

Redacted emails

Numbering as relates to the presentation at the examination meeting October 2025

4a) From AG to NP Team

From: The Goodmans

Sent: 04 August 2021 18:22

To:

Subject: Neighbourhood plan update

Dear all

Following the last meeting of the NP team it was agreed that:

The NP team would go for the minimum number of houses to be built - 25.

(This does not include the 22 already allocated by South Norfolk that have prior planning approval.)

The allocation was

15 to La Ronde on site 1

10 to Tricker and Last on the Chenery site.

The proviso was that should Tricker and Last say 10 was unviable - the offer would be rescinded and the offer made to the owners of the site on the Ipswich Road opposite the listed buildings and beside the Old police station.

The NP team decision went before the Parish Council for their support. The Parish Council thanked the NP team for all their hard and diligent work and requested that we reconsider the option should the Chenery site be unviable. If T and Last reject the offer, the PC would like the offer to be made to La Ronde to build all 25 houses.

I spoke to Tricker and Last and made them the offer explaining this was a "sounding out" conversation and a formal offer would only be made if they confirmed they would accept it and build to the specifications of the NP and the site specific concerns expressed by the NP team. Tricker and Last are talking to the land owners to see if they will accept the offer. I await their reply.

Ann and I spoke to La Ronde. La Ronde have agreed they will build on a carbon neutral basis. In that they will assess the carbon emissions of the whole build and compensate to that number not just the building of the homes. They have accepted the offer of the 15 homes but do have capacity to deliver the whole 25. They are also looking at the Quiet Lanes initiative to see if they can incorporate the ideas and styling into their development plan.

Should T and Last refuse the offer, my personal view is that we should go back to La Ronde and offer them the additional 10 houses. This would show the PC that we are listening to their concerns and thinking strategically about the look and feel of the village of Dickleburgh and Parish as a whole.

One of the reasons we chose the Ipswich Road site was that this was the preferred site of residents when the Hopkins homes development was proposed. However the survey had all 4 sites (2 on Ipswich Road, Chenery and La Ronde) as almost the same so we would still be meeting the wishes of the residents.

I would be happy to organise a meeting in the Village Centre should we wish to have one, alternatively we could utilise email; Unfortunately the PC does not have zoom anymore.

Finally La Ronde have offered free training at the Village Centre on planning and delivering the La Ronde site in a way that we would wish it incorporating our Design Code and the latest NPPF requirements.

Any thoughts?

Andrew.

4b) From AG to ML

The Goodmans

Mon, 20 Sept 2021, 10:56

To

Dear

I contacted your offices in order to discover the results of the meeting between Tricker and Last and the owners of the Chenery site re the opportunity to build on the site. I need to know what the thoughts of the owners are in order to progress the plans. If you are unable to inform us I am happy to speak directly to the owners if you can furnish us with their details, if that helps. Either way we do need to know the intentions.

Kindest regards

Andrew Goodman

4c) From Tricker and Last to AG

Martin Last

Wed, 22 Sept 2021, 08:17

To

Hi Andrew

Whilst my client is pleased to note your intention to include both of his sites in your NP. Unfortunately he does not feel that a proposal to limit the land to 10 dwellings maximises the potential

Kind Regards

Last & Tricker Partnership

Note: The offer to include the green field site as part of the development site was never made. The NP team had already rejected enlarging the site

**4d) From AG to Tricker and Last
The Goodmans**

22 Sept 2021, 09:11

To

Hi Martin

Thank you for getting back to me, I will pass the information on to the rest of the NP team.

Kindest regards

Andrew

5i) A. Eaves to team re site documentation 7th July 2019

Conversation opened. 6 messages. All messages read.

Fwd: Site Assessments

Inbox

10 Jul 2019, 13:07

From: IS

To: AE

Hi Allan, can you give us more details regarding site 10 as I was under the impression that this site was not going to be considered due to the large amount of complaints received by the site manager on DIC 1.

Seems very very suspect that this site was added in June this year, is this because the land is/was owned by councillor XXXXXXXX brothers, sisters & cousins?

Or is it because, if the land is owned by Hopkins homes, that councillor XXXXXXXX family will not get their payments for the land if Hopkins homes are unable to develop this land.

