

## Appendix A – Proposed Decision Statement

### Nether Heyford Neighbourhood Development Plan Decision Statement Regulation 18 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an independent examination, West Northamptonshire Council (the “Council”) now confirms that the Nether Heyford Neighbourhood Development Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Plan Referendum.
- 1.2 The decision statement and copies of the Nether Heyford Neighbourhood Development Plan and its supporting documentation, including the Examiner’s report are available to view on the council’s website at: [West Northamptonshire Council - Nether Heyford Neighbourhood Plan](#)
- 1.3 Hard copies of this decision statement and the modified version of the Neighbourhood Plan are available for inspection at the following locations during normal opening hours:
  - **West Northamptonshire Council (Towcester)** – The Forum, Moat Lane, Towcester, NN12 6AD. Open Monday to Friday 9:00am to 5:00pm
  - **West Northamptonshire Council (Northampton)** – The Guildhall, St Giles’ Square, Northampton, NN1 1DE. Open Monday to Friday 9:00am to 5:00pm
  - **The Olde Sun PH (Nether Heyford)** – 10 Middle Street, Nether Heyford, NN7 3LL. Open Monday to Sunday from 11:30am
  - **Clerk for Nether Heyford Parish Council** – Mr Guy Ravine, 63 Furnace Land, Nether Heyford, NN7 3JS
  - **Heyford Meats** – 25 The Green, Nether Heyford, NN7 3LE
  - **Foresters Arms** – 22 The Green, Nether Heyford, NN7 3LE

#### 2. Background

- 2.1 Nether Heyford Parish Council, as the qualifying body, applied for all of the Nether Heyford Parish to be designated as a neighbourhood area on 9 September 2016. The council designated this as a neighbourhood area on 27 February 2017.
- 2.2 The draft Neighbourhood Development Plan was published by Nether Heyford Parish Council for public consultation on 30 September 2021 and closed on 12 November 2021.

- 2.3 Following submission of the Nether Heyford Neighbourhood Development Plan to the council in November 2022, the plan was published for consultation by the council. The consultation period ran from 13 December 2022 to 7 February 2023.
- 2.4 Following the submission consultation, the council, with the agreement of the parish council, appointed an independent Examiner, Ann Skippers, to review whether the plan met the basic conditions required by the legislation and should proceed to referendum.
- 2.5 Following the examination, the Examiner's report was completed in May 2023 and made available on the website. The report concludes that, subject to the making of the modifications recommended in his report, the plan meets the basic conditions set out in legislation and should proceed to a referendum.

### **3. Decision and Reasons**

- 3.1 The council has made the modifications proposed by the Examiner to ensure the plan meets the basic conditions. Table 1 below sets out these modifications and the actions to be taken in respect of each of them. Recommended changes are illustrated differently in the Decision Statement and are shown in the following way:
- Modifications of wording by the Examiner are shown as underlined or strikethrough for deletions.
  - Where the Examiner has not recommended specific wording and the council has had to interpret the recommendation and identify specific wording, this is double underlined or ~~double strikethrough~~. This includes accuracy changes.
- 3.2 The council has considered whether to extend the area in which the referendum is to take place and concluded there is no reason to extend the referendum area beyond the Nether Heyford Neighbourhood Area.
- 3.3 The Examiner has concluded that with the specified modifications the Nether Heyford Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions and other relevant legal requirements. The council concurs with this view.
- 3.4 To meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, a referendum will be held which poses the questions; 'Do you want West Northamptonshire Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Nether Heyford to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?'
- 3.5 The referendum will take place on 7 September 2023 and will be held at Nether Heyford Baptist Church Hall, The Green, NN7 3LE.

