

# **WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNCIL**

## **PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE**

**22<sup>nd</sup> November 2023**

**Councillor Rebecca Breese – Planning, Built Environment and Rural Affairs**

**Report Title**                      **Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Report Author**                      **Margaret Howe, Senior Policy Officer (Planning)**  
**Margaret.howe@westnorthants.gov.uk**

### **Contributors/Checkers/Approvers**

<b>West S151</b>	Martin Henry Executive Director Finance	Email sent 07/11/2023
<b>Director</b>	Stuart Timmiss, Executive Director Place, Economy & Environment	Email sent 20/10/2023
<b>Assistant Director</b>	Stephanie Gibrat Assistant Director Planning	Email sent 20/10/2023
<b>Legal</b>	Theresa Boyd Legal Service	Email approval received 08/11/2023
<b>Head of Communications</b>	Becky Hutson, Marketing and Communications Manager	Email approval received 23/10/2023

### **List of Appendices**

**Appendix 1 - Proposed Decision Statement including Table 1, Examiner’s recommended modifications and further editorial changes to Arthingworth’s Neighbourhood Development Plan and actions to be taken**

**Appendix 2 – Neighbourhood Area Map**

## **1. Purpose of Report**

---

- 1.1. For Members to consider the recommendations of the independent examiner following the examination of the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP), and seek approval to put the plan to referendum.

## **2. Executive Summary**

---

- 2.1 The report summarises the process which has been followed to produce the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and presents the outcomes of the independent examination, including the examiner's recommendations.

## **3. Recommendations**

---

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Planning Policy Committee:
- a) Notes and welcomes the significant progress in making the neighbourhood development plan (NDP) by the Arthingworth community.
  - b) Accepts the Examiner's recommended modifications in respect of the Arthingworth NDP
  - c) Accepts the Inspector's recommendation that the NDP, as modified in accordance with recommendation (b), shall proceed to a referendum of voters within the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Area.
  - d) Approves the proposed Decision Statement set out in Appendix 1, subject to items (b) and (c) above and any necessary factual alterations.
  - e) Agrees that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning Policy and Specialist Services to make any further minor editorial changes be made to the Plan to address any factual and typographical errors and to reflect the fact that the document will be in its intended final form

## **4. Reason for Recommendations**

---

- 4.1 In order for a NDP to be "made" (adopted) the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ((SI 2012 No. 637) require the Council to make a decision on the examiner's recommendations before agreeing to send it to referendum.

## **5. Report Background**

---

- 5.1 The Localism Act 2011 has introduced three types of neighbourhood planning. This includes a neighbourhood development plan, which is a plan making power allowing local communities to shape development in their area, and a neighbourhood development order, which is a mechanism for granting planning permission. When "made" (or adopted), NDPs will form part of the development plan alongside the Council's Part 1 and Part 2 Local Plans.

- 5.2 The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 set out the process an organisation (the “Qualifying Body” i.e Parish or Town Council) must follow when preparing a neighbourhood development plan (NDP) or order, once a neighbourhood area is designated.
- 5.3 A draft NDP is drawn up and consulted on, and then the NDP is submitted to the local planning authority. This is followed by an examination, following which the Examiner makes recommendations. These recommendations can be that the plan should not proceed to a referendum, that it should proceed to a referendum with certain modifications, or that it should proceed to a referendum unchanged. Then the local planning authority (West Northamptonshire Council) has to consider whether to accept the Examiner’s recommendations. In doing so the Council has to decide for itself if, with the proposed modifications, the plan would meet the basic conditions and would not contravene Convention rights or European Union obligations. The Examiner will also recommend, and WNC must decide, what area should be used for the referendum if one is held; this may be larger than the neighbourhood affected if the impacts are important to a wider area.
- 5.4 Generally, there would need to be a good reason not to accept Examiner’s recommendations, and the greater the divergence of WNC’s decision from the recommendations the stronger the justification would need to be.
- 5.5 If an NDP proceeds to examination, then if it is approved by a majority of those voting, the Council has a duty to ‘make’ the plan, at which point it becomes part of the statutory development plan for the Council. The Council must then publish a decision statement explaining what it has done.

## **6. Issues and Choices**

---

- 6.1 Plan Preparation
- 6.2 Arthingworth Parish Council (APC), as the qualifying body, applied for the designation of a neighbourhood area on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2020. Following consultation on the application, the former Daventry District Council approved the application and designated the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Area on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2020.
- 6.3 The draft NDP was published by APC for the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Area for Regulation 14 public consultation 12<sup>th</sup> August 2022 – 30<sup>th</sup> September 2022.
- 6.4 Following submission of the Arthingworth NDP to the Council the plan was published for formal Regulation 16 consultation from 29<sup>th</sup> March 2023 to 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2023. The Council then, with the agreement of Parish Council, appointed an independent examiner, Andrew Ashcroft MRTPI, to review whether the plan met the basic conditions (see para 6.5) and should proceed to a referendum.
- 6.5 The examination of the plan was largely undertaken by written representations. However, having considered the information presented to him, the Examiner, concluded that the examination should include a focussed hearing on the way the village confines were defined. This was held at Arthingworth Village Hall on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> October 2023 and included visits

to two parts of the village. Representatives from the Council, Parish Council, Owners of Manor House, Bosworth House and the agent for a land owner attended the hearing.

6.6 NDPs are not tested for their soundness, but are tested to ensure they meet 'basic conditions', which are that:

- Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan.
- The making of the neighbourhood development plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.
- The making of the neighbourhood development plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).
- The making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.
- The making of the neighbourhood development plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010) or a European offshore marine site (as defined in the Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 2007) (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects).

6.7 Examination Outcomes

6.8 Following the completion of the Hearing, the Examiner's report on the NDP was received on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2023 and has been published on the Council's website. In his report, the Examiner concludes that "the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a neighbourhood Development Plan subject to the recommended modifications included in the Examiner's report.'

6.9 The main recommendation of the report relates to Policy H2 village confines, which was the subject of the hearing. The policy defines the confines and identifies the policy approach where development proposals on sites within the village confines will be supported and those outside the confines will be carefully controlled in line with national and strategic planning policies. The Policy attracted representations from property owners, land owners and the Council. The hearing considered the way in which the village confines had been drawn in the vicinity of The Manor and Bosworth House, with proposed extensions to the confines to include land relating to these properties. The Examiner concluded that on the balance of the evidence that the confines should not be extended to include The Manor nor the land to the east and west of Bosworth House. The Examiner did suggest some modification to the wording of the policy to improve its clarity.

6.10 The village confines also included the proposed housing allocation. The Examiner concluded that the village confines should be modified to exclude the housing allocation, so it reflected the approach set out in Table 3 in Policy RA3 of the Local Plan Part 2.

6.11 The Examiner supported the residential allocation in Policy H1 'Residential Site Allocation' concluding that the policy takes an 'appropriate approach to the matter' The Plan has taken the opportunity to positively plan for development within the village to help meet local need and

support local services. However, the examiner has suggested some modifications to improve the clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.

