

KIRK IRETON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2019 - 2033

**The Report of the Independent Examiner to Derbyshire Dales District Council
on the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan**

**Andrew Matheson MSc MPA DipTP MRTPI FCIH
Independent Examiner
7th February 2020**

Summary

I was appointed by Derbyshire Dales District Council, in agreement with the Kirk Ireton Parish Council, in October 2019 to undertake the Independent Examination of the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan.

The Examination has been undertaken by written representations. I visited the Neighbourhood Area on 16th December 2019.

The Neighbourhood Plan proposes a local range of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Area. There is an evident focus on safeguarding the very distinctive, rural character of the area whilst accommodating future change and growth.

The Plan has been underpinned by extensive community support and engagement. The social, environmental and economic aspects of the issues identified have been brought together into a coherent plan which adds appropriate local detail to sit alongside the Derbyshire Dales District Plan.

Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this Report I have concluded that the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.

I recommend that the referendum should be held within the Neighbourhood Area.

Report Index

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	3
The Role of the Independent Examiner	3
Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Area	4
Consultation	4
Representations Received	5
The Neighbourhood Plan	6
Basic Conditions	7
The Plan in Detail:	7
Front Cover	7
Contents	8
1. Introduction and Acknowledgements	8
2. Neighbourhood Plan Area Map	8
3. Historic Background	8
4. Groups, Activities and Amenities	8
5. Planning History	9
6. Community Engagement	9
7. Data Gathering and Analysis	10
8. Kirk Ireton Community Vision	10
Policies	10
Policy P1 - Development	11
Policy P2 – Protecting Views	13
Policy P3 – Conservation Area	14
Policy P4 – Business Development	14
Policy P5 - Parking	15
9. Acknowledgements	16
Appendices	16
EU and ECHR Obligations	16
Conclusions	18
Listing of Recommendations	19

Introduction

This report sets out the findings of the Independent Examination of the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan 2019 - 2033. The Plan was submitted to Derbyshire Dales District Council by Kirk Ireton Parish Council in their capacity as the 'qualifying body' responsible for preparing the Neighbourhood Plan.

Neighbourhood Plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently incorporated within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012 and this continues to be the principal element of national planning policy. A new NPPF was published in July 2018, updated in February 2019, and it is against the content of this NPPF that the Plan will be examined.

This report assesses whether the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan is legally compliant and meets the 'basic conditions' that such plans are required to meet. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends modifications to its policies and supporting text. This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome, the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan would then be used in the process of determining planning applications within the Plan boundary as an integral part of the wider Plan.

The Role of the Independent Examiner

The Examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted Neighbourhood Plan meets the legislative and procedural requirements. I was appointed by Derbyshire Dales District Council, in agreement with Kirk Ireton Parish Council, to conduct the examination of the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan and to report my findings. I am independent of both Derbyshire Dales District Council and Kirk Ireton Parish Council. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.

I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I have over 40 years' experience in various local authorities and third sector body as well as with the professional body for planners in the United Kingdom. I am a Chartered Town Planner and a panel member for the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (NPIERS). I am a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

In my role as Independent Examiner I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the Examination:

- the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to a referendum; or
- the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
- the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. If recommending that the Neighbourhood Plan should go forward to referendum, I must then consider whether or not the referendum area should extend beyond the Neighbourhood Area to which the Plan relates.

In examining the Plan, I am also required, under paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to check whether:

- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004;

- the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 Act (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area);
- the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

These are helpfully covered in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement and, subject to the contents of this Report, I can confirm that I am satisfied that each of the above points has been properly addressed and met.