**Table 1: Examiners Recommended Modifications and further editorial changes to the Nether Heyford Neighbourhood Development Plan and actions to be taken (set out in plan order)**

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
01A	Para 15 of the NP	None.	Typo – should read: The character of village properties tends to include <del>that</del> houses that <u>front</u> roads...	To ensure the sentence is accurate.	Make the suggested minor modification .
01B	Para 21 of the NP	None.	Typo – should read: Entirely within the remit of Nether Heyford Parish <u>Council</u> (as the 'qualifying body').	To ensure the sentence is accurate.	Make the suggested minor modification .
01C	Para 52 of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Para 5.8 of the Examiner's Report (ER)	The examiner notes that the plan refers to 'actions being shown in orange-coloured boxes' but not in their version of the plan.	Amend paragraph 52:  <del>These ACTIONS are shown in orange-coloured boxes.</del> <u>ACTIONS for the Parish are contained within boxes marked 'ACTION'.</u>	To ensure it is accurate and accessible.	Make the suggested minor modification .
02	Throughout NP. Para 7.7 of ER	Rectify minor typos throughout the Plan.	Alter any typos throughout the Plan including any references of South Northamptonshire to West Northamptonshire Council where necessary.	To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.	Make the suggested modification .

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
03	P17 pf the NP. Para 7.7 of ER.	<p>Amend the fifth paragraph on page 17 of the Plan to read:</p> <p>"Anyone registered to vote in Nether Heyford Parish <u>area</u> is entitled to <u>vote</u>. A simple majority of Yes votes <u>means that West Northamptonshire</u> Council will adopt our Neighbourhood Plan as part of their development plan. <u>Policies in our Plan will then have the same status</u> as policies in the Local Plan where they apply to Nether Heyford."</p>	<p>Anyone registered to vote in Nether Heyford Parish <u>area</u> is entitled to <u>vote</u>, <del>and</del> <u>A simple majority of Yes votes means that West Northamptonshire</u> <del>South Northants</del> Council will adopt our Neighbourhood Plan as part of their development plan. <u>and Policies in our Plan will then have the same status as</u> <del>can then take precedence over</del> policies in the Local Plan where they apply to Nether Heyford.</p>	<p>To ensure the changes proposed clearly differentiate the additions and removals of text from the Regulation 16 Plan.</p>	<p>Make the suggested modification .</p>
04	Para 25 of the NP. Para 7.9 of the ER.	<p>Change "Figure 6" in paragraph 25 on page 18 of the Plan to "Figure 4".</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.</p>	<p>Make the suggested modification .</p>
05	Page 27, S10 of the NP. Para 7.13 of the ER.	<p>Add the words "<u>where appropriate</u>" after "... recognised, recorded and protected..." in S10 on page 27 of the Plan.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.</p>	<p>Make the suggested modification .</p>
06	Policy H1 of the NP. Para 7.30 of the ER.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change the title of the policy to "New Residential Development"</li> <li>Amend the policy to read: "Proposals for new residential development <u>within the Settlement Confines</u> as defined in Map 3, or on <u>the three allocated sites</u></li> </ul>	<p>Amend Policy H1:</p> <p>Policy H1: New Residential Development <del>Dwellings-Built-Up-Area-Boundary</del></p> <p>Proposals for new residential development <del>dwellings-within the Village Settlement Confines</del></p>	<p>To ensure the changes proposed clearly differentiate the additions and removals of text from the Regulation 16 Plan.</p>	<p>Amend policy H1 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.</p>

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><u>shown on</u> Map 3 will be supported in principle, subject to being in accordance with other policies in the Development Plan.</p> <p>Areas that are outside the <u>Settlement Confines</u> or not designated as <u>allocated</u> sites are classed as open countryside.</p> <p>New residential development within the open countryside will be strictly controlled and limited to exceptions defined in national and local development plan policy <u>including</u> rural exception dwellings, replacement dwellings, conversions of property, dwellings for rural workers and the construction of houses with exceptional design <u>and any other identified exceptions in policy.</u>"</p>	<p><del>Boundary (Built-Up Area Boundary), as defined in Map 3, or on the three allocated sites shown on Potential Residential Development Sites allocated within this Neighbourhood Plan, (also defined in Map 3),</del> will be supported in principle, subject to being in accordance with other policies in the Development Plan.</p> <p>Areas that are outside the <u>Settlement Village Confines Boundary</u> or not designated as <u>allocated Potential Residential Development sites within this plan</u> are classed as open countryside.</p> <p>New residential development dwellings within the <del>local</del> <u>open</u> countryside will be strictly controlled and limited to exceptions defined in national and local development plan policy <u>including concerning</u> rural exception dwellings, replacement dwellings, conversions of property, dwellings for rural workers and the construction of houses with exceptional design <u>and any other identified exceptions in policy.</u></p>		