- 6.12 The Examiner recommended modifications to Policy H3 'Housing Mix' and the supporting text. This was to ensure that the policy comments generally about meeting local housing needs then offers specific support for smaller homes and homes suitable for older people, with the specific reference to 'family' sized housing deleted, as planning can only control the sizes of the houses rather than the way they are occupied. Commentary relating to 4-bedroom homes is then positioned within the supporting text.
- 6.13 Policy H4 Affordable Housing, the Examiner was satisfied that the policy takes a positive approach to the matter and meets the basic conditions. There are suggested modifications to acknowledge that the approach to distributing affordable housing may not always be practicable due to the size or layout of plots.
- 6.14 The Examiner agrees that two local green spaces set out in Policy ENV 1 Local Green Spaces meet the tests set out in the NPPF.
- 6.15 The Examiner recommended the deletion of Policy T2 Electric Vehicles as the need for such a policy has been overtaken by national policy as Part 5 of Building Regulations for electric vehicle charging are now in place.
- 6.16 A schedule of the Examiner's recommendations is set out in Table 1 to the Proposed Decision Statement, which is Appendix 1 of this report. The other main changes recommended by the Examiner are:
- Policy ENV3 Sites and Features of Natural Environmental Significance, modified to ensure it clearly identifies the features it addresses
  - Policy ENV4 Woodland and Notable Trees, modified to ensure that the policy more closely relates to the development management process and can be applied consistently
  - Policy ENV6 Sites of Historical Environment Significance, removal of part of the policy into supporting text as it relates to process not policy
  - Policy ENV8 Local Heritage Assets, modified to ensure that it accords with national policy
  - Policy ENV10 Footpaths and Other Walking Routes, amended to ensure that the policy is positively prepared
  - Policy T3 Pedestrian Footpaths, Pavements and Cycle ways is modified so that the elements referring to maintenance and upgrading are deleted as they are unlikely to constitute development.
  - Policy BE2 Support for New Businesses and Employment is modified to ensure that the policy has an approach necessary for a development plan policy
  - The following policies are all modified to bring clarity as required by the NPPF - Policy H5 Windfall sites, Policy ENV2 Important Open Spaces, Policy ENV5 Biodiversity and Habitat Connectivity, Policy ENV7 Ridge and Furrow, ENV9 Important Views, ENV11 Dark Sky, ENV 12 Flood Risk, Policy CF1 Retention of Community Facilities and Amenities, Policy CF2 New or Improved Community Facilities and Assets, Policy PC1 Broadband and Mobile Infrastructure, Policy T1 Traffic Management, Policy BE1 Support

For Existing Businesses and Employment Opportunities, Policy BE3 Homeworking, Policy BE4 Farm Diversification and Policy BE5 Tourism.

- Policy H6 Design required no modification as it was considered to take a positive approach to the increasingly important design agenda.

6.17 The Examiner stated in his report that it would be appropriate for the Council and qualifying body to be able to make consequential changes to general text as a result of his recommended modifications and to accommodate other administrative matters. The recommendations made by the Examiner, the reasons for them and what action is proposed in response to each of these is set out in Table 1 to the proposed Decision Statement. The changes proposed by the Council to correct errors and make factual updates are marked as “accuracy changes” in Table 1. It is considered that the recommended modifications (including accuracy changes) should be approved to ensure that the NDP meets the basic conditions. Further changes may also be necessary to address any factual and typographical errors and to reflect that the plan will be in its intended final form prior to the referendum. The revised NDP should then proceed to referendum in the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Area to determine if local people support it.

#### 6.18 Decision making process

6.19 The Council is required to issue its final decision on the NDP within five weeks of receiving the Examiner’s report unless the Council and QB agree a different date. The Examiner’s report was received on the 19<sup>th</sup> October 2023 meaning a decision would have to be issued by 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2023. As this date aligns with the date of this meeting of Planning Policy Committee an agreement with the Parish Council for a later date was not needed.

#### 6.20 Referendum

6.21 The referendum should be carried out for Arthingworth Parish. This is recommended by the Examiner and there are no reasons to differ from her recommendation. As set out in the proposed Decision Statement the date for the referendum is provisionally set for 8<sup>th</sup> February 2024. Prior to the referendum the suggested changes, including minor factual and typographical in nature, would be made to the NDP for it to be published as one of the specified documents in respect of the referendum.

6.22 The referendum would follow a similar format to an election. All those registered to vote within the neighbourhood area would be given the opportunity to vote. Voters would be given a ballot paper with the question (the wording of which is specified in the Regulations) “Do you want West Northamptonshire Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Arthingworth to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?” Voters would be given the opportunity to vote “yes” or “no”.

#### 6.23 Making the Plan

- 6.24 If more than 50% of those voting in the referendum vote “yes” then the Council is required to “make” the plan. If the referendum is unsuccessful then the Council takes no further action and Arthingworth Parish Council would have to decide what is wished to do.

## **7. Implications (including financial implications)**

---

### **7.1 Resources and Financial**

- 7.1.1. In accordance with guidance a local planning authority must take key decisions in the neighbourhood planning process and provide advice or assistance to a parish council, neighbourhood forum or community organisation that is producing a neighbourhood plan or Order as required by paragraph 3 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- 7.1.2. The costs of supporting and advising the Arthingworth neighbourhood plan group, formal public consultation on the plan, the appointment and funding of an independent Examiner and examination and the holding of the referendum are the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority. These cost are estimated at approximately £10k plus an amount for officer time, and will all be funded from the Council’s existing Neighbourhood Planning and Planning Policy budgets.
- 7.1.3. In his report, the examiner concludes that the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan, subject to modifications, meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a Neighbourhood Development Plan. Should the Council accept this recommendation it may, on issue of a decision statement detailing the intention to send the plan to referendum, claim against the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities Neighbourhood Planning Grant. This allows for areas where a neighbourhood plan has not previously been made a claim of £20,000 from when the local planning authority issue a decision statement detailing their intention to send the plan to referendum (as set out under Regulation 18 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012).

### **7.2 Legal**

- 7.2.1 In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 the Council is required to consider the report of the Independent Examiner. If the Council is satisfied that the plan, as modified, meets the basic requirements and all other statutory requirements, a referendum must be held.

### **7.3 Risk**

- 7.3.1 There are no significant risks arising from the proposed recommendations in this report.

### **7.4 Consultation and Communications**

7.4.1 The Council and Arthingworth Parish Council have been informing and engaging residents throughout the process through informal and formal consultations. Subject to this committee's decision, communications activities will also be undertaken to encourage participation in the future referendum.

#### 7.5 **Consideration by Overview and Scrutiny**

7.5.1 Not applicable

#### 7.6 **Climate Impact**

7.6.1 The neighbourhood plan must demonstrate that it meets the basic conditions, one of which requires the plan to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. By meeting this condition, the plan will positively contribute to reducing the impact of climate change.

#### 7.7 **Community Impact**

7.7.1 The Arthingworth NDP has been subject to formal and informal consultation in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. A Consultation Statement was produced by the qualifying body which sets out the consultation and engagement activity undertaken, what comments were received and how the plan responded to these.

### 8. **Background Papers**

---

8.1 [Report of the independent examiner](#) into the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan, 19<sup>th</sup> October 2023

8.2 Submission version of Arthingworth Neighbourhood Plan March 2023



**Appendix 1 – Proposed Decision Statement**  
**Arthingworth 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 Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan will proceed to a neighbourhood planning referendum.
- 1.2 This decision statement and copies of the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan and its supporting documentation, including the Examiner’s report are available to view on the council’s website at  
<https://www.daventrydc.gov.uk/living/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/>
- 1.3 Hard copies of this decision statement and the modified version of the neighbourhood plan are available for inspection at the following locations:
  - West Northamptonshire Council Offices (The Forum, Moat Lane, Towcester NN12 6AD and Guildhall, St Giles’ Square, Northampton, NN1 1DE)
  - Brixworth Library, Spratton Road, Brixworth, Northants, NN6 9DS (Open 9-5 Mon-Fri and 10-2 Saturday)
  - St Andrew’s Church Arthingworth, Braybrooke Road, Arthingworth, Northants LE16 8NP

