

WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNCIL PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

28 JUNE 2022

PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING, BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND RURAL
AFFAIRS: COUNCILLOR REBECCA BREESE

Report Title	Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan
Report Author	Jane Parry, Senior Planning Policy Officer jane.parry@westnorthants.gov.uk

Contributors / Checkers / Approvers		
West S151	Martin Henry, Executive Director Finance	13/05/22
Director	Stuart Timmiss, Executive Director Place, Economy & Environment	13/05/22
Legal	Theresa Boyd	30/05/22 & 31/05/22
Head of Communications	Becky Hutson, Marketing and Communications Manager	13/05/22

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Proposed Decision Statement including Table A, Examiner’s recommended modifications and further editorial changes to the Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan and actions to be taken

Appendix 2 – Map of Kilsby Neighbourhood Area

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For members to consider the recommendations of the independent Examiner following the examination of the Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan (Kilsby Review NDP).

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 The report summarises the process which has been followed to produce the Kilsby Review NDP and presents the outcomes of the independent examination, including the Examiner's recommendations. It recommends that the Kilsby Review NDP is "made" subject to a number of modifications.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 It is recommended that Planning Policy Committee:
- a) Notes and welcomes the progress in making the Kilsby Review NDP by the Kilsby community.
 - b) Accepts the Examiner's recommended modifications in respect of the Kilsby Review NDP.
 - c) Approves the proposed decision statement to "make" the Kilsby Review NDP set out in Appendix 1, subject to recommendation b) and any necessary factual alterations.
 - d) Agrees that on being "made", the Kilsby Review NDP will replace the Kilsby NDP which was made in 2016.
 - e) Agrees that delegated authority be given to the Interim Head of Planning and Climate Change Policy to make further minor editorial changes to the Kilsby Review NDP 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 Neighbourhood Development Plan (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.

5. Report Background

- 5.1 The Localism Act 2011 introduced three types of neighbourhood planning including Neighbourhood Development Plans, Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build.
- 5.2 Neighbourhood Development Plans ("NDPs") is a plan making power allowing local communities to shape development in their area. When "made" (or adopted), NDPs form part of the development plan alongside the Council's Part 1 and Part 2 Local Plans.
- 5.3 The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 set out the statutory process a qualifying body (QB) (a parish council, town council or forum) must follow when preparing a NDP or order, following designation of a neighbourhood area.
- 5.4 A draft NDP is drawn up and consulted on by the QB and then submitted to the local planning authority for further formal consultation. This is followed by an examination undertaken by an independent examiner, who makes recommendations. In the case of a review or modified NDP the recommendations can be that the plan can be made unchanged or that it can be made with

certain modifications. The local planning authority (West Northamptonshire Council (WNC)) must consider whether to accept the Examiner's recommendations. In doing so, the council must decide if, with the proposed modifications, the plan would meet the basic conditions and would not contravene convention rights or European Union obligations.

- 5.5 There would need to be a good reason not to accept the Examiner's recommendations and the greater the divergence of WNC's decision is from the recommendations the stronger the justification would need to be.

6. Issues and Choices

6.1 Plan preparation

- 6.2 Kilsby Parish Council (KPC), as the QB, applied for the designation of a neighbourhood area covering the whole of Kilsby Parish on 4 July 2013. The council refused the application and instead designated a neighbourhood area on 6 December 2013 that excluded the area occupied by the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal (DIRFT) (see map in Appendix 2). Following consultation under Regulations 14 and 16 and subsequent examination in 2015 and referendum in 2016, the Kilsby NDP was made on 22 July 2016.

- 6.3 In 2021 KPC decided to review the NDP and submitted a number of documents to the council in August 2021. This comprised the made NDP with tracked changes, a draft modified NDP and a statement of modifications setting out the reason for each change and an opinion on the nature of the change. National Planning Policy Guidance was reviewed in 2019 and introduced the following categories of changes or modifications:

- Minor (non-material) modifications to a neighbourhood development plan or order are those which would not materially affect the policies in the plan or permission granted by the order. These may include correcting errors, such as a reference to a supporting document, and would not require examination or a referendum.
- Material modifications which do not change the nature of the plan or order would require examination but not a referendum. This might, for example, entail the addition of a design code that builds on a pre-existing design policy, or the addition of a site or sites which, subject to the decision of the independent examiner, are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan.
- Material modifications which do change the nature of the plan or order would require examination and a referendum. This might, for example, involve allocating significant new sites for development.

