

## George Pavey

---

**From:** Frank O'Shea [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 November 2020 16:44  
**To:** George Pavey  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** [External] GANP  
**Attachments:** Fig. 18.pdf; Revised Views Overlaid Paths.pdf; GANP - Local Green Spaces with sizes.docx

Dear George

I can now deal with three of the points which came up at the Hearing, to be addressed this week. The fourth is the question of the to be revised Fig 12 with the location of villages and number of dwellings. That has been sent by our consultants to the consultants for the 2 landowners for prior agreement so that we can send it in by 26<sup>th</sup> November. The three are:-

**1. Local Green Spaces areas**

It transpires that part of area "m" - Terlings Park- was already allocated as LGS in the District Plan. Accordingly, our consultants have removed that part from the draft NP. A **new map Fig. 18** is attached plus an amended Table 1 in which not only the areas of each LGS are now shown in hectares but the wording for LGS "m" has been amended to reflect the reduction in size of LGS "m" . The online Map has been adjusted accordingly. The following text has been suggested by our consultants to be added to the policy revisions for December: *Development will not be permitted in Local Green Spaces unless exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified.*

**2. Views**

Our Consultants have made 2 changes which enable them to confirm that all Views bar one are from publicly accessible places, as evidenced from the attached map which overlays RoW. The one exception is View L which is from future parkland in Village 7 location and to the east of a current public footpath (running directly under the blue boundary line). They have amended View L to respond to Savills' concern that it was going too deeply inside the potential village boundary. They have removed View K looking south as it was from land which is currently private-(even though it corresponds to the future location of community facilities in Village 7, they have not yet been determined.)

**3. Discrepancy between Printed and Web Documents**

Our master copy of the draft NP is in a Word document. With all the pictures, diagrams and maps that was far too large to be sent by email. So a low-resolution pdf of it was produced and sent to you as part of the formal submission. That is what is on your web-site and ours. We used a high -resolution pdf for the print run we ordered but it appears that a further proof reading had been carried out on the master copy which showed 10 typos and one cross reference error (the one identified at the hearing) in AG3. This version was sent for printing, but the production of a replacement low-resolution pdf for the websites was overlooked. Full identification of the discrepancies is available if required . All these typos will be picked up in the re-edit we have to do.

I am taking the liberty of copying the Examiner direct. If either of you has any queries at all, please let me know.

Best wishes,

Frank O'Shea  
[REDACTED]