**2. Background**

- 2.1 Arthingworth Parish Council, as the qualifying body, applied for Arthingworth Parish to be designated as a neighbourhood area on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2020. Following consultation on the application the council designated Arthingworth as a neighbourhood area on the 18<sup>th</sup> March 2020.
- 2.2 The draft Neighbourhood Development Plan was published by Arthingworth Parish Council for public consultation on 12<sup>th</sup> August and closed on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2022.
- 2.3 Following submission of the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development plan to the council on 26<sup>th</sup> January 2023, the plan was published by the Council for consultation. The consultation period ran from 29<sup>th</sup> March to 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2023.
- 2.4 Following the submission consultation, the council, with the agreement of the parish council, appointed an independent Examiner, Andrew Ashcroft, MRTPI to review whether the plan met the basic conditions required by the legislation and should proceed to a referendum.
- 2.5 Following the examination, the Examiner’s report was completed on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2023 and made available on the council’s 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 that the plan meets the basic conditions. Table A below sets out these modifications and the action to be taken in respect of each of them. Depending on the recommended change, these are illustrated differently in the Decision Statement and set out below. All deletions will also be shown with a ~~striketrough~~.
- Modifications of wording by the Examiner are shown as **bold** or ~~striketrough~~ 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 ~~striketrough~~ for deletions. This includes accuracy changes.
- 3.2 The Examiner has concluded that with the specified modifications the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions and other relevant legal requirements. The council concurs with this view.
- 3.3 To meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, a referendum will be held which poses the question; 'Do you want West Northamptonshire Council to use the neighbourhood plan for Arthingworth to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?'
- 3.4 The referendum will take place on Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2024 and will be held at Arthingworth Village Hall, Kelmarsh Road, LE16 8JZ.

**Appendix 1 Table 1 Examiner’s Recommended Modifications and further editorial changes to the Arthingworth Neighbourhood Development Plan and actions to be taken (set out in plan order)**

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner’s Report	Examiner’s Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
1	Pg.9, Section 5 (Para 7.12 of examiner’s report)	At the end of the paragraph add in <u>‘The Plan period is 2022 to 2029’</u>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the plan period	Amend paragraph 5.1 in accordance with examiner’s recommendation
2	Policy H1 Residential Site Allocation Pg. 15 (Para 7.19 of examiner’s report)	<p>Revise Policy as follows:</p> <p><b>Replace c) with: ‘The development of the site responds positively to the levels across the site and the existing vegetation.’</b></p> <p><b>Replace e) with: ‘The development of the site incorporates a children’s play area.’</b></p> <p>POLICY H1: RESIDENTIAL SITE ALLOCATION – Land is allocated for residential development at the following location on Kelmarsh Road as shown in figure 2, subject to:</p> <p>a) The development will provide for up to 6 dwellings;</p> <p>b) At least half of the dwellings shall be for Affordable Housing as defined by the NPPF (2021) Annex 2;</p> <p><del>c) The existing planting shall be retained as far as is practical;</del> <b>The development of the site responds</b></p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend policy H1 in accordance with examiner’s recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><b>positively to the levels across the site and the existing vegetation</b></p> <p>d) The design of the scheme shall meet the requirements of the design policy H6; and</p> <p>e) <del>Land for a children's play area of approximately 50 metres squared will be gifted to the parish council at nil cost, before building on the site can commence.</del> <b>The development of the site incorporates a children's play area</b></p>			
3	<p>Policy H2 Village Confines, Pg.17 (Para 7.40 of examiner's report)</p>	<p>Revise the Policy as follows: <b>Replace the second part of the policy with: 'Development outside the defined Village Confines will be carefully managed in accordance with national and local planning policies.'</b></p> <p>POLICY H2: VILLAGE CONFINES – Development proposals on sites within the Village Confines as identified in Figure 3, will be supported where it complies with the policies of this Neighbourhood Plan. <b>Development outside the defined Village Confines will be carefully managed in accordance with national and local planning policies.</b> <del>Land outside the defined Village Confines will be treated as open countryside, where development will be carefully managed.</del></p>	N/A	To ensure that the policy is conformity with the local plan policy	Amend Policy H2 in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
4	Figure 3, Pg. 18 (Para 7.40 of examiner's report)	<p>Revise the Village Confines on Figure 3 to exclude the proposed housing allocation (Policy H1)</p> <p>Include a separate indication of the allocation on Figure 3</p>	Include key indicating the allocation	To ensure that the village confines are drawn in accordance with Criterion B of Table 3 in policy RA3 of LPP2	Amend confines in Fig 3 in accordance with examiner's recommendation
5	Policy H3 Housing Mix, Pg.19 (Para 7.45 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>'Where practicable and viable, new housing development proposals should provide a mixture of housing types specifically to meet identified and evidenced local needs. In this context proposals which deliver smaller homes (three bedrooms or fewer) and homes suitable for older people (especially those who wish to downsize) will be particularly supported.'</b></p> <p>Policy H3: HOUSING MIX –</p> <p><b>Where practicable and viable, new housing development proposals should provide a mixture of housing types specifically to meet identified and evidenced local needs. In this context proposals which deliver smaller homes (three bedrooms or fewer) and homes suitable for older people (especially those who wish to downsize) will be particularly supported</b></p> <p><del>New housing development proposals should provide a mixture of housing types specifically to meet identified and evidenced local needs. Priority should be given to smaller family homes (3</del></p>	N/A	The policy is modified so that it comments generally about meeting local housing needs and then offers specific support for smaller homes and homes suitable for older people.	Amend policy H3 in accordance with examiner's recommendations

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><del>bedrooms or fewer) and those suitable for older people (especially those who wish to downsize). There will be a presumption against homes with 4 or more bedrooms.</del></p>			
6	Supporting text Pg.19, (Para 7.45 of examiner's report)	<p><i>As a new paragraph at the end of the supporting text add: 'Policy H3 addresses this important matter. Proposals which include homes with four or more bedrooms should identify the way in which they delivery local housing needs or the way in which they would make the delivery of the overall development commercially-viable.'</i></p>	N/A	The policy is modified so that it comments generally about meeting local housing needs. Planning process can only control size of houses rather than occupiers.	Amend supporting text in accordance with examiner's recommendations
7	Policy H4 Affordable Housing, Pg. 20 (Para 7.48 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the final part of the policy with: 'Affordable housing should be designed and delivered to be indistinguishable from market housing and, wherever practicable, should be distributed evenly throughout the development.'</b></p> <p>POLICY H4 AFFORDABLE HOUSING – Development proposals which include affordable housing should provide a mix of housing types and sizes to help meet the identified needs of the Parish. The provision of smaller homes, especially for young families and young people and for older people who wish to downsize, will be supported, as is the provision of affordable housing for people with a local connection.</p>	N/A	The policy is modified so that it acknowledges that the approach to distributing affordable housing may not always be practicable due to size or layout,	Amend policy H4 in accordance with examiner's recommendations

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><b>Affordable housing should be designed and delivered to be indistinguishable from market housing and, wherever practicable, should be distributed evenly throughout the development.</b></p> <p>Any Affordable Housing should be designed and delivered to be indistinguishable from market housing and must be distributed evenly through the development as a whole.</p>			
8	Policy H5 Windfall Sites, Pg.21 (Para 7.52 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the opening element of the policy with: 'Development proposals for infill and/or redevelopment sites comprising individual dwellings or small groups of dwellings within the Village Confines will be supported where they:'</b></p> <p><b>In a) replace 'retains' with 'retain'</b></p> <p><b>In b) replace 'provides' with 'provide'</b></p> <p><b>In c) replace 'does' with 'do', 'adversely' with 'unacceptably', and 'significant detrimental' with 'unacceptable'</b></p> <p>POLICY H5: WINDFALL SITES</p> <p>Development <b>proposals for</b> infill and/or redevelopment sites comprising individual dwellings or small groups of dwellings within the Village Confines will be supported where <b>they</b>:</p> <p>a) <b>Retains retain</b> existing important natural boundaries such as trees, hedges and streams;</p>	N/A	The policy is modified to bring clarity required by the NPPF	Amend policy H5 in accordance with examiner's recommendations