In undertaking this examination I have considered the following documents:

- Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan 2019 - 2033 as submitted
- Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions Statement (undated)
- Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement and Statutory Consultation Statement with Appendix (undated)
- Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Development Plan (January 2019)
- Content at: www.kirkiretonparishcouncil.co.uk/portfolio.html
- Content at: www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/planning-a-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/kirk-ireton-neighbourhood-plan
- Representations made to the Regulation 16 public consultation on the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan
- Derbyshire Dales Local Plan 2013 - 2033 adopted in December 2017
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019)
- Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (March 2014 and subsequent updates)

I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the Neighbourhood Area on 16th December 2019. I looked at Kirk Ireton, its Conservation Area and the surrounding countryside including all the various sites and locations identified in the Plan document.

The legislation establishes that, as a general rule, Neighbourhood Plan examinations should be held without a public hearing, by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted plan which I felt made their points with clarity, I was satisfied that the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan could be examined without the need for a public hearing and I advised Derbyshire Dales District Council accordingly. The Qualifying Body and the Local Planning Authority have helpfully responded to my enquiries so that I may have a thorough understanding of the facts and thinking behind the Plan, and the correspondence has been shown on the Derbyshire Dales District Council Neighbourhood Planning website for the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan.

Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Area

A map showing the boundary of the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Area has been provided within the Neighbourhood Plan. Further to an application made by Kirk Ireton Parish Council, Derbyshire Dales District Council approved the designation of the Neighbourhood Area on 5th September 2014. This satisfied the requirement in line with the purposes of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan under section 61G(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Consultation

In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, the Qualifying Body has prepared a Consultation Statement to accompany the Plan.

The Planning Practice Guidance says:

“A qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its Neighbourhood Plan [or Order] and ensure that the wider community:

- is kept fully informed of what is being proposed
- is able to make their views known throughout the process
- has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging Neighbourhood Plan [or Order]
- is made aware of how their views have informed the draft Neighbourhood Plan [or Order].” (Reference ID: 41-047-20140306)

The submitted Community Engagement and Statutory Consultation Statement notes that consultations were undertaken “to engage with the residents and other community stakeholders. The neighbourhood plan group consulted as widely and appropriately as possible to ensure that everyone would be aware of the plan and would be able to contribute to it.” Kirk Ireton Primary School pupils made posters and descriptions with a ‘development theme’ as part of a school project based on the local area to help the Neighbourhood Plan launch. The first public meeting was held in February 2015 and was attended by 70 members of the village and at this there was overwhelming support to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and villagers were invited to be part of a Steering Group and several Working Groups.

The Steering Group adopted a constitution in May 2015; meetings were publicised as open to all and a website was set up to keep everyone informed of progress. A second public meeting was held in October 2015 to present displays by the three Working Groups and was attended by over 100 residents who were encouraged to leave comments and questions for the Steering Group. In April 2016 a questionnaire was delivered by hand to all households within the Parish (several copies were given to family households to encourage young people to give their views) and of the three hundred questionnaires delivered 174 were returned (an impressive 58% response rate).

An Editorial Group was formed in October 2016 to work with the questionnaire results, working group reports and other published material to prepare a first draft of the Plan. This was subsequently presented to the community at a two day ‘Open Weekend’ in the Village Hall in November 2017; over 70 villagers attended the meeting over the two days. A further public consultation took place toward the end of the statutory Regulation 14 Consultation Period in January 2019; twenty eight members of the public attended with fifteen giving written comments. The Regulation 14 Consultation ran from November 2018 to February 2019 and after due consideration of the received comments, the submission draft Plan was passed to Derbyshire Dales District Council in April 2019.

Accordingly, overall I am satisfied that the consultation process accords with the requirements of the Regulations and the Practice Guidance and that, in having regard to national policy and guidance, the Basic Conditions have been met. In reaching my own conclusions about the specifics of the content of the Plan I will later note points of agreement or disagreement with Regulation 16 representations, just as the Qualifying Body has already done for earlier consultations. That does not imply or suggest that the consultation has been inadequate, merely that a test against the Basic Conditions is being applied.

