Candidates were invited to answer a maximum of four out of the six questions set in the examination paper. Each question was worth a maximum of 20 marks; answering four questions was worth a maximum of 80 marks.\(^1\)

The overall standard candidates achieved was good and very good. Out of the maximum possible 80 marks on offer for answering the examination paper, 49 was the lowest mark awarded and 60 marks, the highest.

In the Examiner's opinion, candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the course, or at least that part of the course upon which they were examined.

These topics were examined (with the number of candidates answering each question set out in brackets):

1. Development standards (four)
2. Development applications (seven)
3. Development consents (six)
4. Modification of a development consent (eight)
5. Environmental impact assessment (six), and
6. Existing use rights (five).

Majority of candidates tackled Question 4 (Modification of a development consent) and so it may be useful to comment on the overall standard answering of this question. The candidate awarded the lowest mark\(^2\) appeared to understand the issues but should have done more in terms of citing cases by name and legislation by reference to section numbers. The candidate awarded the highest mark\(^3\) was able to cite cases and legislation in support of their statements of principle.

In terms of the highest marks awarded for answering any of the questions,\(^4\) candidates provided detailed analysis, including citing cases and legislation in support of statement of principle. Some of these answers were very good indeed.

---

\(^1\) Each candidate completed an assignment prior to sitting the examination. The assignment was worth a maximum of 20 marks; the assignment and examination paper were together worth a maximum of 100 marks.

\(^2\) 11 marks.

\(^3\) 16 marks.

\(^4\) Three candidates were awarded 17 marks out of a maximum of 20 marks for answering one question.