Since the near completion of the DIC1, Harvey Lanes:-

A) footfall has increased substantially with parents with young children, teenagers, young adults and the more elderly.

B) there has also been an very substantial increase in vehicles, from the east of Harvey Lane, of all sorts speeding towards the very narrow part of the lane (were the PEDESTRIAN MARGIN LINE will be) before the village centre/children's play area/school, playing field and access to local shop and bars.

C) The speeding has dramatically increased since the small road widening was put in place to the east of Limmer Avenue by JMS

Can you also explain why, on the plan that site 10 is marked in DARK RED?

Please get back to us with some urgency.

Regards

IS

Begin forwarded message:

From: AE

Date: 7 July 2019 at 10:48:55 BST

To: NP Team

Subject: Site Assessments

Hi All Neighbourhood Team,

I have completed my review/revisions of all the assessment documents based on feed back from our 22nd June meeting and also made comments or amendments based on the assessments completed by GNLP in their document.

As before I have to send the updated HELAA assessments by 3 further e mails due to their MB size

Regards



4 attachments

Submission Site Assess Doc.doc

PREFACE TO SUBMISSION OF HELLA ASSESSMENTS.doc
DICKLEBURGH SITE ANALYSIS AREAS .xls
GNLP SITE MAPSDickleburgh with Late 2018 Sites.pdf

Reom:AE

10 Jul 2019, 13:27

To IS AG

Hi I,

I note your concern and agree all your comments on site 10 but am not aware of any involvement of by councillors or their relatives. It was the GNLP team that now re included part only of site 10 in their assessments. However it is not included in our recommended sites nor is it in the current GNLP favoured sites in fact they rate it in their "Unreasonable Sites". The only reason why it is marked in red, I think, is because it was a new revised version of the site.

If you would like further information about the GNLP assessments we received prior to our meeting on 22nd June I will forward to you. However our assessments should take preference.

Regards

AE

4 attachments

Submission Site Assess Doc.doc
PREFACE TO SUBMISSION OF HELLA ASSESSMENTS.doc
DICKLEBURGH SITE ANALYSIS AREAS .xls
GNLP SITE MAPSDickleburgh with Late 2018 Sites.pdf

The Goodmans

10 Jul 2019, 14:51

To AE IS

Further to Allan's remarks. Highways have indicated (privately) that they will object to further development of Harvey Road.

A

IS

10 Jul 2019, 17:57

To AG

Hi Andrew, thanks for that information, I just didn't want that Hopkins Homes Chris Smith getting another one over on us, so he could smile at us again.

Regards

I

Sent from my iPad

AE

19 Jul 2019, 11:27

To AG

Hi Andrew

Should we talk 're next steps?

Allan

The Goodmans

19 Jul 2019, 16:34

To A

Hi A yes definitely. Next week at your discretion. Hope B is recovering well.

Kindest regards as always

Andrew

5e) From AG to AECOM

The Goodmans

To

12 Aug 2022, 10:37

Dear

I am forwarding this as evidence to support the NP decision to go for option 1 site 1 (brown field site). I am still writing the prose. The developer is playing a bit of a game here. The NP team did/have not agreed to extend the boundary to include what is identities on fig 5.4 as N (I believe) he is none the less making it clear they do not want to develop the land - through difficulties in meeting the design brief of the NP. The earlier attachment shows their thoughts should they get the extension and not have to meet the design brief.

Kindest regards

Andrew

5f) From A.Mann to AG

From:

Sent: 01 October 2024 16:59

To: cllr.andrewgoodman@dickleburghandrushallpc.org.uk

Cc: clerk@dickleburghandrushallpc.org.uk

Subject: Local green space in Dickleburgh

Dear Mr Goodman,

Thank you for your letter addressed to my father and myself which was received back in August. I apologise for the slow response, but we did have to seek a third-party opinion in order to get some clarity on your proposal, in which you suggest the field between Manor Farm and the bungalows off the Ipswich Road in Dickleburgh is used as a local green space in the future Neighbourhood Plan.

I spoke with Ann Baker on the telephone last week and explained to her that the Thelveton Farms Partners do not wish to see this field allocated as a local green space in the Neighbourhood Plan at this stage. Should this situation change then we will of course let you know.