Representations Received

Consultation on the submitted Plan, in accordance with Neighbourhood Planning Regulation 16, was undertaken by Derbyshire Dales District Council from 23rd September - 4th November 2019. I have been passed the representations – just 7 in total – which were generated by the consultation and which have now been included alongside the details of the Plan on the Derbyshire Dales District Council Neighbourhood Planning website. I have

not mentioned every representation individually within the Report but this is not because they have not been thoroughly read and considered in relation to my Examiner role, rather their detail may not add to the pressing of my related recommendations which must ensure that the Basic Conditions are met.

The Neighbourhood Plan

Kirk Ireton Parish Council is to be congratulated on its extensive efforts to produce a Neighbourhood Plan for their area that will guide development activity over the period to 2033. I can see that a sustained effort has been put into developing a Plan with a vision that “Kirk Ireton will be an active rural community with a balanced population comprising mixed ages. Village amenities will include a thriving school, a well supported shop and village pub, church, chapel and a village hall capable of providing the facilities expected of a modern village. The village’s heritage, including the surrounding countryside, views, open spaces and recreational facilities will have been preserved and enhanced where possible.” The Plan document is well presented with a distinctive combination of text, clear images and Policies that are, subject to the specific points that I make below, well laid out and helpful for the reader. The Plan has been kept to a manageable length by not overextending the potential subject matter and the coverage of that.

It is an expectation of Neighbourhood Plans that they should address the issues that are identified through community consultation, set within the context of higher level planning policies. There is no prescribed content and no requirement that the robustness of proposals should be tested to the extent prescribed for Local Plans. Where there has been a failure by the Qualifying Body to address an issue in the round, leading to an inadequate statement of policy, it is part of my role wherever possible to see that the community’s intent is sustained in an appropriately modified wording for the policy. It is evident that the community has made positive use of “direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area” (Planning Practice Guidance Reference ID: 41-001-20140306).

Individually I can see that the Policies address legitimate matters for a Neighbourhood Plan as identified with the community. I will later look at the Policies in turn so as to ensure that the Basic Conditions are met, which include an obligation to have regard to Local Plan strategic policies. However, a representation comments: “The underlying tone throughout the document is that development is unappealing and unwelcome in the village.... Surely, like us, many would welcome future development in the village that is of appropriate scale, quality and density and that reflects sensitivity to the characteristics of the conservation area.” As the NPPF requires (para 16b) that Plans should “be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable” I asked the Qualifying Body to address this concern. The Qualifying Body responded: “We confirm that the Plan was prepared with a positive intent. We followed advice, throughout the process, from Joe Dugdale of Rural Action Derbyshire. We had four public meetings over the course of the process [and] delivered an extensive questionnaire with multiple copies to every household in the Neighbourhood Plan area. We had three working groups which met numerous times and were all minuted. We engaged widely in the community and kept the community informed through the village newsletter.... Please also refer to policy 1 which states that sensitive development is supported.”

It is often the case that community consultation produces more clarity on what is not wanted than what *is* wanted; some care is therefore required in the analysis. However, having considered all the evidence and representations submitted as part of the Examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It works from a positive vision for the future of the Neighbourhood Area and promotes policies that are, subject to amendment to variable degrees, proportionate and

sustainable. The Plan sets out the community's priorities whilst seeking to identify and safeguard Kirk Ireton's distinctive features and character. The plan-making had to find ways to reconcile the external challenges that are perceived as likely to affect the area with the positive vision agreed with the community. All such difficult tasks were approached with transparency, with input as required and support from Derbyshire Dales District Council.

However, in the writing up of the work into the Plan document, it is sometimes the case that the phraseology is imprecise, not helpful, or it falls short in justifying aspects of the selected policy. This is not uncommon in a community-prepared planning document and something that can readily be addressed in most instances. Accordingly I have been obliged to recommend modifications so as to ensure both clarity and meeting of the 'Basic Conditions'. In particular, Plan policies as submitted may not meet the obligation to "provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency" (NPPF para 17). I bring this particular reference to the fore because it will be evident as I examine the policies individually and consider whether they meet or can meet the 'Basic Conditions'.