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>b) Provides <b>provide</b> for a safe vehicular and pedestrian access to the site; and</p> <p>c) <del>Does</del> <b>do</b> not reduce garden space to an extent where it <del>adversely</del> <b>unacceptably</b> impacts on the character of the area, the amenity of neighbours and the occupiers of the dwelling or has <del>an significant detrimental</del> <b>unacceptable</b> heritage or environmental impact.</p>			
9	Policy ENV1 Local Green Space, Pg.27 (Para 7.58 of examiner's report)	<p><b>In the policy replace 'permitted' with 'supported'</b></p> <p>POLICY ENV E1: LOCAL GREEN SPACES – Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or have an adverse effect on, the following Local Green Spaces (details Appendix G; location figure 5) will not be <del>permitted</del><b>supported</b> other than in very special circumstances. St Andrew's Churchyard and its setting (inventory sites 163-165) "Village Green" (168)</p>	N/A	The policy is modified to bring clarity required by the NPPF	Amend Policy ENV1 in accordance with examiner's recommendations
10	Local Green Space, Pg.26 (Para 7.58 of examiner's report)	<p><i>At the end of the supporting text add: 'Policy ENV1 follows the matter-of-fact approach in the NPPF. If development proposals come forward on the local green spaces within the Plan period, they can be assessed on a case-by-case basis by West Northamptonshire Council. It will be able to make an informed judgement on the extent to which the proposal concerned demonstrates the 'very special circumstances' required by the policy'</i></p>	N/A	The additional supporting text helps clarify the policy	Amend supporting text in accordance with examiner's recommendations



Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
11	Local Green Space, Pg.26 (Para 7.58 of examiner's report)	On Figure 5 revise the boundaries of the Village Green LGS to exclude the road and the associated highway verges.		To ensure clarity to the designation on the map	Amend Figure 5 in accordance with examiner's recommendations
12	Policy ENV2 Important Open Spaces, Pg.29 (Para 7.60 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace 'significant adverse effect' with 'unacceptable effect'</b></p> <p>POLICY ENV E2: IMPORTANT OPEN SPACES – The following open spaces (locations, figures 6.1, 6.2; details, Appendix F) are of high local value for recreation, beauty, amenity, or tranquillity, within or close to the built-up area. Development proposals that result in their loss, or have <b>an significant-adverse unacceptable</b> effect on them, will not be supported unless the open space is replaced by at least equivalent provision in an equally suitable location, or unless it can be demonstrated that the open space is no longer required by the community.+</p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy ENV2 in accordance with examiner's recommendations
13	Policy ENV3 Sites and Features of Natural Environmental Significance, Pg.30 (Para 7.65 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace 'The sites...have been identified' with 'The sites and features shown on figures 7.1 and 7.2 are identified'</b></p> <p>POLICY ENV E3: SITES AND FEATURES OF NATURAL ENVIRONMENT SIGNIFICANCE – The sites and features <b>shown on figures 7.1 and 7.2 are identified</b></p>	N/A	Modify policy to ensure that it more clearly identifies the features which are addressed by the policy	Amend Policy ENV3 in accordance with examiner's recommendations

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>mapped here (figures 7.1 and 7.2; details in Appendix F) have been identified as being of at least local significance for their natural environment significance. They are ecologically important in their own right, make a local contribution to carbon sequestration, and are locally valued. Development proposals that would have a detrimental impact on a site of historic environment significance will not be supported unless the need for and benefits arising from development in that location clearly outweigh the loss. Development is also required to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity, or the BNG metric in force at the time.</p>			
14	Supporting text Pg.30 (Para 7.65 of examiner's report)	<p><i>At the end of the supporting text as a new paragraph add:</i></p> <p><i>'Policy ENV3 seeks to safeguard these important features of the neighbourhood area. It balances the significance of the sites with the importance of the development proposed to the local community. The sites have been identified as being of local significance for their environmental features (natural and/or historic).'</i></p>	N/A	Additional supporting text to further explain the purpose of the policy	Include additional paragraph in supporting text in accordance with examiner's recommendations
15	Policy ENV4 Woodland and Notable Trees, Pg.33	<b>Replace the policy with:</b>	N/A	To ensure that the policy more closely relates to the	Amend Policy ENV4 in accordance with

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
	(Para 7.68 of examiner's report)	<p><b>'Development proposals should protect woodland and notable trees of arboricultural, biodiversity and landscape importance (as shown on Figure 8) from loss or damage and integrate them sensitively into the overall design.</b></p> <p><b>Proposals which use trees and hedges to enhance the appearance, amenity and biodiversity value of the site will be supported.'</b></p> <p><del>POLICY ENV 4: WOODLAND AND NOTABLE TREES – Woodland and notable trees (figure 8) of arboricultural, biodiversity and landscape importance should be protected from loss or damage in development proposals and integrated into their design. Proposals which use trees and hedges to enhance the appearance, amenity and biodiversity value of the site will be supported.</del></p> <p><del>Development proposals should be accompanied by an arboricultural survey (BS5837:2012 standard or its equivalent) to establish the health and longevity of trees on the site. Biodiversity Metric 3.0 or the Small Sites metric should be used to calculate the</del></p>		development management process and can be applied consistently	examiner's recommendations.

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>wildlife value of proposal sites, as appropriate; where damage or loss is unavoidable, the developer should provide or arrange for replacement woodland, trees and/or hedges of at least equivalent type (habitat), quantity and/or scale to deliver a net gain in biodiversity and to protect amenity.</p> <p><b>Development proposals should protect woodland and notable trees of arboricultural, biodiversity and landscape importance (as shown on Figure 8) from loss or damage and integrate them sensitively into the overall design.</b></p> <p><b>Proposals which use trees and hedges to enhance the appearance, amenity and biodiversity value of the site will be supported.</b></p>			
16	Supporting text Pg.32 (Para 7.68 of examiner's report)	At the end of the supporting text (as a new paragraph) add: 'Policy ENV4 addresses this matter. As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should be accompanied by an arboricultural survey (BS5837:2012 standard or its equivalent) to establish the health and longevity of trees on the site. Biodiversity Metric 3.0 or the Small Sites	N/A	The final part of the policy relates to process rather than policy	Amend Policy ENV4 in accordance with the examiner's recommendations

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		metric should be used to calculate the wildlife value of development sites. Where damage or loss of trees is unavoidable, the developer should provide or arrange for replacement woodland, trees and/or hedges of at least equivalent type (habitat), quantity and/or scale to deliver a net gain in biodiversity and to protect amenity.'			
17	ENV5 Biodiversity and Habitat Connectivity, Pg.34 (Para 7.71 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>'Development proposals should safeguard habitats and species, including those of local significance, by planning for biodiversity net gain. Where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, development proposals should incorporate their relocation to an alternative site with less harmful impacts, ensuring adequate mitigated, or appropriate compensated.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals should also achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity, or the biodiversity net gain metric in force at the time.</b></p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy ENV5 in accordance with the examiner's recommendations

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><b>Development proposals should respond positively to the habitat connectivity provided by the wildlife corridors identified in Figure 9.'</b></p> <p>POLICY ENV 5 BIODIVERSITY AND HABITAT CONNECTIVITY—All new development proposals will be expected to safeguard habitats and species, including those of local significance, by planning for biodiversity net gain. If significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided (through relocating to an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or compensated for, planning permission should be refused, in conformity with paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and following the objectives of the biodiversity net gain (metric 3.0 and small sites) methodology. Development is also required to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity, or the BNG metric in force at the time.</p>			