- 6.4 KPC concluded that the changes were material but not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan (the middle bullet point above). Officers agreed with this view and the council issued a confirmation letter to KPC. This meant that the Kilsby Review NDP had to be subject to formal consultation under Regulations 14 and 16 and independent examination.

- 6.5 A draft Kilsby Review NDP was published by KPC for the Kilsby neighbourhood area for Regulation 14 public consultation from 1 October to 15 November 2021. Following submission of the Kilsby Review NDP to the council on 14 January 2022 the plan was published for formal Regulation 16 consultation. The consultation period ran from 28 January to 11 March 2022.

With the agreement of KPC, the council appointed an independent Examiner, Christopher Collison BA(Hons) MBA MRTPI MIED IHBC, to review whether the plan met the basic conditions (see below).

6.6 NDPs are not tested for their soundness, but are tested to ensure they meet the “basic conditions” set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 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 plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.
- The making of the neighbourhood 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 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 The Examiner’s report on the Kilsby Review NDP was received in May 2022 and has been published on the council’s website. In his report, the Examiner concludes that, subject to a number of modifications, the plan has met all the legal requirements and should be “made”. He noted that the NDP has been underpinned by community support and engagement. The examiner also confirmed that the modifications contained in the Kilsby Review NDP do not change the nature of the development plan and would therefore not require a referendum.

6.9 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. Most of the changes are minor and necessary for clarity, accuracy and to ensure they are in accordance with national planning policy. More significant changes are:

- Amending policy K3 “Design of new development” to ensure that it is applied proportionately to development according to its scale, nature and location
- Clearer reference to relevant parts of the Kilsby Design Code in policy K3.
- Inclusion of the Kilsby Design Code as an appendix to the Review NDP. However, it should be made clear that as a whole the Code does not form part of the statutory development plan. Where specific principles are referred to in policies and supporting text (K3 Design of new development and K5 “Built heritage”) they do form part of the development plan.
- Removal of four “important views” because they have not been sufficiently well evidenced (relevant to policy K5 “Built heritage”).
- Amending policy K6 “Character, form and setting” and supporting text to more accurately explain that one area of ridge and furrow is a non-designated heritage asset and to afford the significance and views of it appropriate policy protection.

6.8 The Examiner included as a final modification that it would be appropriate for the council and QB to be able to modify general text, figures and images to achieve consistency with his recommended modifications and achieve updates and correct identified errors. 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.

6.9 Decision making process

6.10 The council is required to issue its final decision on the NDP within five weeks of receiving the Examiner’ report, unless the council and QB agree a different date. In the case of the Kilsby Review NDP, the final examiner’s report was received on 11 May 2022, meaning that a decision would have to be issued by 16 June 2022 unless a different date is agreed. On 11 May 2022 KPC confirmed agreement to an extension of time to allow this decision to be made at Planning Policy Committee on 28 June 2022.

6.11 Making the Plan

6.16 The Examiner recommended that the Kilsby Review NDP should be made, subject to the modifications put forward. He determined that a referendum is not required. The decision statement and adoption notice will be issued on 6 July 2022. The Review NDP will replace the first Kilsby NDP made in 2016.

7. Implications (including financial implications)

7.1 Resources and Financial

7.1.1 A referendum is not required. Printing of the small number of deposit copies of the made plan which will be met from existing resources.

7.2 Legal

7.2.1 In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (Regulation 17A) the council is required to consider the report of the independent examiner and decide what actions to take in response to each recommendation. It must also decide what modifications to make.

7.3 Risk

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

7.4 Consultation

7.4.1 The council and Kilsby Parish Council have been informing and engaging residents throughout the process, through informal and formal public consultations.

7.5 **Consideration by Overview and Scrutiny**

7.5.1 Not applicable.

7.6 **Climate Impact**

7.6.1 The NDP does not specifically address climate change. However, the implementation of a number of its policies concerned with protecting the natural, built and historic environment will in combination, help to contribute to reduce the impact of climate change.