Basic Conditions

The Independent Examiner is required to consider whether a Neighbourhood Plan meets the "Basic Conditions", as set out in law following the Localism Act 2011; in December 2018 a fifth Basic Condition was added relating to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Plan for the area;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations;
- not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017(d).

The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has very helpfully set out to address the issues in relation to these requirements in the same order as above and has tabulated the relationship between the policy content of the Plan and its higher tier equivalents. I note that the Local Plan is the Derbyshire Dales District Local adopted in December 2017. As the Plan does not allocate land for development and is supportive of Kirk Ireton's rural features, I am satisfied that the making of the Plan will not breach the Basic Condition relating to the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

I have examined and will below consider the Neighbourhood Plan against all of the Basic Conditions above, utilising the supporting material provided in the Basic Conditions Statement and other available evidence as appropriate.

The Plan in Detail

I will address the aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan content that are relevant to the Examination in the same sequence as the Plan. Recommendations are identified with a bold heading and italics, and I have brought them together as a list at the end of the Report.

Front cover

A Neighbourhood Plan must specify the period during which it is to have effect. I note that there is a prominent reference to the Plan period 2019 – 2033 on the front cover. I would add that the impressive photograph of Kirk Ireton showing its hilltop built framework is an admirable opener for the Neighbourhood Plan providing an ideal context for the Policies that follow.

Contents

The Contents list will need to be reviewed once the text has been amended to accommodate the recommendations from this Report. I note that references to “Additional Documents” are included here but there is no footnote indicating where these documents can be accessed.

Recommendation 1:

Review the “Contents” page once the text has been amended to accommodate the recommendations from this Report; add footnote source references for the “Basic Conditions Statement” and the “Community Engagement and Statutory Consultation Statement”.

1 Introduction and Acknowledgements

I note that whilst the heading here includes “Acknowledgements” the related content in fact appears, probably more appropriately, at the end of the document; the truncated content of paragraph 1.07 should be part of that later acknowledgment. On a technical point relating to paragraph 1.03, Neighbourhood Plans are not “adopted” but ‘made’. In relation to the content of paragraph 1.05 I believe the reference to the Conservation Area “Appraisal” is premature, that will be most relevant within the Policy content. Also in that paragraph there is a reference to all households in “the village”, whereas this should be ‘Neighbourhood Area’, and a reference to “Appendix F” but as that is not included within the Plan document and its detail is referenced more appropriately later. The Plan should include a commitment to keep the implementation of the Plan monitored with a review at least every 5 years and this is probably the best section to include that.

Recommendation 2:

Under the heading “1 Introduction and Acknowledgements”:

2.1 Delete “and Acknowledgements” from the title.

2.2 In paragraph 1.03 replace “adopted” with ‘made’.

2.3 In paragraph 1.05 delete “Appraisal” and its footnote, replace “the village” with ‘the Neighbourhood Area’ and delete reference to “Appendix F”.*

2.4 Move any relevant part(s) of paragraph 1.07 to Section 9.

2.5 Add in place of the content of paragraph 1.07:

‘The Parish Council will monitor the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that its objectives are being delivered. At least every 5 years the Plan will be reviewed to see whether a new or modified Plan is required.’

2 Neighbourhood Plan Area Map

The map is required to identify the “Neighbourhood Area” and so that is what the title and content should show. It is unclear why this paragraph is italicised but this would appear to be inappropriate.

Recommendation 3:

Under the heading “2 Neighbourhood Plan Area Map”:

3.1 In the title and last sentence delete “Plan”.

3.2 Review the need for this section to be italicised.

3 Historic Background

4 Groups, Activities & Amenities

These sections contain brief and helpful background information about the Parish. In paragraph 4.03 there is a reference to an “Appendix G” but there is no Appendix G within the

Plan document – it is instead KINP B - and the content of it is not material to the policy content of the Plan. It would be sufficient and more appropriate not to attach Appendix G/ KINP B) but instead include a footnote with a source reference, as suggested for Appendix F above.

