refer to the evidence that shows it has considered the economic and other benefits of the BMVA in the area and come to the conclusion that parcels of 10 hectares or less do not require policy protection. Given that 10 hectares is likely to accommodate development of a scale considered to be strategic in the context of West Somerset and which should be the subject of an allocation in the Plan is this policy ever likely to protect any BMVA in practice?

General points about the policy wording

51. The detailed wording of policy is rightly a matter for the Council and should not be a matter for detailed comment. However, the effective delivery of the Plan is one of the tests of soundness. Where policy wording could affect delivery it becomes a legitimate area of concern for the examination. From the representations it is apparent that some policies are capable of different interpretations thus potentially undermining their and the Plan's effectiveness.
52. In part, my concerns stem from the nature of the Plan. Some policies are strategic but others are more in the form of an aim or objective and are not obviously supported by an implementation policy. Examples include policies SC3, SC5A, EC10, CC5 and NH4. It may be that the development management policy is one that is saved from the 2006 Local Plan or perhaps it will be included in a forthcoming local plan. My specific concerns are set out below.
53. Policy EN1: the Council intends to add to the purposes section following this policy a clarification that this does not apply to the development covered by the NSIP process and to which a DCO applies. This must be correct but, in that case, the impact mitigation proposals that the policy addresses must lie outside the boundaries of the new nuclear power station site and therefore within the LPA area. What does this policy add that is not already covered by other development management policies in this or the saved 2006 Local Plan?
54. Policies SC1/OC1/SV1: Since it does not say that it is limited to residential development proposals only, policy SC1 must apply to all development. In which case, what is the purpose of policy SV1? However, if as seems probable from the justification, policy SC1 actually targets only residential development, Clause 4 of it deals with residential development in the open countryside. However, so does policy OC1. That policy provides a definition of what 'open countryside' means but the criteria to be met are different to those in policy SC1. This needs to be resolved.
55. Still with policy OC1, the first bullet which states that applications for rural workers' housing will be subject to a functional and financial test and initially given on a temporary basis only is rooted in the now replaced Planning Policy Statement 7. Neither the Framework nor the PPG retain this policy stance

towards such dwellings. Clearly local planning authorities can develop national policy in the particular circumstances of their area but this must be justified by the evidence. The justification for these aspects of policy OC1 is not given.

56. Policy SC3: While the purpose and assumptions that follow the policy wording are drawn from the evidence base the wording of the policy is more in the form of an aim or an objective. Neither it nor the justification explains what size of development it applies to (it must be of some size since 'a mix' of housing sizes, tenures and types is required). Moreover, the policy has no criteria against which any proposal would be judged and there does not appear to be any other development management policy in the Plan that would be relevant. How would this policy be implemented?
57. Policy SC5A: this policy appears to require development to improve the balance of land uses within a settlement whereas the second bullet of policy SV1 requires development at primary and secondary villages to maintain or enhance the existing level of service provision and help to create balanced communities. It is not clear to me whether these policies complement or conflict with one another.
58. Policy EC1: the second paragraph of this policy does not make sense. It is perhaps the clearest example of the confusion caused where the preamble and the criteria within the policy are not properly separated.
59. Policy EC2: my concern here relates to delivery of the employment site at Williton and therefore the effective test of soundness but relates to the evidence base rather than the policy wording. The last review of this site appears to be the Employment Land Review Stage 1 Report (EB8) dated May 2009. Page 59 deals with the allocated site and notes that the undeveloped part of the allocation contains a ménage, grazing land, stables and horse shelters. It states that the ownership is unclear. The latter was resolved during a Hearing in March 2015 into an appeal (APP/H3320/C/14/2226386) under s174 against an enforcement notice issued by the Council. In evidence the appellant told me that she owned the land, had never been approached by anyone wishing to see it developed in accordance with the allocation and had no immediate intention of allowing it to be so developed in any event (see paragraphs 16 to 18 of the decision letter). What evidence is there that this site will come forward in the Plan period and what are the implications if it does not? The justification still refers to PPS4.
60. Policy CC2: although in two parts each seems to deal with essentially the same point. The limited justification does not explain how they are different.
61. Policies NH8 and NH9: In my view it is impossible to tell from Figure 6: Proposals Map Amendment the precise extent of the Bat Consultation Zone. Equally the extent of the Somerset Waterfowl Consultation Zone is not clear from Figure 7 since that term is not listed in the Legend. Presumably it is the Wetland Bird Consideration Zone? The western boundary is not clear. Both policies say that within each zone proposals for development 'may' require a test of significance to be carried out. However, in the justification for each it says that the Council as competent authority 'is required' to carry out a test of likely significant effect on applications that potentially affect the conservation objectives of the site. Therefore is it not the case that any proposal within the defined zone will potentially affect the conservation objectives? If that is not the case, what is the justification for the extent of the zones identified? Is

there a difference between a 'test of significance' and a 'test of likely significant effect'? If not, why are different terms used?

62. Policy ID1: the relationship between the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SD18) and the Council's Planning Obligations SPD, referred to in the policy justification, is not explained. Paragraph 1.7 of SD18 explains that the Council does not intend to progress a Community Infrastructure Levy and will instead rely on contributions through the s106 mechanism. It notes that careful use will need to be made of this given the five contribution limit now in place when pooling them but there is no explicit comment on the implications of this for implementation of the Plan.

Other matters

63. Although it is not required, in my experience most local planning authorities prepare and submit a self-assessment checklist of soundness and legal compliance. During the first hearing session the Council will be asked a series of questions to confirm that various steps have been carried out. It is usually a far more efficient use of hearing session time if this question can be in the form 'is there anything you need to add or change in document XX?'.
64. I note that SD4 is not the Plan published for the purposes of regulation 19 but the Plan as proposed to be modified in accordance with the changes shown in SD7. These have not been subject to consultation. Changes to policy cannot generally be regarded as 'minor'. These and any other main modifications required for soundness will therefore need to be consulted upon in due course following SA as necessary.
65. The Council has not indicated in the Plan how it will monitor the performance of the policies and what, for example, would trigger the bringing forward of one or more of the LT1 sites.

Conclusion

66. I am on annual leave between 4 and 18 September inclusive. As the August Bank Holiday also falls before that, I would be grateful if you could provide an initial response to the points and questions raised via the Programme Officer not later than noon on 16 September. You can of course develop your response in the papers that you will be asked to prepare as the examination proceeds. If you consider that additional work may be required now to address certain matters could you please indicate a timetable for its completion? I will then be able to finalise the draft matters and issues, the programme for the hearing sessions and the participants. I would be grateful if both this letter and your response to it are placed on the examination web site.

Yours sincerely,

Brian Cook

Appointed Inspector