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>Development proposals should not adversely affect the habitat connectivity provided by the wildlife corridors identified in figure 9.</p> <p><b>Development proposals should safeguard habitats and species, including those of local significance, by planning for biodiversity net gain. Where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, development proposals should incorporate their relocation to an alternative site with less harmful impacts, ensuring adequate mitigated, or appropriate compensated.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals should also achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity, or the biodiversity net gain metric in force at the time.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals should respond positively to the habitat connectivity provided by the wildlife corridors identified in Figure 9.</b></p>			

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
18	Supporting text Pg.34 (Para 7.71 of examiner's report)	<i>At the end of the supporting text (as a new paragraph) add: 'Policy ENV5 sets out the Plan's approach to this important matter. If significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided (through relocating to an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or compensated, development proposals will not be supported in accordance with paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 and following the objectives of the biodiversity net gain (metric 3.0 and small sites) methodology.'</i>	Subsequent re numbering of paragraphs	Consolidated supporting text to better explain the purpose of the policy and identifies for development proposals which do not meet the requirements of the policy.	Amend supporting text in accordance with examiner's recommendations
19	Policy ENV6 Sites of Historical Environment Significance Pg. 35 (Para 7.73 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Delete the second part of the policy</b></p> <p><i>Reposition the deleted second part of the policy to the end of the supporting text.</i></p> <p>POLICY ENV 6: SITES OF HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT SIGNIFICANCE - The sites mapped in figure 10 (details in Appendix F) are of at least local significance for their historical features. The features are extant and have visible expression or there is proven buried archaeology on the site, and they are locally valued. The significance of the features present should be balanced against the local benefit of any development that would affect</p>	N/A	The final part of the policy relates to process rather than policy, which is better positioned in supporting text.	Amend Policy ENV6 in accordance with examiner's recommendation



Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>or damage them. Professional advice should be sought, and appropriate assessment undertaken to assess the extent and significance of any heritage assets which may be affected by proposals prior to development commencing</p>			
20	Supporting text Pg.35 (Para 7.73 of examiner's report)	<p><i>Reposition the deleted second part of the policy to the end of the supporting text.</i></p> <p>Professional advice should be sought, and appropriate assessment undertaken to assess the extent and significance of any heritage assets which may be affected by proposals prior to development commencing</p>			
21	Policy ENV 7 Ridge and Furrow Pg.38 (Para 7.76 of Examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the first part of the policy with:</b>  <b>'The areas of ridge and furrow earthworks shown in figure 11.2 are identified as non-designated local heritage assets.'</b></p> <p><b>Replace the second part of the policy with:</b>  <b>'In assessing development proposals which would involve any loss or damage to an identified area of ridge and furrow earthwork on Figure 11.2 the benefits of the development will be balanced against the significance of the feature concerned as a heritage asset'</b></p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy ENV7 in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>POLICY ENV 7: RIDGE AND FURROW</p> <p>The areas of ridge and furrow earthworks mapped <del>mapped</del> <b>shown</b> in figure 11.2 are <b>identified as</b> non-designated local heritage assets.</p> <p><b>In assessing development proposals which would involve any loss or damage to an identified area of ridge and furrow earthwork on Figure 11.2 the benefits of the development will be balanced against the significance of the feature concerned as a heritage asset.</b></p> <p><del>Any loss or damage arising from a development proposal (or a change of land use requiring planning permission) is to be avoided; the local benefits of such development must be balanced against the significance of the ridge and furrow features as heritage assets.</del></p>			
22	Policy ENV8 Local Heritage Assets Pg.40 (Para 7.79 of examiner's report)	<b>In the first part of the policy delete the final sentence.</b>	N/A	To ensure that the policy accords with national policy	Amend local heritage assets to non designated heritage assets through the policy and supporting

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><b>Throughout the policy, the supporting text and the figures replace references to 'local heritage assets' with 'non-designated heritage assets'</b></p> <p><b>POLICY ENV 8: LOCAL NON DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS –</b></p> <p>The buildings and structures listed here (details Appendix H, location map Figure 13) are non-designated local heritage assets. They are important for their contribution to the layout and characteristic mix of architectural styles in the village, and their features and settings will be protected wherever possible. <del>Any harm arising from a development proposal or a change of use requiring planning approval affecting any of them will need to be balanced against their significance as heritage assets.</del></p> <p>Development proposals that affect the identified buildings or their settings, should conserve the significant features which make them important. In considering planning applications that affect directly or indirectly a non-designated heritage asset and/or its setting, a balanced judgment will be required having regard to the significance of the building</p>			text and figures in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>or structure and the scale of any harm or loss of the building or structure or its features</p> <p>LL-1 Sunnybank  LL-2 Inn Yard Court  LL-3 Agricultural cottages  LL-4 Bulls Head PH  LL-5 Village Hall  LL-6 Old School House  LL-7 Church Farm  LL-8 Manor Lodge  LL-9 Siddoms Bridge</p>			
23	Supporting text Local Heritage Assets Pg.40 (Para 7.79 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Throughout the policy, the supporting text and the figures replace references to 'local heritage assets' with 'non-designated heritage assets'</b></p> <p><del>Local</del><b>Non-Designated</b> heritage assets</p> <p>To add local detail to the above statutory designations, the Neighbourhood Plan identifies nine further buildings and structures in the built environment of the Plan Area that are considered to be of local significance for architectural, historical or social reasons (details in Appendix H). The list below (policy EN<del>V</del> 8) uses Historic England criteria for evaluation and justification. Listing here records them in the Planning system as non-designated heritage assets.</p>	N/A	To ensure that the policy accords with national policy	Amend local heritage assets to non-designated heritage assets through the policy and supporting text and figures in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
24	Policy ENV9 Important Views, Pg.42 ( Para 7.82 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b>  <b>'The Plan identifies the following important views (as shown on Figure 14). [Thereafter list the views].</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals which would affect the identified views should be designed to ensure that their layout, scale, and mass respect the significance and character of the views concerned. Where necessary, development proposals should include measures to mitigate the effects of the development on the important view concerned.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals which would have an unacceptable impact on an important view will not be supported.'</b></p> <p><del>POLICY ENV 9: IMPORTANT VIEWS —The following views (map figure 14, details Appendix I) are important to the setting and character of the village. Development proposals should respect and whenever possible protect them. Development which would have an adverse impact on the identified views will not be supported.</del></p> <p><b>The Plan identifies the following important views (as shown on Figure 14)</b></p> <p>1. From Brampton Way east along the bridleway to the village and its hilltop setting</p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy ENV9 in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>2. From Clark's Spinney north across the valley to the village</p> <p>3. From Desborough Road toward the village</p> <p>4. From Half Farm buildings to the parish boundary in the direction of Naseby</p> <p>5. From the churchyard northeast across the parkland to the old Manor House</p> <p>6. From far northwest corner of the parish, southeast to the village</p> <p><b>Development proposals which would affect the identified views should be designed to ensure that their layout, scale, and mass respect the significance and character of the views concerned. Where necessary, development proposals should include measures to mitigate the effects of the development on the important view concerned.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals which would have an unacceptable impact on an important view will not be supported.'</b></p>			
25	Supporting text Pg.42 (Para 7.82 of examiner's report)	<p><i>At the end of the second paragraph of the supporting text add: 'Policy ENV9 provides a context to ensure that new developments respect the identified views. It sits within the wider context set by Policy ENV2 (Special Landscape Areas) of the Local Plan Part 2. Where necessary, development proposals should include appropriate mitigation measures. Plainly</i></p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF and consequential modifications to the supporting text.	Amend supporting text in accordance with examiners recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><i>they will vary on a case-by-case basis. However, they could include reduced or varied heights of buildings, the provision of gaps through development by sensitive layout planning, landscaping, or tree-planting to soften the impact of built structures in a rural landscape.'</i></p>			
26	<p>Policy ENV10 Footpaths and other Walking Routes, Pg.44 (Para 7.84 of the examiner's report)</p>	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b>  <b>'Development proposals should respond positively to the existing network of footpaths (as shown on figure 15).</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have an unacceptable effect on, the existing network of footpaths will not be supported unless appropriate mitigation is included within the overall package.</b></p> <p><del>POLICY ENV 10: FOOTPATHS AND OTHER WALKING ROUTES - Development proposals <b>should respond positively</b> that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, to the existing network of footpaths (as shown on figure 15). will not be supported without appropriate mitigation.</del></p> <p><b>Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have an unacceptable effect on, the existing network of footpaths will not be</b></p>	N/A	To ensure the policy is positively prepared.	Amend Policy ENV10 in accordance with the examiner's report