Recommendation 4:

Under the heading “4 Groups, Activities & Amenities” add a footnote source reference for the content of “Appendix G” and delete “Appendix G” (and omit Appendix G/KINP B from the Plan document).

5 Planning History

There is an evident overlap between parts of this section and the previous “Historic Background” section as well as some overlap with the Policies section to follow. To keep this section pertinent to the purpose of the Plan document I believe some editing would be helpful as well as a retitling to “Planning Context”.

As is acknowledged later in the Plan document, the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan classifies Kirk Ireton as a Tier 4 settlement where “Development will therefore be limited to that needed to help maintain existing services and facilities and to meet the housing needs of the settlement. As such there is some limited scope for development within these settlements”. Whilst it is accurate to say that the Local Plan does not set a housing growth target for Kirk Ireton, it is not accurate to say that this suggests “a very [my emphasis] limited amount of development” as local population growth/services support may suggest otherwise; the Qualifying Body agreed that “very” should be deleted.

Recommendation 5:

For Section 5 headed “Planning History”:

5.1 Alter the title to “Planning Context”.

5.2 Delete the sub-headings “The Past” and “The Present” as well as paragraphs 5.1 to 5.03; renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

5.3 In the last sentence of paragraph 5.04 delete “very”.

5.4 Add to paragraph 5.05 between the second and third sentences: ‘This Neighbourhood Plan is required to have regard to national planning policy and guidance and be in general conformity with the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan.’

5.5 In paragraph 5.06 replace “An adopted” with ‘A ‘made’.

5.6 Footnotes: Move the footnote source reference for the Conservation Area Appraisal to the Policies section. Provide the source reference for the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan that has been omitted at the foot of the page.

6 Community Engagement

This is a helpful overview but it appears to over-detail the early stages and fails to mention the required pre-submission Regulation 14 Consultation.

Recommendation 6:

Under the heading “6 Community Engagement”:

6.1 Delete paragraph 6.02 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly), the second and third sentences of paragraph 6.03, and the third sentence of paragraph 6.12.

6.2 Amend the reference to “all households” in the first sentence of paragraph 6.11 to ‘all households in the Neighbourhood Area’.

6.3 Insert a new paragraph between paragraphs 6.12 and 6.13 as follows:
'The draft copy of the Neighbourhood Plan was presented in a two day 'Open Weekend' in the Village Hall on the 4th & 5th Nov 2017. More than 70 villagers attended the meeting over the two days. After further consultations with interested parties, in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, the Neighbourhood Plan was published for pre-submission consultation between 19th November 2018 and 2nd February 2019.'

6.4 In place of the reference to an Appendix C in paragraph 6.13 provide a source reference to the on-line copy of the Consultation Statement.

7 Data Gathering

I feel, and some respondents have commented, that this section does not readily lead into the Policies section; in places the "analysis" raises more questions than it answers. The "Community Engagement" section has noted that a household questionnaire survey was undertaken and the Consultation Statement illustrates how the results have fed into the further drafting of the Plan. The Policies section illustrates how community views have been addressed but that also they are only part of the evidence informing policy development. Accordingly I recommend that section 7 is deleted.

Recommendation 7:

Delete section 7 and renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

8 The Kirk Ireton Community Vision

It is helpful that the Plan Policies have the context of a community vision to 2033. However, that vision needs to 'fit' with what a Neighbourhood Plan can realistically do. Any growth or otherwise in car ownership and degrees of reliance on car journeys for mobility are both beyond the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan and, as these will be material to any "increase in traffic", an ambition to restrain traffic growth is questionable, as representations have noted. Further the local authority has commented: "The District Council does not consider that given the development strategy for the village set out in the adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan, and the relatively isolated nature of the village away from main through routes that there is likely to be any substantial increase in through traffic in the village." I have also noted that the Plan does not identify or allocate land for additional parking; therefore the Plan as written cannot help to make progress toward this aspect of the Vision. The Qualifying Body has suggested alternative wording here.