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
07	Para 60, page 31 of NP. Para 7.30 of the ER.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change references to "built up area boundary" in paragraph 60 on page 31 of the Plan to "<u>settlement confines</u>"</li> <li>Remove references to the "yellow site" from paragraph 60 including sub section d.</li> </ul>	<p>Amend para 60:</p> <p>The <u>settlement confines built-up area boundary</u> encloses potential development sites which have been identified and then assessed both indicatively (local process) and formally (independent process) by the methods shown in the supporting document <i>Site Assessments &amp; Methodologies</i>. The local process and evaluation were shared with villagers at the 2018 village fete, and also online, with posters, maps and displays. The formal assessment confirmed findings from the local assessment and discussions with villagers, to conclude three development sites (shown in blue Map 3). <del>and one site (yellow) which is identified as a potential site for relocation of the village school and the creation of additional community facilities.</del> The <u>settlement confines built up area boundary</u> is shown in red.</p> <p>a. The independent assessors suggest that Site SNC542 (see Map 4) is reduced to create a narrow strip sufficient for a</p>	To ensure the changes proposed clearly differentiate the additions and removals of text from the Regulation 16 Plan.	Make the suggested modifications.

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
			<p>small row of houses in the non-flood plain area of the plot (see Map 3).</p> <p>b. Site SNC257 (see Map 4) is visually sensitive at this entrance to the village, and it is suggested that the site is reduced to provide a continuity from housing opposite (Appendix the the eastern side of the plot, reflecting the density (see Appendix 1) of housing opposite with sensitivity to the views afforded from current homes. This is the most popular site voted for by villagers for development.</p> <p>c. Site OR317 (Map 4) A small development of new dwellings would appear part of a natural extension and continuation of the built form of Furnace Lane and would assimilate into the settlement pattern and character reasonably well. This site is currently garden land.</p> <p>d. Site SNC310 (Map 4 and in yellow on Maps 3 and 5) Part site development, which would be an <i>educationally-led</i> allocation, to include community facilities and parking. A cooperative master plan as an overarching planning document defining spatial layout, involving all agencies, would be required</p>		

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
			to structure the site use and subsequent development.		
08	Map 3 of the NP. Para 7.30 of the ER.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the yellow site from Map 3 with consequential amendments needed to the key</li> <li>Consequential amendments to Map 3 to change references to "settlement" confines will be needed</li> </ul>	None.	To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.	Make the suggested modification .
09	Para 61 of the NP. Para 7.30 of the ER.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change paragraph 61 of the supporting text to: "The Settlement Confines is in line with the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (WNJCS) R1, and the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (Part 2) 2011-2029 (Policy SS1: The Settlement Hierarchy). The allocated sites will become part of the built-up area once this Plan is made."</li> </ul>	Amend para 61:  <del>Policy H1 Built-up Boundary</del> The Settlement Confines are is in line with the former Local Plan LH1 and West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (WNJCS) R1, and the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (Part 2) 2011-2029 (Policy SS1: The Settlement Hierarchy). The allocated sites will become part of the built-up area once this Plan is made.	To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.	Make the suggested modification .
10	Map 4 of the NP. Para 7.30 of the ER.	Add a key to Map 4	None.	To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.	Make the suggested modification .
11A	Policy H2 Part A and H2 Part B, paragraphs	Delete Policy H2 Part A and Part B and the associated supporting text (paragraphs 62 – 66) and Map 5.	None.	To allow further engagement regarding the	Delete policies H2 Part A and



ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
	62 – 66, and Map 5 of the NP. Para 7.39 of the ER.			existing school site and potential site allocation.	H2 Part B in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
11B	Policy H2 Part A and H2 Part B of the NP. Para 7.39 of the ER.	The Independent Examiner notes that these policies could be altered into a community action if desired.	<u>Liaise with West Northamptonshire Council regarding the potential to relocate Bliss School site and the allocation of mixed-use site outside of the current settlement confines of Nether Heyford.</u>	To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.	
11C	Para 79 of the NP.	None	<p>Paragraph 79 provides supporting information to Policies H2 Part A and H2 Part.</p> <p>Those policies are to be deleted as set out in the Independent Examiners recommendations.</p> <p>As such it is proposed to remove the following parts of paragraph 79 from the NP.</p> <p>To support the village, additional or enhanced community facilities will be required over the life of the plan to ensure the wellbeing of existing and future residents. <del>The relocation of Bliss School (Policy H2A &amp; H2B) provides an</del></p>	To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.	Delete part of paragraph 79 of the submitted NHNP.

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
			<p><del>opportunity for redevelopment and the repurposing of this important building. Should the school relocate, we would expect the allocated site (SNC 310) to deliver enhanced facilities such as a sports hall, pre-school facilities, health and wellbeing resources and community shared spaces, alongside education.</del></p> <p>Should Bliss School not relocate during the time of the plan period there will still be the need for facilities such as storage and meeting place for scouts, potential healthcare and wellbeing space and additional sports facilities. These will be supported where they meet the criteria of the policy.</p>		
12	Policy H4 of the NP. Para 7.46 of the ER.	<p>Change the policy to read:</p> <p>"Market Housing Developments should provide a mix of house types and sizes which reflects the most up-to-date needs of the Parish and be informed by the <u>most recently available Housing and Economic Needs Assessment</u>, Parish level surveys or Housing Needs Surveys as well as any site-specific issues and evidence of market circumstances."</p>	<p>Amend Policy H4 to read:</p> <p>Market Housing Developments should provide a mix of house types and sizes which reflects the most up-to-date needs of the Parish and be informed by the <u>most recently available Housing and Economic Needs Assessment</u>, <del>Strategic Housing Market Assessment</del>, Parish level surveys or Housing Needs Surveys as well as any site-specific issues and evidence of market circumstances.</p>	To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.	Amend policy H4 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
13	Policy H5 of the NP. Para 7.49 of the ER.	Change the words "the elderly" in the policy to " <u>older people</u> ".	Amend Policy H5:  Specialist accommodation for <u>older people</u> <del>the elderly</del> or those with specialist accommodation needs will be supported, subject to compliance with other policies in this Plan.	To reflect NPPF terminology	Amend policy H5 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
14	Policy H6 of the NP. Para 7.53 of the ER	Amend the first criterion of the policy to read: "Will not result in <u>unacceptable impacts on the living conditions of the occupiers of residential properties arising from</u> traffic movements, noise, fumes, smell, or other disturbance in line with WNC's environmental policies."	None.	To bolster the policy.	Amend policy H6 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
15	Policy BE1 of the NP. Paras 7.59 and 7.60 of the ER.	Delete the last sentence of the policy which begins "The expectation is..."*  * The Independent Examiner noted that, if desired, this sentence could be moved to supporting text. This has been moved to under paragraph 89 of the Submission Version of the Plan.	Amend Policy BE1: This policy supports any new development to include green spaces for the benefit of all villagers' health and wellbeing. This policy does not support the addition of private land maintained at additional cost to people living in the development. <del>The expectation is that all land (the grass verges beside roads and footways, up to the boundary wall, hedge or fence) would be reviewed by</del>	To ensure the policy refers only to planning matters.	Amend policy BE1 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
			the PC at planning stage, for their later adoption see Note 1.		
16	Note 1 on page 42 of the NP. Para 7.60 of the ER.	Change "figure 6" in Note 1 on page 42 of the Plan to "figure 7"	Amend Note 1:  ...where external sub-contractors maintain a 'buffer zone' of scrub land (seen on figure 7),...	To ensure Note 1 is factually correct,	Make the suggested modification .
17	Policy BE2 of the NP. Para 7.64 of the ER.	Correct the reference to "Appendix 7" in the Policy to "Appendix 1".	... that surround or adjoin the densities shown in Appendix 1.	To ensure Policy BE2 directs the reader to the correct Appendix.	Amend policy BE2 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
18	Para 92 of the NP. Para 7.64 of the ER.	Correct the reference to "Appendix 7" in the supporting text on page 43 of the Plan to "Appendix 1".	Please see Appendix 1 for further details.	To ensure paragraph 92 directs the reader to the correct Appendix.	Make the suggested modification .
19	Policy BE3 of the NP. Para 7.74 of the ER.	Change the policy so that it reads:  <u>"To ensure the conservation or enhancement of designated heritage assets, proposals must:</u> <u>a. Conserve or enhance the significance of the designated heritage asset and its setting;</u>	Amend Policy BE3:  <del>Proposals which cause harm to the special-significance of designated or nondesignated heritage assets or their settings will not be supported.</del>	To ensure Policy BE3 meets the basic conditions.	Amend policy BE3 in accordance with Examiner's