Yours sincerely

Alex Mann

5h) From AG to NP Team

The Goodmans

Fri, 4 Sept 2020, 08:53

To

Dear all

Thank you for attending the meeting which I thought was quite inciteful. The plan, now we have spoken to Martin is to hold our next meeting on Zoom to revisit the site preferences and whittle them down to accommodate around 40 ish houses rather than the 80+ previously muted through the GNLP.

As we discovered yesterday there are problems with next Thursday so I will cancel that meeting. The meeting therefore to consider sites and consider whether we support aspects of the Last proposal will take place on Thursday week in the evening. It would be helpful if as many members of the wider group were present so if you are able to spread the word it would be helpful.

Allan and I will send the agenda in the next few days and hopefully after a successful meeting we will be able to confirm to owners of all 4 sites which ones are going forward as preferred sites in the NP.

Kindest regards as always

Andrew

5j) From AE to AG questioning the stated density of the Chenery site.

18 Mar 2020, 11:14

To

Hi Andrew,

thank you for plans submitted by Last Tricker. My comments are as follows :-

Firstly I would refer to overall NP requirements, and my recent preferred site specific briefs and the following :-

1. The most significant requirement in the site specific brief for this site is the requirement that the view of the Grade 1 Church Tower is not impeded by any development. An existing site line approaching the village from the south of site on left of Ipswich Road gives a view of the Church Tower from before the Grade II White House. In order to maintain this view any development of the site needs to either be set back from road to west of site line or height restricted to maintain view.

The developer needs to demonstrate by way of elevations, sections, axonometric or photographic projections that this site line is maintained.

2. The density indicated on the plan is shown as 20.6 dph but by my calculations it is 24 dph and above our recommended standards.

3. I have looked at back gardens lengths and on some of the bungalows these are as little as 5M and 10M. On the 2 storey houses some of the back gardens are as little as 10M-15M and on back to back of gardens o/a

25M not meeting our requirement for habital room overlooking min distance of 30M. Also on front to front of 2 houses on the new road as close as 12M.

4. The car parking provision required for the 25 houses with the o/a bedroom provision is 66 based on our design guide. I counted 49 off road and 6 in laybys of road, total 55 ie short by 11 spaces.

5. The above points require amendments to meet the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan and will involve a reduction in density to achieve them

regards

Allan

5g/ k) From AG to Team housing allocation final meeting

D and R NP housing allocation final meeting

10 messages

The Goodmans

9 June 2021 at 11:47

To:

Dear all

I propose that we have 1 more zoom meeting to agree the final document going to South Norfolk.

Why?

As you may know the numbers required from this parish have been changing over the time we have been developing the plan. Today the number as identified by the latest reg 18 consultation is a minimum of 25 homes. This means if we do not reconsider then we will exceed this number by around 150% which I am confident no one wants.

The final draft section 8 (redacted) identifies 2 sites. We must

1 confirm we are happy with the allocation - which I think we have already done but lets make absolutely sure

2 confirm the sites. there is some possible confusion here as when we last met a third site on the Ipswich road was offered as a possibility if site 1 and 2 failed to deliver the required housing. The fact is they absolutely will, so we can confirm the final 2 sites, whatever they are.. I know there is some concern that we get the sites right.

Can we have a zoom meeting maybe next thursday 19th July at 7.30 pm The mtting will effectively be each person stating their preference and then a vote. The PC nolonger have zoom so it will be through the free service which means we must end after 40 minutes. I promise it will be brief - but vital

Kindest regards to all

Find below a section from the reg 18 outlining the thoughts on the reg 18 documentation

Dickleburgh Neighbourhood Plan

The Dickleburgh Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared by the Dickleburgh Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. The Dickleburgh Neighbourhood Plan will include site allocations for residential development, based upon housing requirements for different areas as set out in the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP).

The indicative housing requirements for Dickleburgh is a minimum of 25 homes.

To ensure transparency, the chapter includes the list of the sites in Dickleburgh that have been promoted to the Council for consideration. The assessment and allocation of these sites will be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan, relevant details of the site(s) promoted to the Council have been shared with the Neighbourhood Plan steering Group.

The ongoing devolution of responsibility for making allocations to Dickleburgh will be contingent on adequate progress being made with the Neighbourhood Plan.

