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Purpose of the Guidance Note

1. Further to the Examination Guidance Note, dated 7 June 2019, this note provides further guidance to participants on the procedural and administrative arrangements for the examination.

Hearing statements

2. The previous Guidance Note provided guidance on the preparation and content of hearing statements. In paragraph 32 it states:

Hearing statements from those who made representations should be a maximum of 3000 words for each Matter. Within this limit, they should be kept as short as possible. Appendices should only be included where directly relevant and necessary and should also be as succinct as possible. [...] 

3. Whilst most of the submissions received adhered to this guidance, several statements significantly exceeded the maximum word limit specified.

4. In order to enable me to focus my time appropriately and ensure fairness for all participants, it would be helpful if a brief summary could be prepared for those statements that exceed the word limit (namely Matters 4 and 5: statements from LRM Planning and DPDS Consulting).

5. Please note that a summary of the submitted statement is requested. No new material should be submitted at this stage.

6. The summaries should provide a clear indication of the changes that are considered necessary to make the plan sound.

7. If any reference is made to appendices, detailed reference to the particular paragraph(s) or page(s) of the relevant document would be helpful.

8. These summaries should be submitted no later than 17.00 on Friday 6 September 2019.

Consideration of Alternative Sites

9. For the avoidance of doubt, the attention of hearing participants is also drawn to paragraph 40 of the previous Guidance Note:

40. [...] Sites that have been put forward for inclusion in the Plan by representors, but which have not been selected for allocation are referred to informally as ‘omission sites’. Representors should be aware that it is not part of my role to examine the soundness of the omission sites and, subject to the legal right to be heard [...], such sites will not normally be discussed in detail at the Hearing sessions.
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