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><u>b. Demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and of the wider context in which the heritage asset sits, alongside an assessment of the potential impact of the development on the heritage asset and its context; and</u></p> <p><u>c. Provide clear justification, through the submission of a proportional heritage statement, for any works that could harm a heritage asset yet be of wider substantial public benefits that might outweigh any harm or loss through detailed analysis of the asset and the proposal.</u></p> <p>Proposals, including changes of use, which enable the retention of or the appropriate and sensitive restoration of listed buildings, will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that will aid the understanding of the area's heritage, for example, the introduction of waymarking or information boards, will be supported.</p> <p><u>Proposals for any works that would cause harm to the significance or setting of non-designated heritage assets should be supported by an appropriate analysis of the significance of the asset to enable a balanced judgment to be made having regard to the</u></p>	<p><u>To ensure the conservation or enhancement of designated heritage assets, proposals must:</u></p> <p><u>a. Conserve or enhance the significance of the designated heritage asset and its setting;</u></p> <p><u>b. Demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and of the wider context in which the heritage asset sits, alongside an assessment of the potential impact of the development on the heritage asset and its context; and</u></p> <p><u>c. Provide clear justification, through the submission of a proportional heritage statement, for any works that could harm a heritage asset yet be of wider substantial public benefits that might outweigh any harm or loss through detailed analysis of the asset and the proposal.</u></p> <p>Proposals, including changes of use, which enable the retention of or the appropriate and sensitive restoration of listed buildings, will be supported.</p> <p><u>Development which impacts the setting of heritage assets will be expected to</u></p>		<p>recommend ation.</p>

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><u>scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset."</u></p>	<p>demonstrate the highest standards of design in terms of appearance. Development which fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of heritage assets within the parish will not be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that will aid the understanding of the area's heritage, for example the introduction of waymarking or information boards will be supported.</p> <p><u>Proposals for any works that would cause harm to the significance or setting of non-designated heritage assets should be supported by an appropriate analysis of the significance of the asset to enable a balanced judgment to be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.</u></p>		
20	Map 7, page 46 of the NP. Para 7.74 of the ER.	Remove Map 7 on page 46 of the Plan from the Plan.	None.	To reflect that non-designated heritage assets are now to be dealt with through an action within the Plan.	Remove Map 7 from the Plan.