Details of the Dickleburgh Neighbourhood Plan can be found here: <https://dickleburgh-rushallpc.norfolkparishes.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>

Form and character

Dickleburgh and Rushall

The main concentration of development within the parish is based along the former A140. There are also smaller rural communities at Rushall and Langmere. Individual dwellings and farmsteads are dispersed throughout the remainder of the parish.

The historical centre of the village has developed along The Street and is characterised by buildings close to the road. More recent development has extended the built-up area both north and south along the former A140 with further developments eastwards along Rectory Road and Harvey Lane. Immediately to the north of the main part of the village is an area of development at Dickleburgh Moor, a small detached ribbon of development along the west side of Norwich Road. A number of estate developments have taken place in between Rectory Road and Harvey Lane. The A140 by-passes the village to the west providing links to Norwich to the north and Ipswich to the south, as well as Diss via the A1066.

Services and Community Facilities

The settlement has a range of social, recreational and community facilities including preschool, a primary school, village hall, pub and shop. The village has the benefit of mains sewerage. There is also a limited bus service. There are also several employment uses covering various sectors.

Settlement Limit and Constraints

The Settlement Limit has been drawn to include the main built form of the settlement, but specifically excludes the grounds of All Saints Church and the Rectory, the allotment gardens on Chapel Road and the recreation ground on Harvey Lane because of their contribution to the form and character of the village. In addition, no boundary has been drawn around the detached ribbon development at Dickleburgh Moor as further residential development would be detrimental to the rural character of the area. The Settlement Limit extends around the main settlement which includes the allocated land north of Harvey Lane made within the 2016 Site Allocations Plan. No alterations are proposed to the existing Settlement Limit.

Allan Eavis

To:

9 June 2021 at 17:30

Andrew can you confirm you do mean " maybe next thursday 19th July at 7.30 pm"

Allan

The Goodmans

To: Allan Eavis

9 June 2021 at 21:29

Hi Allan

At the moment yes. I hope no one replies suggesting a different day and time. If I do not get any negative replies by Saturday I will confirm by email the date and time (thursday) and give people a zoom password.

Fingers crossed

Andrew

Jackie Patching

To: The Goodmans

10 June 2021 at 08:17

Hi Andrew, this is fine but I think the date should read Thursday 17th June. Let me know if I am wrong.

Kind regards,

Jackie

Sent from my iPad

The Goodmans

To: Jackie Patching

Oops

Cheers Jackie - Thursday 17th it is

Andrew

10 June 2021 at 10:20

Allan Eavis

To: The Goodmans

Andrew,

you said next Thursday 19th July ??? Next Thursday is 17th June , but if you did mean July then there is no thur 19th??

11 June 2021 at 10:17

The Goodmans

To: Allan Eavis

11 June 2021 at 12:58

Hi Allan

Yes it will be Thursday 19th. Sorry about the confusion. So far no one has said they can not attend the zoom meeting

Regards

Andrew

PS I have been contacted by La Ronde again. They would like to meet the team the following week. Perhaps in person.

Anyway we can talk that one through on the 19th.

Take care

Matthew Hill
To: The Goodmans
Cc:

14 June 2021 at 13:49

Afternoon Andrew,
I am just catching up on emails regarding the NP.
You mention a Zoom Meeting next Thursday 19th July at 7.30pm. We assume that you mean this Thursday, 17th June? Can you please confirm?
Thanks a lot
Matt
Sent from my iPhone

Karen Barker
To: The Goodmans

15 June 2021 at 08:54

Hi Andrew
Thanks for this, just to confirm do you mean this Thursday? 17th? I have another meeting this week 7 to 8.
Karen