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		supported unless appropriate mitigation is included within the overall package.			
27	Policy ENV11 Dark Sky., Pg.45 (Para 7.87 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b>  <b>'Development proposals should conserve and enhance the relative tranquillity in relation to light pollution and dark night skies.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals should also demonstrate that they meet or exceed the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance and other relevant standards or guidance (such as the CIE 150:2003 Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations), or any equivalent replacement/updated guidance for lighting within environmental zones.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals which include lighting should ensure that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>the measured and observed sky quality in the surrounding area is not reduced;</b></li> <li>• <b>the lighting concerned is not unnecessarily visible in nearby designated and key habitats;</b></li> </ul>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend policy ENV11 in accordance with the examiner's report



Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the visibility of lighting from the surrounding landscape is avoided; and</li> <li>• building designs should avoid large areas of glazing which would result in light spillage into rural and unlit areas.'</li> </ul> <p>POLICY ENV-11: DARK SKY –</p> <p>Development proposals should conserve and enhance the relative tranquillity in relation to light pollution and dark night skies.</p> <p>Development proposals should also demonstrate that they meet or exceed the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance and other relevant standards or guidance (such as the CIE 150:2003 Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations), or any equivalent replacement/updated guidance for lighting within environmental zones.</p> <p>Development proposals which include lighting should ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the measured and observed sky quality in the surrounding area is not reduced;</li> </ul>			

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the lighting concerned is not unnecessarily visible in nearby designated and key habitats;</li> <li>• the visibility of lighting from the surrounding landscape is avoided; and</li> <li>• building designs should avoid large areas of glazing which would result in light spillage into rural and unlit areas.'</li> </ul> <p>In recognition of the Plan Area's status as part of a dark sky zone, development proposals for or incorporating external lighting should include a full lighting scheme to demonstrate that the lighting is the minimum required for its purpose, is directed downwards with a beam angle below 70°, and that there will be no significant adverse effects individually or cumulatively on the character of the area, on the residential amenity of residents, or on wildlife. Lighting design, location, type, lux levels and times of use should follow current best practice for bats and other nocturnal wildlife, e.g. by applying the guidelines in Guidance note 08/18 Bats and artificial lighting in the UK (Bat Conservation Trust / Institution of Lighting Professionals, 2018).</p>			

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
28	Policy ENV12 Flood Risk Resilience, Pg.46 (Para 7.90 of examiner's report)	<p><b>In the second paragraph of the policy replace 'adversely' with 'unacceptably'</b></p> <p><b>Delete the third part of the policy.</b></p> <p>POLICY ENV 12: FLOOD RISK RESILIENCE – Development proposals within the areas indicated in Figure 17 will be required, where appropriate, to demonstrate that the benefit of development outweighs the harm in relation to its adverse impact on climate change targets, and on the likelihood of it conflicting with locally applicable flood mitigation strategies and infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposals to construct new (or modify existing) floodwater management infrastructure (ditches, roadside gullies, retention pools, etc.), including within or close to the built-up area, will be supported, provided they do not <b>unacceptably adversely</b> affect sites and features of natural or historical environment significance.</p> <p><del>Development proposals of one or more dwellings and/or for employment or agricultural development should demonstrate that:</del></p> <p><del>-if in a location susceptible to flooding from rivers or surface water, no alternative site to meet the local residential development need is available;</del></p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy EN12 in accordance with the examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-its location and design respect the geology, flood risk and natural drainage characteristics of the immediate area and is accompanied by a hydrological study whose findings must be complied with in respect of design, groundworks and construction;</li> <li>-it includes a Surface Water Drainage Strategy which demonstrates that the proposed drainage scheme, and site layout and design, will prevent properties from flooding from surface water, including allowing for climate change effects, and that flood risk elsewhere will not be exacerbated by increased levels of surface water runoff and that the development will not threaten other natural habitats and water systems;</li> <li>- its design includes, as appropriate, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) with ongoing maintenance provision, other surface water management measures and permeable surfaces;</li> <li>- proposed SuDs infrastructure includes, where practicable, habitat creation comprising e.g. landscaping, access and egress for aquatic and terrestrial animals, and native species planting;</li> <li>- it does not increase the risk of flooding to third parties; and</li> <li>-it takes the effects of climate change into account.</li> </ul>			
29	Supporting Text Pg. 45	<i>At the end of the second paragraph of the supporting text add the deleted third part of the policy.</i>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as	Amend Policy EN12 in accordance with the

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
	(Para 7.90 of examiner's report)	<p>In light of this, it is particularly important that the location and technical standards of all new development proposals in the Plan Area should in future be judged on their likely contribution to flooding in a climate change world. To complement this objective, the community will support proposals to improve the infrastructure within the built-up areas for managing flooding from the river and from surface water run-off events, providing this is not unduly detrimental to the historic built environment, the archaeological resource, biodiversity sites, or open and green spaces.</p> <p><b>Development proposals of one or more dwellings and/or for employment or agricultural development should demonstrate that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· if in a location susceptible to flooding from rivers or surface water, no alternative site to meet the local residential development need is available;</li> <li>· its location and design respect the geology, flood risk and natural drainage characteristics of the immediate area and is accompanied by a hydrological study whose findings must be complied with in respect of design, groundworks and construction;</li> <li>· it includes a Surface Water Drainage Strategy which demonstrates that the proposed drainage scheme, and site layout and design, will prevent</li> </ul>		required by the NPPF.	examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>properties from flooding from surface water, including allowing for climate change effects, and that flood risk elsewhere will not be exacerbated by increased levels of surface water runoff and that the development will not threaten other natural habitats and water systems;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· its design includes, as appropriate, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) with ongoing maintenance provision, other surface water management measures and permeable surfaces;</li> <li>· proposed SuDs infrastructure includes, where practicable, habitat creation comprising e.g. landscaping, access and egress for aquatic and terrestrial animals, and native species planting;</li> <li>· it does not increase the risk of flooding to third parties; and</li> <li>· it takes the effects of climate change into account.</li> </ul>			
30	Policy CF1 Retention of Community Facilities and Amenities, Pg.50 (Para 7.93 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the opening element of the policy with: Development proposals which would result in the loss of an existing community facility will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that:</b></p> <p><del>POLICY CF1: RETENTION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES, AMENITIES AND ASSETS - Development leading to the loss of an existing community facility, including the village hall, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that:</del></p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy CF1 in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><b>Development proposals which would result in the loss of an existing community facility will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that:</b></p> <p>a) There is no longer any need or demand for the existing community facility; or</p> <p>b) The existing community facility is, demonstrably, not economically viable or able to be supported by the community – such viability and support includes fundraising and volunteering by parishioners and others and subject to a marketing campaign for 12 months; or</p> <p>c) The proposal makes alternative provision for the relocation of the existing community facility to an equally or more appropriate and accessible location within the parish which complies with the other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>			
31	Policy CF2 New or improved community facilities and assets, Pg.51 (Para 7.95 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace c) with: 'provides appropriate levels of car parking'</b></p> <p>POLICY CF2: NEW OR IMPROVED COMMUNITY FACILITIES - Proposals that improve the quality and/or range of community facilities, will be supported provided that the development:</p> <p>a) Meets the design criteria stated in Policy H6;</p> <p>b) Will not result in unacceptable traffic movements or other disturbance to residential properties;</p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy CF2 in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>c) <del>Will not generate a need for parking that cannot be adequately catered for;</del> <b>'provides appropriate levels of car parking'</b></p> <p>d) Is of a scale appropriate to the needs of the locality and conveniently accessible for residents of the village wishing to walk or cycle; and</p> <p>e) Takes into full account the needs of people with disabilities</p>			
32	<p>Policy PC1 Broadband and Mobile Infrastructure, Pg.51 (Para 7.98 of examiner's report)</p>	<p><b>At the beginning of the first and second parts of the policy add:</b></p> <p><b>'Insofar as planning permission is required'</b></p> <p><b>In the third part of the policy replace 'must' with 'should'</b></p> <p>POLICY PC1: BROADBAND AND MOBILE INFRASTRUCTURE - <b>Insofar as planning permission is required</b> Proposals to provide improved access to faster broadband for all businesses and households in Arthingworth Parish will be supported. This includes suitable connectivity for future generations of mobile technology.</p> <p><b>Insofar as planning permission is required</b> Improvements to the mobile telecommunication network that serves all businesses and households within the parish will be supported. If a new mast is</p>	N/A	<p>To ensure clarity of policy and that the wording used is appropriate for a neighbourhood plan policy.</p>	<p>Amend Policy PC1 in accordance with examiner's recommendation</p>



Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>installed, this should be shared, where possible, by more than one provider.</p> <p>Any infrastructure improvements requiring above ground network installations, <del>must</del> <b>should</b> be sympathetically located and designed to integrate into the local area.</p>			
33	Policy T1 Traffic Management, Pg.53 (Para 101 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the opening element of the policy with: 'As appropriate to its scale, nature and location, new housing and commercial development should:'</b></p> <p><b>Replace e) and f) with: 'incorporate appropriate traffic calming and the improvement of footpaths and cycle ways networks in the immediate locality.'</b></p> <p><del>POLICY T1: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT - With particular regard to the rural highway network of the Parish and the need to minimise any increase in vehicular traffic, all new housing and commercial development must:</del> <b>As appropriate to its scale, nature and location, new housing and commercial development should:</b></p> <p>a) Be designed to minimize additional traffic generation and movement through the village;</p> <p>b) Incorporate sufficient off-road parking;</p> <p>c) Not remove or compromise the use of any existing off-road parking areas unless a suitable equivalent alternative is provided;</p>	N/A	To allow simplification of the policy to improve its clarity.	Amend Policy T1 in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>d) Provide any necessary improvements to site access, communal parking and the highway network either directly or by financial contributions;</p> <p>e) <del>Consider the introduction of appropriate traffic calming where appropriate; and</del> <b>incorporate appropriate traffic calming and the improvement of footpaths and cycle ways networks in the immediate locality</b></p> <p>f) <del>Consider, where appropriate, the improvement and where possible the creation of, footpaths and cycle ways.</del></p>			
34	Policy T2: Electric Vehicles, Pg.54 (Para 103 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Delete the policy</b></p> <p><del>POLICY T2: ELECTRIC VEHICLES - Residential development of one dwelling or more should provide the most powerful appropriate cabling to the most practical point in the home to facilitate subsequent installation of a home electric vehicle charging point.</del></p> <p><del>The provision of communal vehicular charging points within the parish will be supported where there is universal access and they do not impact negatively on the availability of existing parking within the parish.</del></p>	Subsequent reordering of paragraph numbers Policy T3 becomes Policy T2	The need for the policy has been overtaken by national policy as Part S of Building Regulations for electric vehicle charging are now in place	Delete policy in accordance with examiner's recommendation
	Supporting Text Pg.54 Neighbourhood Plan	<i>Delete the supporting text (including the Electric Vehicles heading).</i>	Subsequent reordering of	The need for the policy has been overtaken by	Delete supporting text in accordance

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
	(Para 103 of examiner's report)	<p><del>Electric vehicles are growing in popularity underpinned by the Government's intention to ban sales of new petrol and diesel cars from 2030. In the parish survey, almost 8% of respondent's cars are fully electric or hybrid.</del></p> <p><del>Currently, residential charging is the norm but generally only possible where off road parking is available. For those without off road parking, vehicle charging is a big issue. It is important that more publicly available rapid charging points are created. These could be installed at locations within the parish, for example the Village Hall.</del></p> <p><del>Central Government strategy aimed at reducing atmospheric pollution recommends that 25% of all car parks should have charging points by 2025. The Parish Council therefore must explore all opportunities to support this pressing aspiration.</del></p>	paragraph numbers	national policy as Part S of Building Regulations for electric vehicle charging are now in place	with examiner's recommendation
35	Policy T3 Pedestrian Footpaths, Pavements and Cycleways, Pg. 55 (Para 7.105 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the policy with: 'Proposals for the extension of the footpath and cycle network in the parish will be supported'</b></p> <p><b>POLICY T3 T2: PEDESTRIAN FOOTPATHS, PAVEMENTS AND CYCLE WAYS – Proposals for the extension of the footpath and cycle</b></p>	Renumber Policy to T2	Elements referring to maintenance and upgrading are deleted from the policy as they are	Amend Policy T3 in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p><b>network in the parish will be supported.</b>  <del>The maintenance, upgrading and, where appropriate, extension of the footpath and cycle network in the parish will be supported in order to: a) Service new developments and connect them to the existing network; and b) Provide an improved and more extensive foot/cycle path network to support exercise and leisure activities for residents and visitors.</del></p>		unlikely to constitute development.	
36	Policy BE1 Support for Existing Businesses and Employment Opportunities, Pg. 55 (Para 7.107 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the second sentence of the policy with: 'Development proposals for a change of use or the redevelopment of a business or commercial use to an activity which does not provide employment opportunities will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that:'</b></p> <p>POLICY BE1: SUPPORT FOR EXISTING BUSINESSES &amp; EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES - There will be a presumption against the loss of commercial premises or land that provides employment opportunities. <b>Development proposals for a change of use or the redevelopment of a business or commercial use to an activity which does not provide employment opportunities will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that:</b>  <del>Applications for a change of use to an activity that does not provide employment opportunities will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that:</del></p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy BE1 in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>a) The commercial premises or land in question has not been in active use for at least 12 months; and</p> <p>b) The commercial premises or land in question has no potential for either reoccupation or redevelopment for employment generating uses and as demonstrated through the results both of a full valuation report and a marketing campaign lasting for a continuous period of at least 6 months.</p>			
37	Policy BE2 Support for new businesses and employment, Pg. 56 (Para 7.110 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the opening element of the policy with: 'Proposals for new employment development will be supported where they comply with the following criteria:'</b></p> <p><b>In a) replace 'fall' with 'they fall'</b></p> <p><b>In b) replace 'where possible be sited' with 'where practicable they are sited'</b></p> <p><b>In c) replace 'be' with 'they are'</b></p> <p><b>In d) replace 'not involve' with 'they would not involve'</b></p> <p><b>In e) to g) insert 'they would' at the beginning of each of the criteria.</b></p>	N/A	To ensure policy has an approach necessary for a development plan policy	Amend Policy BE2 in accordance with examiner's recommendation