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
21A	Para 95 of the NP. Para 7.74 of the ER.	Delete the reference to non-designated heritage assets from paragraph 95 of the Plan.	Amend para 95:  The Parish of Nether Heyford is home to 25 Heritage Assets as listed buildings and a number of Non-Designated Heritage Assets. The listed buildings are shown on the following map (number 6).	To reflect that non-designated heritage assets are now to be dealt with through an action within the Plan.	Amend para 95 of the NP.
21B	Para 96 of the NP. Para 7.72 of the ER.	The Independent Examiner noted that the task of identifying non-designated heritage assets can be changed to a community action if desired.	Include in 'Heritage & Non-Designated Heritage Assets ACTIONS' <u>Work with West Northamptonshire Council to produce a local heritage list</u>	To reflect the intentions of the Parish Council	Amend Heritage ACTIONS.
22	Para 97 of the NP. Para 7.77 of the ER.	Amend paragraph 97 on page 47 of the Plan to read:  One of the development sites identified in this plan is currently garden land. <u>See OR317 on Map 4.</u> This policy guides the future development of this site and any other garden land sites.	Amend para 97:  One of the development sites identified in this plan is currently garden land. <u>See OR317 on Map 4.</u> This policy guides the future development of this site and any other garden land sites. <u>See OR317 on Map 4.</u>	To ensure Policy BE4 meets the basic conditions.	Amend para 97 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
23A	Policy BE6 of the NP. Para 7.83 of the ER.	Delete Policy BE6 and its supporting text and turn it into an action.	Delete Policy BE6 and paragraphs 103 and 104 of the neighbourhood plan.  Create the following action at the end of the Built Environment chapter: <u>Built Environment Action</u>	To ensure conformity with Planning Practice Guidance.	Delete Policy BE6 in accordance with Examiner's recommend

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
			<p><u>Positive and proactive engagement with the local community can manage expectations and simplify the application process. This Plan supports the early engagement and involvement of the local community in any significant or sensitive developments within the Neighbourhood Area. The Parish Council will seek to proactively engage with developers in the pre-application process so that all issues can be identified and ideally addressed at an early stage.</u></p> <p><u>Applications for 5 or more dwellings are expected to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. Make a presentation to Parish Council prior to submission</u></li> <li><u>b. Allow time for villagers to comment on publicity provided both online and in hard copy within the village, prior to submission</u></li> </ul>		ation and include as an 'Action'
23B	Para 109	None.	Amend text in paragraph 109: The neighbourhood <del>area</del> -plan supports...	To ensure clarity in text.	Make minor modification .
24	Policy ECON1 of the NP. Para 7.92 of the ER.	Amend the first criterion of the policy to read:  "Will not result in unacceptable <u>impacts on the living conditions of the occupiers of residential</u>	Amend Policy ECON1:  Will not result in unacceptable <u>impacts on the living conditions of the occupiers of residential properties arising from</u>	To ensure conformity with existing policies.	Amend policy ECON1 in accordance with



ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<u>properties arising from</u> traffic movements, noise, fumes, smell, or other disturbance."	traffic movements, noise, fumes, smell or other disturbance <del>to residential</del> properties.		Examiner's recommendation.
25	Policy ECON2 of the NP. Para 7.95 of the ER.	Change the words "...high speed broadband..." to "...full fibre broadband..." in the policy  Change the title of the policy to "Connectivity"	Amend Policy ECON2:  Policy ECON2: <u>Connectivity Superfast Broadband</u> All new residential and commercial development within the Neighbourhood Area will be expected to include the necessary infrastructure to allow future connectivity to <u>full fibre high-speed</u> broadband / internet.	To ensure the policy meets the basic conditions.	Amend policy ECON2 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
26	Para 115 of the NP. Para 7.95 of the ER.	Change references in the supporting text to fast broadband in paragraph 115 to <u>full fibre</u> broadband.	Amend para 115: This will require effective <u>full fibre</u> <del>fast</del> broadband provision.	To align with changes to Policy ECON2.	Amend policy para 115 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
27	Para 116 of the NP. Para 7.95 of the ER.	Change the title of the policy in paragraph 116 to reflect the earlier modification.	Amend para 116: This Policy <del>Econ-2</del> <u>ECON2 (Connectivity) Superfast Broadband</u> is defined ...	To align with changes to Policy ECON2.	Amend policy para 116 in accordance with Examiner's