7.7 **Community Impact**

7.7.1 The Kilsby Review 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 QB 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 Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan – Submission Draft

8.2 Report of the independent Examiner into the Kilsby Review NDP, May 2022

Appendix 1 – Proposed Decision Statement

Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan

Decision Statement

Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an independent examination, West Northamptonshire Council (the “council”) has considered all of the information available and is publishing its decision to “make” the Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan. The reviewed neighbourhood plan was not subject to a referendum, the reasons for which are outlined later in this decision statement.

2. Background

- 2.1 Kilsby Parish Council, as the qualifying body, applied for Kilsby Parish to be designated as a neighbourhood area on 4 July 2013. The council refused the application and instead designated a neighbourhood area on 6 December 2013 that excluded the area occupied by the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal (DIRFT). Following Regulations 14 and 16 consultation and subsequent examination in 2015, the Kilsby NDP was made on 22 July 2016.
- 2.2 The draft Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan was published by Kilsby Parish Council for public consultation from 1 October to 15 November 2021.
- 2.3 Following submission of the Kilsby Review NDP to the council on 14 January 2022 the plan was published by the Council for consultation. The consultation period ran from 28 January to 11 March 2022.
- 2.4 With the agreement of Kilsby Parish Council, the Council appointed an independent Examiner, Christopher Collison BA(Hons) MBA MRTPI MIED IHBC, to review whether the plan met the basic conditions required by the legislation and whether the changes in the Review Plan are significant as to require just examination or more significant to require examination and referendum.
- 2.5 Following the examination, the Examiner’s report was completed on 11 May 2022 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 be made. The Examiner also determined that a referendum was not required.

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 taken in respect of each of them. Depending on the recommended change, these are illustrated differently in the Decision Statement and set out below:
- 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 ~~strikethrough for deletions~~. This includes accuracy changes.
- 3.2 The Examiner has concluded that with the specified modifications the Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions and other relevant legal requirements. The council concurs with this view.
- 3.3 As per the determination of the Examiner, the Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan can proceed to be “made” without a referendum.
- 3.4 In accordance with the Regulations, the Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan is “made” and planning applications in the Kilsby neighbourhood area must be considered against the Kilsby Review Neighbourhood Development Plan, as well as existing planning policy.
- 3.5 This decision statement and copies of the Kilsby Review 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 Daventry Area – submitted neighbourhood plans

- 3.6 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, Daventry Area Offices (Lodge Road, Daventry, NN11 4FP)
 - Kilsby Village Store, Red Lion Car Park, 26 Main Road, Kilsby CV23 8XP
 - St Faith’s Church porch, Church Walk, Kilsby CV23 8XZ

Table 1 Examiner's Recommended Modifications and further editorial changes to the Kilsby Review 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	p10, para 1.11	N/A	<p>1.11 The Draft NDP Review was therefore published for 6 weeks formal consultation (Regulation 14). The Modified Plan has been <u>was</u> revised further following consideration of the responses, for submission to West Northamptonshire Council. The Council will undertake <u>undertook</u> a further 6 weeks formal consultation (Regulation 16), and <u>after which</u> the NDP will <u>proceed</u> to examination.</p> <p>1.12 The independent Examiner will produced his final report in <u>May 2022 in which he considered that with modifications, the Review NDP should be made. He also determined whether or not that</u></p>	To ensure it is accurate and factually up to date.	Make the suggested minor modification.