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>POLICY BE2: SUPPORT FOR NEW BUSINESSES AND EMPLOYMENT - <del>In supporting additional employment opportunities, new development will be required to</del> <b>Proposals for new employment development will be supported where they comply with the following criteria</b></p> <p>a) <del>they</del> <b>they</b> Fall within the village confines, unless it relates to small scale leisure or tourism activities, or other forms of commercial/employment related development appropriate to a countryside location;</p> <p>b) <del>Where possible</del> <b>practicable</b>, be sited in existing buildings or on areas of previously developed land;</p> <p>c) <del>Be</del> <b>they are</b> of a size and scale not adversely affecting the character, infrastructure and environment of the village itself and the Plan area, including the countryside;</p> <p>d) <del>Not generally involve</del> <b>they would not involve</b> the loss of dwellings;</p> <p>e) <b>they would not</b> increase noise levels or light pollution or introduce any pollution to an</p>			

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>extent that they would unacceptably disturb occupants of nearby residential property;</p> <p>f) <b>they would not</b> generate unacceptable levels of traffic movement and on-road parking, and provide sufficient off-road parking spaces;</p> <p>g) <b>they would</b> contribute to the character, the design of the local built environment and the vitality of the local area; and</p> <p>h) <b>they would</b> be well integrated into and complement existing businesses.</p>			
38	Policy BE3 Home working (Para 7.112 of examiner's report), Pg.57	<p><b>In b) replace 'significant adverse' with 'unacceptable'</b></p> <p><b>In c) replace 'shall be' with 'are'</b></p> <p>POLICY BE3: HOME WORKING – Where planning permission is required, proposals for the use of part of a dwelling for office, and for small-scale free-standing buildings within its boundaries, extensions to the dwelling or conversion of outbuildings for those uses, will be supported where:</p> <p>a) Such development will not result in unacceptable traffic movements and that appropriate parking provision is made;</p> <p>b) No <del>significant adverse</del> <b>unacceptable</b> impact arises to nearby residents or other sensitive land uses from</p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy BE3 in accordance with examiner's recommendations

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>noise, fumes, light pollution, or other nuisance associated with the work activity; and</p> <p>c) Any extension or free-standing building shall be <del>are</del> designed having regard to policies in this Plan and should not detract from the quality and character of the building to which they are subservient by reason of height, scale, massing, location or the facing materials used in their construction.</p>			
39	Policy BE4 Farm Diversification, Pg. 58 (Para 7.114 of examiner's report)	<p><b>Replace the opening element of the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>'Proposals for the conversion of existing agricultural buildings to employment-related uses will be supported subject to:'</b></p> <p><b>In c) replace 'adverse' with 'unacceptable'</b></p> <p><b>In e) replace 'There is no.... on neighbours' with 'The development will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of residential properties in the immediate locality'</b></p> <p><del>POLICY BE4: FARM DIVERSIFICATION - The major use of land within the parish is agricultural. The maintenance of this land as agriculture and for biodiversity of wildlife is strongly supported. In recognition of farms that wish to diversify and the sustainable growth and expansion of businesses, the</del></p>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy BE4 in accordance with examiner's recommendations



Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>improvement of existing agricultural and commercial buildings will be supported where:</p> <p><b>Proposals for the conversion of existing agricultural buildings to employment-related uses will be supported subject to:</b></p> <p>a) The use proposed is appropriate to the rural location;</p> <p>b) The conversion/adaptation works respect the local character of the surrounding area;</p> <p>c) The development will not have an <del>adverse</del> <b>unacceptable</b> impact on any archaeological, architectural, historic or environmental features;</p> <p>d) The local road system is capable of accommodating the traffic generated by the proposed new use and adequate parking can be accommodated within the site; and</p> <p>e) There is no significant adverse impact on neighbours through noise, light or other pollution, increased traffic levels or increased flood risk. <b>The development will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of residential properties in the immediate locality.</b></p>			
40	Policy BE5 Tourism, Pg.58 (Para 7.116 of examiner's report)	<b>Replace the opening part of the policy with: 'Development proposals to enhance and/or manage tourism facilities will be supported subject to the following criteria:'</b>	N/A	To ensure clarity of the policy as required by the NPPF.	Amend Policy BE5 in accordance with examiner's recommendations

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		<p>In b) replace 'do not have a detrimental' with 'they do not have an unacceptable'</p> <p>In c) replace 'do not adversely affect' with 'they do not have an unacceptable effect on'</p> <p>Replace d) with 'they provide appropriate levels of off-road car parking'</p> <p>In f) replace 'feasible with 'practicable'</p> <p>POLICY BE5: TOURISM - Support will be given to facilities to enhance tourism where they:</p> <p><b>Development proposals to enhance and/or manage tourism facilities will be supported subject to the following criteria</b></p> <p>a) Are on a scale appropriate to the settlement;</p> <p>b) Do not have a detrimental—<b>an unacceptable</b> effect on the distinctive rural character of the Parish;</p> <p>c) Do not adversely affect <b>They do not have an unacceptable effect on</b> the surrounding infrastructure, particularly local road networks;</p> <p>d) Do not result in more on road parking; <b>they provide appropriate levels of off-road car parking'</b></p> <p>e) Benefit the local community, through for</p>			

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		instance, provision of local employment opportunities and improvements to local service provision, and is proportionate to the size of settlement in which it is located; and f) Where <del>feasible</del> , <b>practicable</b> involve the re-use of existing buildings.			
41	Monitoring Review, Pg.59 (Para 7.120 of examiner's report)	In the first paragraph of Section 8 replace '2031' with '2029'  The Neighbourhood Plan will last for a period up to <del>2031</del> . <b>2029</b> . During this time, the circumstances which it seeks to address could change	N/A	Modification to text so they correspond to the correct plan period	Amend supporting text in accordance with examiner's recommendation.
42	Other Matters - General (Para 7.12.1 of examiner's report)	Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies and to accommodate any administrative and technical changes.	N/A	To ensure clarity to the plan	Amend general text where necessary in accordance with examiner's recommendation.
	Introduction, Pg.5 Other Matters – Specific (Para 7.122 of examiner's report)	Replace the fourth paragraph of the Introduction with: 'A neighbourhood plan can be general or more detailed, depending on what local people want. However, they have must have regard for national planning policies and be prepared in a prescribed manner. In addition, they should be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development	N/A	To improve legibility to the plan	Amend Introduction in accordance with examiner's report

Recommendation ID number	Page/Para/Policy reference in Submission Version of NDP and para in Examiner's Report	Examiner's Recommendation	Details of further editorial changes	Reason	Action to be taken
		plan (here the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (Local Plan Part 1 and the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan Part 2).'			
43	Other Matters - Policy Numbering (Para 7.125 of examiner's report)	<p>Consider the use of a different prefix for the ENV policies.</p> <p>Amend the ENV Policy prefix from 'ENV' to 'E'</p> <p><del>ENV1</del> <b>E1</b> Local Green Spaces</p> <p><del>ENV2</del> <b>E2</b> Important Open Spaces</p> <p><del>ENV3</del> <b>E3</b> Sites and Features of Natural Environment Significance</p> <p><del>ENV4</del> <b>E4</b> Woodland and Notable Trees</p> <p><del>ENV5</del> <b>E5</b> Biodiversity and Habitat Connectivity</p> <p><del>ENV6</del> <b>E6</b> Sites of Historical Environment Significance</p> <p><del>ENV7</del> <b>E7</b> Ridge and Furrow</p> <p><del>ENV8</del> <b>E8</b> Local <b>Non Designated</b> Heritage Assets</p> <p><del>ENV9</del> <b>E9</b> Important Views</p> <p><del>ENV10</del> <b>E10</b> Footpaths and Other Walking Routes</p> <p><del>ENV11</del> <b>E11</b> Dark Sky</p> <p><del>ENV12</del> <b>E12</b> Flood Risk Resilience</p>	Amend any reference to the ENV Policies to 'E' throughout document	To avoid confusion with the referencing of environment policies in Local Plan Part 2	Amend Policy prefix ENV1 – ENV12 to E1-E12 in accordance with Examiner's report.