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
					recommendation.
28	Policy ECON3 of the NP. Para 7.98 of the ER.	Delete element b. of the policy.	Amend Policy ECON3: ... a. Encourage the provision of space to support homeworking, with flexible space adaptable to a home office, where appropriate <del>b. Incorporate cabling or suitable ducting to support high speed broadband.</del>	To ensure there is no duplication of Policy ECON2	Amend policy ECON3 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
29	Policy ECON4 of the NP. Para 7.102 of the ER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change the title of the policy to "<u>Grand Union Canal, River Nene and Tributaries</u>"</li> <li>Change the policy so that it reads:  The use of the <u>Grand Union Canal (owned by the Canal &amp; River Trust), River Nene and tributaries</u> for business and leisure related activities will be supported if: a. Flood risk is not exacerbated b. River and Canal banks are preserved in their natural <u>or existing</u> state for the benefit of ecology, <u>recognising that exceptions, including works to support moorings or marinas, will have to be balanced against matters of navigational safety and the safety of waterway users</u></li> </ul>	Amend Policy ECON4:  <del>Policy ECON4: River and Canal Activities</del> <u>Grand Union Canal, River Nene and Tributaries</u>  The use of the <u>Grand Union Canal (owned by the Canal &amp; River Trust), River Nene and tributaries</u> <del>the Grand Union Canal</del> for business and leisure related activities will only be supported if:  a. Flood risk is not exacerbated b. River and Canal banks are preserved in their natural <u>or existing state</u> for the benefit of	To ensure the policy meets the basic conditions.	Amend policy ECON4 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>c. There are no adverse impacts on heritage assets or their settings</p> <p>d. There are no adverse impacts on residential amenity</p> <p>e. There is no major reshaping of the river or man-made features such as engineering works</p> <p><u>f. Within the setting of the canal, there has been consideration of the impacts on the character, appearance, heritage and ecological character of the canal corridor and provision of any necessary mitigation. There should be no inhibitions that would affect the Canal &amp; River Trust's statutory obligations in operating or maintaining their infrastructure."</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a new paragraph that reads: <u>"The Canal and River Trust own and manage the Grand Union canal which runs almost through the centre of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The canal corridor is designated as part of the Grand Union canal conservation area."</u></li> </ul>	<p><u>ecology, recognising that exceptions, including works to support moorings or marinas, will have to be balanced against matters of navigational safety and the safety of waterway users.</u></p> <p>c. There are no adverse impacts on heritage assets or their settings</p> <p>d. There are no adverse impacts on residential amenity</p> <p>e. There is no major reshaping of the river or man-made features such as engineering works</p> <p>f. <u>Within the setting of the canal, there has been consideration of the impacts on the character, appearance, heritage and ecological character of the canal corridor and provision of any necessary mitigation. There should be no inhibitions that would affect the Canal &amp; River Trust's statutory obligations in operating or maintaining their infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>The Canal and River Trust own and manage the Grand Union canal which runs almost through the centre of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The canal</u></p>		

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
			<p><u>corridor is designated as part of the Grand Union canal conservation area.</u></p>		
30	Policy ECON5 of the NP. Para 7.106 of the ER	Add the word "or" at the end of the first criterion of the policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant can demonstrate that the site/premises is no longer viable; <u>or</u></li> <li>Development of the site for other appropriate uses will facilitate the relocation of an existing leisure or tourist facility to a more suitable site</li> </ul>	To ensure the policy can be interpreted correctly.	Amend policy ECON5 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
31	Policy COM1 of the NP. Para 7.111 of the ER.	Move sentence about Map 8 in the policy to the supporting text.	<p>Amend Policy COM1 All development schemes should demonstrate how they will manage surface water run-off and mitigate the risk of flooding. <del>Please see 2018 revision of the flood map for Nether Heyford (Map 8).</del></p> <p>Add the following to the end of para 126: <u>Please see 2018 revision of the flood map for Nether Heyford (Map 8).</u></p>	To reflect the Examiner's recommendation.	Amend policy COM1 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
32	Map 8 of the N. Para 7.111 of the ER.	Add the following sentence to Map 8: <u>"This information is correct at the time of publication. The most up to date information should always be sought from the Local Planning Authority or appropriate statutory body."</u>	None.	To reflect the Examiner's recommendation.	Amend text associated with Map 8 in accordance with