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><u>a Referendum is was not required. West Northamptonshire Council agreed to make the Review NDP at Planning Policy Committee on 28th June 2022. The Kilsby Review NDP replaces the Kilsby NDP which was made in 2016.</u></p>		
2	p19, Objective 3 (para 52 of Examiner's report)	<p>Revise Objective 3 as follows:</p> <p>To ensure that the significance of the historic buildings and environment of the village is sustained and documented and that the village's green spaces, green field boundaries, and, in particular, the ridge and furrow fields, are protected and maintained for the benefit of future residents and the national heritage.</p> <p><u>To ensure that development proposals affecting the heritage and natural environment assets of the village, including green</u></p>	N/A	To ensure that the objective is in accordance with the NPPF.	Amend Objective 3 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><u>spaces, green field boundaries and ridge and furrow fields are considered having regard to the scale of any harm or loss proposed and the significance of the asset.</u></p>			
3	p19, Objective 7 (para 52 of Examiner's report)	<p>Revise Objective 7 as follows:</p> <p>To ensure that the village infrastructure does not lag behind development and that developers contribute, <u>including</u> through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) towards improved and new village infrastructure. In particular to ensure that the village has reliable service from the utilities and mobile phone companies, dedicated medical facilities, and improved transport links.</p>	N/A	To acknowledge that developer contributions may arise from mechanisms other than CIL.	Amend Objective 7 in accordance with Examiner's recommendations.
4	p24 Policy K1 (para 73 of Examiner's report)	<p>Revise part 3 of policy as follows:</p> <p>3. In particular proposals for the development of a new building or the sensitive conversion of an</p>	N/A	To provide a basis for determining development proposals.	Amend policy 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
		existing building to accommodate the village shop will be encouraged <u>supported</u> . Such proposals should be sensitively designed and be fully accessible to all.			
5	p26 Policy K2 (para 78 of Examiner's report)	Revise part 1 of policy as follows: 1. Proposals to improve accessibility for walking and cycling and enhancement of routes linking residential areas to community facilities, the <u>and the</u> village centre, and <u>towards</u> nearby towns and villages will be supported. A list of proposed routes for improvements to walking and cycling routes is provided Appendix V: Community Infrastructure Projects.	N/A	To bring clarity required by NPPF.	Amend policy in accordance with Examiner's recommendations.
6	p30 Policy K3 (para 106 of Examiner's report)	Revise policy as follows: 2 nd para: <u>All development P</u> proposals <u>throughout the neighbourhood area</u> should have <u>demonstrate</u>	N/A	To enable the policy to be applied proportionately and to bring clarity required	Amend policy 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>regard to <u>for the following principles of the Kilsby Design Codes in a proportionate way according to the scale, nature and location of development: and demonstrate how they have addressed the detailed principles of the codes in their designs. In particular, proposals should:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protect the natural environment and mitigate against any loss of <u>demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity (part of Code 1);</u> 2. Demonstrate that they are responding to climate change. by incorporating the highest possible standards of insulation and energy conservation will be supported in line with- <u>(part of Code 1) –Sustainability and Climate Change.</u> 3. Consider and minimise any impacts on views in accordance with Code 2 – Landscape, Views 		by NPPF for determining development proposals.	