The Goodmans
To: Karen Barker

15 June 2021 at 10:56

Hi Karen
Yes this thursday 7pm it will NOT be a long meeting - promise
Andrew

From AE to KB and AG
Allan Eavis

Fri, 14 Jun 2019, 08:34

to
Dear Karen.
Further to the Neighbourhood Team meeting on 30th May, I recall you offered your services to assist me in the Development Team. Sorry I have not got back to you sooner.
I have been engaged in completing the HELAA site Assessments for All the sites offered up under Call for Sites in preparation for presentation at the Meeting planned for 22nd June. The HELAA forms consist of 3 pages each and I have also prepared an Index of Contents, Preface and Notes (please see attached).
I have not copied the HELAA documents as they exceed the capacity of my e mail MB for attachments being a total of 140 MB. The main reason for this is that the forms were not writable so I had to use (dragged) pdf copies which can then be completed but with a sort of click and Markup Toolbar.
Ideally at the meeting I would like to have given all Team members a print out of all documents to agree/disagree/comment so we can complete a consensus for submission. However this would involve a Mass of paper and my poor printer would probably give up ghost ! So still not sure how to achieve this. But I would very much appreciate your views and have copied documents to a Memory stick which I could either drop round to you or you could call to collect.
Kind Regards
Attachments
Preface of HELLA document
Submission site assess doc

Emails related to Part 1.2

1a) 12th February 2024 AG to CB at AECOM. Responses from regulation 14.
Fwd: Your Neighbourhood Planning Application
Dickleburgh and Rushall NP policies
Re: RE: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

To:

26/07/24 18:02

3

Hi Cheryl

I thought we were putting in an expression of interest but it may have been a full application form. We applied as Dickleburgh and Rushall Parish Council

User name

password

You will note I made a mistake in the user name it is not the full address of this email. It is missing the 1 after goodman

Please do talk to Locality as we may have messed things up in the application

Thank you for completing your application form - Locality Neighbourhood Planning

Thank you for your support Cheryl

Kindest regards

Andrew

----- Original Message -----

From: CB

To: AL AG

Cc: RL

Sent: Thursday, July 25th 2024, 10:24

Subject: RE: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

Hi Andrea/ Andrew,

Nice to hear from you both, Andrew – sorry for the slight delay, very busy week and about to head on leave.

Yes, I agree that we need an SEA and HRA update for submission, please could I request that you enter a EoI (Expression of Interest) through the Locality website so that we can get a project code to deliver the updates. If you just submit the EoI I'll speak to Locality and let them know its on its way and I'll fast track the application myself. We can turn around the reports pretty quickly once we've a budget to work from.

Hope this is ok, please don't hesitate to get in touch if any further queries, I'm away for a long-weekend but returning Tuesday next week.

Many thanks

Cheryl.

From: AL

Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2024 10:16 AM

To: CB

Cc: RL

Subject: Re: Dickleburgh and Rushall NPhad previous

Dear Cheryl,

I hope you are well. Myself and my colleague Rachel Leggett are supporting the Dickleburgh Np Team with their NP submission. My commission is to prepare the Basic Conditions Statement. Neither myself or Rachel have had previous involvement in the plan and therefore some of the background to it is a little sketchy.

I have copies of the SEA and HRA reports produced by AECOM - these we presume were undertaken on the Pre-Submission version of the Plan. Following the Pre-Submission consultation, the plan has been amended by the Group working with my colleague Rachel. Whilst the amendments are significant in terms of number, they are largely around clarity and conformity and in terms of policy direction there is probably little substantive change.

One of the questions I have asked the group is to check with yourselves as to whether the SEA (and HRA) will need updating to reflect these amendments e.g. for example the wording of the objectives have changed in a few places and policy titles may have changed .

it is our understanding that the Group are currently pulling the document together to incorporate the changes and hopefully they should be sending this on to you for a view on whether the updates are required. I will then be able to complete the Basic Conditions.

Hopefully this provides a bit of context for you

Best wishes

Andrea

From: The Goodmans

Sent: 23 July 2024 17:08

To: Beattie, Cheryl; Us Goodman; Andrea Long

Subject: Re: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

Hi Cheryl

This computer died 6 months ago, along with access to this email - it has taken that long to get it back up and running. Today is the first day. So, apologies for leaving you in the lurch without an answer.

You will see I have copied another email address for myself can we use them both please over the next few weeks if we need to share thoughts. just in case.

I have copied Andrea Long into this. Andrea and her business partner Rachel are consultants working with us to get the NP over the line. Andrea has written the basic conditions report but has some questions that probably are best answered by you. But in answer to your question - yes the NP policies have changed we have merged some and dropped others. I will send you a word document from the laptop with the other email address on it that will have the latest and I hope final policies. When you see it the blue is intended to go in the red is intended to come out.