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
					Examiner's recommendation.
33A	Policy COM2 of the NP. Para 7.119 of the ER.	Change the second sentence of the policy to read:  "Proposals which enhance and improve existing community facilities will be supported <u>subject to satisfactory impacts of the new development.</u> " [retain first sentence as is]	Amend Policy COM2:  Proposals which enhance and improve existing community facilities will be supported <u>subject to satisfactory impacts of the new development.</u> <del>provided that the impact on usage can be evidenced.</del>	To ensure conformity with strategic policies.	Amend policy COM3 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
33B	Para 137 of the NP.	None.	Amend text: Policy NE1 Green Infrastructure is in line with SNLP(2) <del>GF1</del> <u>GS1</u>	So the text references the correct South Northamptonshire LPP2 policy.	Make minor amendment.
34A	Policy NE3 of the NP. Para 7.139 of the ER.	Delete the reference to SSSIs from the policy.	Amend Policy NE3:  Development which would adversely affect either directly or indirectly the <del>Sites of Special Scientific Interest or the</del> Local Nature Reserve, or any future designated wildlife reserves will not be supported.	To reflect that the SSSI lays outside of the plan area.	Amend policy NE3 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.
34B	Policy RT1 of the NP.	None.	Addition of text to Policy RT1 suggested by Nether Heyford Parish Council.	Suggested addition from the Parish and	Amend Policy RT1

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
	Para 7.146 of the ER.		<p><u>The towpath is an important traffic free route for walking and cycling for both leisure and utility walkers and represents a multifunctional asset, providing a recreational opportunity, and a safe, convenient, and attractive walking and cycling network to promote health and well-being.</u></p>	welcomed by the Examiner.	in accordance with Parish and Examiner.
35	Policy RT2 of the NP. Para 7.151 of the ER.	<p>Amend the second paragraph of the policy to read:</p> <p>"All new development should demonstrate that there is adequate provision for off-road parking <u>to meet</u> the recommendations in SNC's Design Guide. <u>All developments should also provide a minimum of two car parking spaces per 1 – 3 bedroomed properties and a minimum of three spaces for homes with 4 or more bedrooms and take account of the South Northamptonshire Parking Standards and Design Supplementary Planning Document 2018 or any successor document.</u> Dwellings should provide secure storage space for cycles."</p>	<p>Amend Policy RT2:</p> <p>All new development should demonstrate that there is adequate provision for off-road parking <u>to meet</u> <del>meeting</del> the recommendations in SNC's Design Guide.</p> <p><del>Additionally, our local requirement for parking is a minimum of two spaces per property.</del></p> <p><u>All developments should also provide a minimum of two car parking spaces per 1 – 3 bedroomed properties and a minimum of three spaces for homes with 4 or more bedrooms and take account of the South Northamptonshire Parking Standards</u></p>	To ensure the changes proposed clearly differentiate the additions and removals of text from the Regulation 16 Plan.	Amend policy RT2 in accordance with Examiner's recommendation.

ID No	Page / Para / Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
			<p><u>and Design Supplementary Planning Document 2018 or any successor document.</u> Dwellings should provide secure storage space for cycles.</p>		
36	Policy RT2 of the NP.	None	<p>Both the West Northamptonshire and the Parish Council noted that the final part of policy RT2 needed a factual amendment. Amend last paragraph of Policy RT2:</p> <p>Non-residential developments must provide adequate parking in accordance with the <del>County Council's adopted standards</del> <u>South Northamptonshire Parking Standards and Design Supplementary Parking Standards.</u></p>	<p>The former South Northamptonshire Council did not adopt the former Northamptonshire County Council Parking Standards. Parking within the South Northamptonshire area must adhere to the South Northamptonshire Parking Standards and Design: Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	Amend policy RT2.