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>and the Settlement Edge. Where dDevelopment proposals are on the settlement edge <u>should be designed so that the spacing of buildings will offer long glimpsed views to the surrounding landscape and achieve a suitable transition between built and rural environments.</u> schemes should be of a lower density than the rest of the settlement. Where appropriate, access to the network of existing public rights of way surrounding the village should be provided. Grass verges and amenity green should be protected (<u>part of Code 2</u>).</p> <p>4. Where they are for housing, be of a <u>The height and scale of proposed new homes should be</u> which is sympathetic to the character of their setting. the surrounding area in accordance with Code 3 – Building Design. Development should have a maximum height of two storeys</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>but may include an additional storey within the roof space with sky lights and/or gable end windows. Scale should be informed by adjacent dwellings. There should be variations in orientation and rigid layouts where buildings are clustered very formally should be avoided <u>(part of Code 3)</u>.</p> <p>5. Include materials informed by the local vernacular in line with Code 3 – Building Design. <u>Traditional materials prevalent in Kilsby including ironstone, sandstone, local red brick, limestone, render and painted brick with slate. Thatched roofing will be supported (part of Code 3); is frequently used on older cottages and where feasible could continue to be used in the future.</u></p> <p>6. <u>Wherever possible provide off-road parking.</u> and boundary treatments in line with Code 4 – Parking, Gardens and Boundary</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>Treatments. On-street parking as the only means of parking should be avoided. Where on- Any on-road street parking is delivered, it should be provided in the form of small groupings with appropriate landscaping. Back gardens should be of sufficient size to provide reasonable and useable amenity space. When rear boundaries <u>Boundary materials should be in keeping with their setting and where they abut the settlement edge, surrounding landscape or open green spaces, boundaries should be formed of hedgerows and trees (part of Code 4).</u> should be used. 7. In addition, developments <u>Development proposals</u> should provide safe access for all and be accessible to local facilities by walking and cycling. Schemes should also demonstrate consideration of 'Secured by Design' principles.</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
		8. Where new homes <u>housing development</u> adjoins the M45, A5 or A361 a noise buffer should be provided using planting or fencing. Where development is adjacent to the A5 or A361 this buffer should be appropriately designed to avoid a fortress appearance.			
7	Para 106 of Examiner's report	Include the Kilsby Design Code as an appendix to the Review Neighbourhood Plan and clearly state: "The Design Code does not form part of the statutory Development Plan. Where specific principles are referred to in Policy K3, and with respect to the Kilsby Conservation Area in Policy K5, of the Review Neighbourhood Plan they do form part of the statutory Development Plan"	N/A	For ease of reference to users of the Review NDP.	Include the Kilsby Design Code as an appendix in accordance with Examiner's recommendations.
8	p34 policy K4 (para 106 of Examiner's report)	Revise part 3 of policy as follows: 3. In line with the West Northamptonshire Joint Core	N/A	To provide the clarity required by the NPPF for determining	Amend policy 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>Strategy (H2), the tenure mix of affordable housing should reflect local housing need and viability on individual sites. Affordable housing will be sought for schemes in line with Policy HO8 – Housing Mix and Type Parts B i and B ii in the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2). Where affordable housing is proposed there will be a preference for <u>this should be</u> affordable housing for rent from a registered provider <u>unless this is demonstrated not to be deliverable.</u></p>		development proposals.	
9	p38 Policy K5 (para 128 of Examiner's report)	<p>Revise policy as follows:</p> <p>1. Development proposals must conserve designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>3. Development proposals <u>within or affecting the setting of</u></p>		<p>To ensure that the policy is in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>To provide the clarity required</p>	<p>Amend policy in accordance with Examiner's recommendations.</p> <p>Consequential change to re-number views in Table 2.</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><u>the Kilsby Conservation Area should respond positively to the established form, scale, design and materials used within the conservation area as highlighted in the <u>Kilsby Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan SPD Appraisal and Kilsby Design Codes unless an alternative approach is clearly demonstrated to be appropriate.</u></u></p> <p>5. 'Important views' 2, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 identified within the CAAMP (see Map 5 Kilsby Conservation Area, Important Views and Vistas and Heritage Assets in Appendix 1 <u>Map 2: Kilsby Review NDP Policies Map and Map 2A Kilsby Review NDP Policies – Village Inset</u>) are all views within, into and out of the conservation area and should be sustained and enhanced <u>the significance of which should not be significantly adversely</u></p>	<p>Consequential change to re-number sequentially the important views.</p>	<p>by the NPPF for determining development proposals.</p> <p>To provide the clarity required by the NPPF for determining development proposals.</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
		<u>affected by development proposals</u> and any adverse impacts mitigated through detailed designs.			