Regarding a submission date - essentially as quick as we can

Kindest regards

Andrew

On Mon, 25 Mar 2024 at 15:41, Beattie, Cheryl wrote:

Hi Andrew,

My sincere apologies, I'm not sure if I responded to you on this – have updates been made to the NP now, and is there a submission date you are working towards?

Many thanks

Cheryl.

From: The Goodmans

Sent: Monday, February 12, 2024 10:30 AM

To:

Subject: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

hi Cheryl

Sorry I did not use the opportunity to telephone you. Things have been extremely busy here. As you will be aware Ann the Parish Clerk has been collating the NP Reg 14 responses along with Alan Patching. I assume you have had all the responses from the different organisations and public regarding the SEA but just in case - I have been given this and I thought it best to pass it on to you, just in case.

Happy to talk over any issues if needed.

We have had our Reg 14 response meeting and I am in the process of writing it up. Do you need a copy of that document when it is finished?

Kindest regards

Andrew

1e, d) 25th July 2024 CB to AG and AL Agreed there may need to be an update. AG to apply for funding and email trail. (Including 1a) 12th February 2024 AG to CB at AECOM. Responses from regulation 14.) (Including **1b)** 25th March 2024 CB to AG. Clarification on progress to full submission.)

1c) 23rd July 2024 AG to CB. Identifying the progress.

Dickleburgh and Rushall NP policies

To: CB SEA; AL

23/07/24 17:35

1

3

Dickleburgh and Rushall NP policies as of 23rd July 2024.docx

5.1 MB

1 Attachment

Hi Cheryl

Attached is are the policies as of now

Kindest regards

Andrew

RE: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

To: AL AG

25/07/24 10:24

3

Hi Andrea/ Andrew,

Nice to hear from you both, Andrew – sorry for the slight delay, very busy week and about to head on leave.

Yes, I agree that we need an SEA and HRA update for submission, please could I request that you enter a EoI (Expression of Interest) through the Locality website so that we can get a project code to deliver the updates. If you just submit the EoI I'll speak to Locality and let them know its on its way and I'll fast track the application myself. We can turn around the reports pretty quickly once we've a budget to work from.

Hope this is ok, please don't hesitate to get in touch if any further queries, I'm away for a long-weekend but returning Tuesday next week.

Many thanks

Cheryl.

From: AL

Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2024 10:16 AM

To: CB

Cc:

Subject: Re: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

Dear Cheryl,

Dear Cheryl,

I hope you are well. Myself and my colleague Rachel Leggett are supporting the Dickleburgh Np Team with their NP submission. My commission is to prepare the Basic Conditions Statement. Neither myself or Rachel have had previous involvement in the plan and therefore some of the background to it is a little sketchy.

I have copies of the SEA and HRA reports produced by AECOM - these we presume were undertaken on the Pre-Submission version of the Plan. Following the Pre-Submission consultation, the plan has been amended by the Group working with my colleague Rachel. Whilst the amendments are significant in terms of number, they are largely around clarity and conformity and in terms of policy direction there is probably little substantive change.

One of the questions I have asked the group is to check with yourselves as to whether the SEA (and HRA) will need updating to reflect these amendments e.g. for example the wording of the objectives have changed in a few places and policy titles may have changed.

It is our understanding that the Group are currently pulling the document together to incorporate the changes and hopefully they should be sending this on to you for a view on whether the updates are required. I will then be able to complete the Basic Conditions.

Hopefully this provides a bit of context for you

Best wishes

Andrea

From: The Goodmans

Sent: 23 July 2024 17:08

To:

Subject: Re: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

Hi Cheryl

This computer died 6 months ago, along with access to this email - it has taken that long to get it back up and running. Today is the first day. So, apologies for leaving you in the lurch without an answer.

You will see I have copied another email address for myself can we use them both please over the next few weeks if we need to share thoughts. just incase.

I have copied Andrea Long into this. Andrea and her business partner Rachel are consultants working with us to get the NP over the line. Andrea has written the basic conditions report but has some questions that probably are best answered by you. But in answer to your question - yes the NP policies have changed we have merged some and dropped others. I will send you a word document from the laptop with the other email address on it that will have the latest and I hope final policies. When you see it the blue is intended to go in the red is intended to come out.

