Shimpling Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2037

Independent Examination correspondence document

First published: **29 October 2026**

Last updated: **29 October 2026**

Introduction

Outside of the Examination Procedures Note already published on the website page mentioned below this document provides a written record of all relevant correspondence had between the Independent Examiner (Ann Skippers), the Parish Council (the Qualifying Body or 'QB') / their Consultant (Ian Poole), and Babergh District Council during the examination of the Shimpling Neighbourhood Plan.

As required, specific documents will continue to be published on our Shimpling webpage: https://www.babergh.gov.uk/w/shimpling-neighbourhood-plan

Copies of e-mails / letters etc. appearing on the following pages:

1. E from Examiner dated 27 Oct 2026: Questions for clarification.

1. E from Examiner dated 27 Oct 2026: Questions for clarification.

Dated: 27 October 2026
From: Ann Skippers
To: Paul Bryant (BMSDC), Ian Poole (Shimpling NP Consultant)
Fwd to: Claire Douglas-Hughes (Shimpling NP Working Group)

Dear Paul and Ian,

I am making good progress with the above examination.

Some matters have arisen on which I would be grateful for your kind assistance and that of the Parish Council. Subject to the satisfactory resolution of these issues, I do not consider at this stage that a hearing will be needed, but this will depend on the information provided.

It is not unusual at all for me to have a few queries or to ask for some further information (as you very well know) so I'd like to reassure the Parish Council that this is quite 'normal' for me.

I would be most grateful if both Councils as appropriate would respond to these queries which are detailed in the attachment. [BDC note. This now copied below]. I have sent you this in word format so that some of the answers may be easily added in to it if you so wish.

I would usually suggest a week or so to come back to me with the responses to maintain momentum with the examination, but I know it is half term this week. Please may I therefore ask for your response by close of business on Friday 6 November 2026. However, if a little more time is needed please do let me know. [BDC note: A short time extension has been requested and accepted]

It would be very helpful to me if all the answers could be collated together or that just one bundle of responses is sent to me at the same time from each Council and that Paul coordinates this.

This email, the attachment with the questions (and the responses to them) will be a matter of public record and should be placed on the appropriate websites.

With many thanks in anticipation of your kind assistance, and of course please do not hesitate to contact me if anything is not clear or if there are any questions about this stage of the examination.

Ann Skippers MRTPI
Independent Examiner

* * * * * *

Questions of clarification from the Examiner to the Parish Council and BDC

Having completed my initial review of the Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan), I would be grateful if both Councils (as appropriate) could kindly assist me as appropriate in answering the following questions which either relate to matters of fact or are areas in which I seek clarification or further information.

Please do not send or direct me to evidence that is not already publicly available.

1. With regard to **Policy SPG 5 - Replacement Dwellings and Conversions Outside the Settlement Boundary**, there are arguably two areas of ambiguity in the policy's wording. These are the reference to the "original" dwelling and the phrase "significantly larger".
   In respect of the reference to the original dwelling, this could be the original dwelling as on a particular date, the original dwelling as first constructed or the original dwelling as existing at the time of any planning application for a replacement dwelling. There may be other interpretations too such as the original dwelling as first built and any allowance under permitted development.

   It would therefore be helpful to add a definition as a footnote to the policy or as part of the supporting text.

   Please could I be provided with a suitable form of words, bearing in mind this should be broadly consistent with any applicable BDC level policies.

   With regard to the phrase "significantly larger", again this is arguably open to interpretation. It would be useful to add an explanation or definition into the policy and/or its supporting text.

   Please could I be provided with a suitable form of words for this phrase.

2. With regard to **Policy SPG 12 - Design Considerations**, a Design Guidance and Codes document has been produced by AECOM. However, the policy's wording does not require this document to be taken into account or any compliance with the codes.

   Rather the policy only requires new development proposals to show how they comply with the general design guidance (replicated in Appendix 6) and the development design checklist (replicated in Appendix 7). Both these elements are acceptable in themselves.

   However, is it intentional not to require compliance or account to be taken of the codes in the Design Guidance and Codes document and if so, why? If not intentional, how could the policy be modified to ensure the Design Guidance and Codes document is fully taken account of?

It may be the case that on receipt of your anticipated assistance on these matters that I may need to ask for further clarification or that further queries will occur as the examination progresses. These queries are raised without prejudice to the outcome of the examination.

Where I have invited changes to be suggested, this is entirely without prejudice to my consideration of the issue.

Please note that this list of clarification questions is a public document and that your answers will also be in the public domain. Both my questions and your responses should be placed on the Councils' websites as appropriate.

With many thanks,

Ann Skippers MRTPI
Independent Examiner
27 October 2026

[Ends]