10	p66 Map 5 (para 128 of Examiner's report)	<p>Modify Map 5 so that important view reference numbers 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 are more clearly identifiable.</p> <p>Alternatively, an approach to rely on the Policies Map rather than Map 5 would be equally satisfactory.</p> <p>Delete other important views and vistas numbered 1,3, 5, and 6.</p>	N/A	<p>To provide the clarity required by the NPPF for determining development proposals.</p> <p>The quality and importance of views 1, 3, 5 and 6 are not sufficiently well evidenced.</p>	Amend NDP Map 2 in accordance with Examiner's recommendations and delete views from Map 5.
11	P41, policy K6 (para 136 of Examiner's report)	<p>Revise policy as follows:</p> <p>2. Development outside the existing confines of Kilsby village, should be appropriate to the open countryside and seek to sustain the character and</p>	N/A	To ensure that the policy is in accordance with the NPPF in respect of an area of ridge and furrow	<p>Amend policy in accordance with Examiner's recommendations.</p> <p>Add Viewpoint 4 to Map 2 Kilsby Review</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>setting of the village and local landscape, including any areas of archaeological significance.</p> <p>3. Areas of ridge and furrow identified as significant through policy documents or the planning process should be sustained and enhanced.</p> <p><u>Development proposals directly or indirectly affecting the significance of ridge and furrow fields must demonstrate appropriate consideration of the significance of the heritage asset, and detail the scale of harm or loss. Development proposals affecting views of the ridge and furrow fields north of the village (identified as a non-designated heritage asset through the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan SPD) seen from viewpoint 4 identified on Map 5 should minimise any adverse impact on those views.</u></p>		<p>identified as a non-designated heritage asset and to afford it appropriate protection. To provide the clarity required by the NPPF for determining development proposals.</p>	<p>NDP Policies Map and Map 2A Kilsby Review NDP Policies Map Village Inset</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
		An alternative approach to rely on the Policies Map rather than Map 5 would be equally satisfactory.			
12	P39, para 4.3.10	<p>Modify paragraph 4.3.10 of the supporting text to more accurately explain that an area of ridge and furrow north of Rugby Road is included in the Local List.</p> <p>4.3.10 The surrounding countryside is protected by Daventry Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) Policy RA6 – Open Countryside. However the ridge and furrow fields, of which there are particularly fine examples on the northern boundary of the village have no formal, specific protection. They <u>The area around Kilsby village includes several ridge and furrow fields which</u> are the remains of a medieval, open field system of</p>	N/A	Explanation of status of heritage asset will enable clarity required by the NPPF for determining development proposals.	Amend para 4.3.10 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>farming far older than any village buildings standing today. This feature is rare, valued by residents as part of the village's heritage, and needs to be protected and preserved. <u>The Local List for Kilsby has been adopted by West Northamptonshire Council and this includes one area of ridge and furrow off Rugby Road. This specific area of ridge and furrow therefore has the status of a non-designated heritage asset. This is shown in figure 35 (page 36) of the Kilsby Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP). The CAAMP identifies other areas of ridge and furrow, which are shown in Figure 17 (page 26), although they are not on the Local List. The CAAMP itself is an adopted supplementary planning document which is a material consideration in decision making. The Kilsby Conservation</u></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>Area Appraisal identifies several areas in the Parish and those around the village are shown on Figure 1.7 A map showing important open spaces within the village, TPOs (Tree Preservation Orders) and ridge and furrow. The Conservation Area Appraisal. This sets out in Section 11.2 Threats and Recommendations the following in relation to ridge and furrow:</p>			
13	P47, para K7 (para 146 of Examiner's report)	<p>Revise policy as follows:</p> <p>The sites listed below and shown on Map 2 Kilsby Modified NDP Policies Map and Maps 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d, 6e and 6f in detail at Appendix III, are designated as Local Green Spaces.</p> <p><u>Inappropriate</u> dDevelopment of Local Green Space is ruled out other than in very special circumstances</p>	N/A	<p>To correct a typographical error.</p> <p>To ensure that the policy is in accordance with the NPPF and to provide the clarity required</p>	Amend policy 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
				by the NPPF for determining development proposals.	
14	Annex: Minor corrections to the Review Neighbourhood Plan" of Examiner's report	Modify policy explanation sections, general text, figures and images, and supporting documents to achieve consistency with the modified policies, and to achieve updates and correct identified errors.	<p>Executive Summary Revise penultimate para as follows: The NDP Policies are also supported by a number of actions to address issues related to <u>employment</u>, transport and infrastructure which lie beyond the role of neighbourhood plan policies.</p> <p>Chapter 4.0 Modified Neighbourhood Plan Policies, Revise 2nd para as follows:</p> <p>The Made NDP policies were prepared to address the issues and concerns of local residents in Kilsby and were identified through the formal and informal consultation processes undertaken as part of the preparation of the emerging</p>	<p>To achieve consistency between policies and supporting text.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt.</p>	Make the minor corrections as required 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>Plan. The policies have been through a process of review, and this has resulted in changes to some of the original policies in the made NDP <u>the deletion of one policy and one new policy. All the other policies have been subject to a degree of modification.</u></p> <p>Consultation Statement: Heading 4.0 should be corrected as follows: 15 October 165 November</p>	To correct a minor error.	



Appendix 2 – Map of Kilsby Neighbourhood Area