Regarding a submission date - essentially as quick as we can

Kindest regards

Andrew

On Mon, 25 Mar 2024 at 15:41, CB wrote:

Hi Andrew,
My sincere apologies, I'm not sure if I responded to you on this – have updates been made to the NP now, and is there a submission date you are working towards?
Many thanks
Cheryl.

From: The Goodmans
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2024 10:30 AM
To: Beattie, Cheryl
Subject: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP
along with Alan Patching. I assume you have had all the
hi Cheryl

Sorry I did not use the opportunity to telephone you. Things have been extremely busy here. As you will be aware Ann the Parish Clerk has been collating the NP Reg 14 responses along with Alan Patching. I assume you have had all the responses from the different organisations and public regarding the SEA but just in case - I have been given this and I thought it best to pass it on to you, just in case.

Happy to talk over any issues if needed.

We have had our Reg 14 response meeting and I am in the process of writing it up. Do you need a copy of that document when it is finished?

Kindest regards
Andrew

1f) 26th July 2024 AG to CB funding application for SEA update had begun.

Re: RE: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

To:

26/07/24 18:02

3

Hi Cheryl

I thought we were putting in an expression of interest but it may have been a full application form. We applied as Dickleburgh and Rushall Parish Council

User name

password

You will note I made a mistake in the user name it is not the full address of this email. It is missing the 1 after goodman

Please do talk to Locality as we may have messed things up in the application

Thank you for completing your application form - Locality Neighbourhood Planning

Thank you for your support Cheryl

Kindest regards

Andrew

1g) 5th August 2024 CB to AG. AECOM organising the application for funding.

RE: App-15321

To:

05/08/24 11:14

1

Hi Andrew,

I've asked Locality to send the application straight to me when it comes through, and it will be me delivering the update. I'll let you know as it progresses.

Many thanks

Cheryl.

1h,i) 21st August 2024 AG to PH (SNDC) confirming PC sign off of the NP and the application for SEA funding.

Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

To:

21/08/24 10:12

6

Dear Paul

An update. We have completed reg 14. We have reviewed all policies including the housing allocation. The PC are happy with the policy and have signed it off. You will be receiving a letter from the parish clerk informing

you of this over the next few weeks. The NP is now in the hands of a consultant recommended by your team, Rachel Leggett and associates. Rachel is preparing the NP for full and final hand over to South Norfolk. We are happy for you and your team to talk directly to Rachel.

Upon advice from RL and associates we have spoken to Locality and the Aecom team that wrote our SEA to ascertain whether an updated SEA is needed. The advice was that we may need a new / updated SEA. That process has been in motion for the last few weeks, Cheryl, the team leader is aware that we need the document to fall into the same production timescale as the NP.

We are, as is Rachel, keen to ensure we meet any SNBDC imposed deadlines.

Kindest regards

Andrew

1j) 30th November 2024 AG to CB RL NP team response to the first draft

Dickleburgh and Rushall NP team response to the SEA first draft - PDF version

To:

30/11/24 11:24

Dickleburgh and Rushall Neighbourhood Plan Meeting AECOM amendments__ AG V12.pdf

1.5 MB

1 Attachment

Dear Cheryl

Please find attached the only D and R response to the 1st draft. Any previous unauthorised documents should be ignored.

I am pleased to inform you that the team is back on track. You will notice in the document there are references to the updated NP particularly around Local Gap B. The changes here are crucial.

Hi Rachel,

Thank you for your help and support in getting us back on track.

Kindest regards to you both

Andre

1k) AG to CB

Dickleburgh and Rushall SEA

To: Beattie, Cheryl Aecom SEA; Leggett, Rachelle;

11/12/24 10:44

2

Dear Cheryl,

I have found the evidence regarding the Historic England scheduling of aspects of Dickleburgh Moor see web address below.

The schedule application is no:1487027

<https://services.historicengland.org.uk/webfiles/GetFiles.aspx?av=035DF9E4-265B-42F4-ACE4-7AED63AD54BA&cn=71C98C09-AB94-40FD-B910-3DD334DFA9C3>

Kindest regards

Andrew

1l) Email CB to AG, RL delivery of the SEA

RE: RE: RE: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP team response to the SEA first draft - PDF version

To:

20/12/24 09:50

DRNP SEA Environmental Report_submission version_19 Dec 2024.pdf

1.8 MB

Dickleburgh and Rushall Neighbourhood Plan Meeting AECOM amendments__ AG V12+CB.docx

24.8 MB

2 Attachments Download all as ZIP

Hi Andrew/ Rachel,

Thank you so much for bearing with me this week, it's been a difficult (hectic) run up to Christmas. Please find attached the finalised SEA addressing the comments received. I have also attached responses in the comments document so you can more readily track the updates. The Environmental Report is now with Locality for final sign off before the project is closed.

I wish you both the best of luck with submission, and hope that you have a wonderful Christmas break and a happy new year!

Should anything arise during examination with regards to the SEA, please do get in touch with either me (I'm hopefully here into February assuming baby doesn't come early) or alternatively email Nick

Many thanks
Cheryl.

1m) 11th September 2025 Email from R. Squires to A Goodman reply to email 11th September 2025
RE: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

To:

11/09/25 16:18

5

Hi Andrew,

Thanks for your email. I've checked through my email archive and I do not recall being involved in the consideration / decision to undertake a review to the SEA. As Rachel says, I think that decision was based on her advice following Reg. 14, based on the age of the original SEA, some of the Reg. 14 representations, and the amendments to the plan.

Looking back at South Norfolk Council's Reg. 14 representations, the decision to review the document may or may not have been influenced by the following comment from ourselves:

'At this point in time the Council does not intend to comment on the individual assessments of site. The Council is however very concerned that the assessment of sites has been significantly influenced by the application of various emerging policy constraints included in the Neighbourhood Plan, most notably the proposed strategic gaps. The Council has commented separately on the justification for the strategic gaps. However, on the basis of the SEA, the Council is very concerned that the appraisal has not properly considered reasonable alternatives e.g. all other things being equal, it would appear that potential sites 8 and 10 could be developed without meaningfully eroding the separation between the settlements of Dickleburgh and Rushall. This may have unduly constrained the consideration of sites, leading to questions about whether the plan is underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence that justifies the policies within it in accordance with the NPPF and which contributes to the achievement of sustainable development as required by the basic conditions.

The Council would recommend that the evidence base of the plan is reviewed to ensure that the approach to the assessment of potential allocations has been fairly and objectively undertaken and that opportunities for sustainable development have not been unjustifiably discounted.'

I have found the following statement within an update email that you sent me on 21/08/2024, if that helps:

'Upon advice from RL and associates we have spoken to Locality and the Aecom team that wrote our SEA to ascertain whether an updated SEA is needed. The advice was that we may need a new / updated SEA. That process has been in motion for the last few weeks, Cheryl, the team leader is aware that we need the document to fall into the same production timescale as the NP.'

Having not been involved in the SEA or site assessment process, I can't offer my own explanation for the lower number of sites in the more recent SEA. However, paragraphs 3.2.7-3.2.13 in the Dec 2024 SEA seem to discuss this issue. 3.2.7 states 'Site number 3 has more recently been withdrawn by the developer'.

I hope this helps.

Kind regards,
Richard

From: AG

Sent: 11 September 2025 09:40

To:

Cc:

Subject: Dickleburgh and Rushall NP

Hi Richard

We are beginning to put together responses for the inspection. There is an area where you may have information that helps clarify the situation.

I hope you will remember that there was some concern raised post regulation 14 that there may need to be a review of the SEA. My recollection is that - we reviewed and changed the NP to address the issues raised by the Reg 16 responses. We also asked you if the SEA needed review. You, I think, were not sure and suggested we ask Aecom. I contacted Cheryl Beattie at Aecom who suggested that it might and that she would get guidance. I do not know if there was any communication between the Local Authority and Aecom but certainly the outcome was that it was agreed there should be a review / modification / re write / addition.

The consequence was that Ann and I successfully applied for additional funding and Aecom produced a new SEA authored by Cheryl. Looking at the 2 SEA's together, my view is they provide an extremely thorough analysis of the environment of the Parish and the consequences of development.

A concern that was raised by regulation 18 objectors is that there are less sites on SEA 2 than SEA 1. I am guessing the answer is that some sites have been withdrawn by the landowner/s but that is my speculation. Can you shed any light on this?

Thank you
Andrew