In a similar vein the local authority has noted that "The evidence that mobile communication is an issue for the community and raised in consultation is lacking from the community engagement/data gathering and analysis section". The Qualifying Body agreed that this element of the Vision Statement should be deleted.

Recommendation 8:

Under the heading "8 [amended to 7 as above] The Kirk Ireton Community Vision":

8.1 Replace the "and" before "a village hall" with a comma and after "modern village" insert: "and the issue of adequate off-street parking will have been addressed".

8.2 Delete the second sentence of paragraph 8.02 and paragraph 8.03.

Policies

I feel that the opening wording for this section has the potential to mislead about the planning decision-making process and some rewording is required. The local authority agreed that other wording would be appropriate.

Recommendation 9:

Reword the text under “Policies” on page 11 as follows:

‘All policies should be read in conjunction with the Derbyshire Dales District Council’s adopted policies. No Neighbourhood Plan policy will be applied in isolation; account will be taken of all relevant policies.’

Policy P1 - Development

The local authority comments suggest that this Policy does not meet the Examination Basic Conditions: “It is considered that elements of this policy are not in general conformity with the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan and do not therefore meet the Basic Conditions. As outlined in previous correspondence [with the Qualifying Body] it is recommended that reference to the existing built framework illustrated on the map on page [17] should be removed from Policy 1. The designation of a built framework to the settlement of Kirk Ireton is contrary to the provisions of the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (2017). Kirk Ireton is classified as an ‘Accessible Settlement with Minimal Facilities - Fourth Tier’ within the settlement hierarchy of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (Policy S2). The adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan seeks to encourage new development in such villages as Kirk Ireton by way of infill and consolidation of the existing built framework of the settlement, or through development well related to the existing built framework that would not result in a prominent intrusion into the countryside; or constitutes an exception site for the provision of affordable housing (see policies S2, S4 and HC5 Derbyshire Dales Local Plan). Advice in the NPPF (paragraph 13) states “neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained within Local Plans”. As currently drafted Neighbourhood Plan Policy 1 restricts development to within a framework boundary, and infers that only ‘sensitive development’ within it will be supported and that all development outside it would be rejected, this is more restrictive than the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan and raises a principle issue of non - conformity.” I have noted that para 4.20 of the Local Plan, applicable to Kirk Ireton, states that “Development on a large scale would be unsustainable in these villages, as this would generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys outside the villages and undermine the spatial strategy”; the Neighbourhood Plan does not seem to acknowledge this position.

The local authority has indicated a correction for the Consultation Statement where it says: “Kirk Ireton is listed as a Tier 4 settlement in the DDDC Local Plan and is not allocated a settlement framework boundary. Kirk Ireton had a settlement boundary from 1992 up until the adoption of the 2017 DDDC Local Plan.” The local authority notes that this is “factually incorrect – The only defined Built Up Area [for Kirk Ireton] that has been included within a Local Plan was in 1988 Southern Parishes Local Plan”. A representation adds: “It maybe should be made clearer that the so called “settlement boundary” or “built framework” has in fact little relevance for a tier 4 village such as Kirk Ireton. The impression given by the draft [Plan] may be misleading as such boundary or framework is not defined and does not exist for tier 4 villages such as Kirk Ireton.”

The Qualifying Body has responded: “We agree we were incorrect about the settlement boundary in earlier DDDC local plans. We believed there had been a settlement boundary from 1992 and we accept we were wrong.” They further commented: “We disagree with the interpretation by the DDDC of their own plan as regards our Policy 1. We are in line with the Inspectorate examination of the DDDC Local Plan dated 13th Nov 2017. In his analysis of the DDDC Local Plan Mark Dakeyne stated ...[Inspectors Report: Page 9: 40] “The 4th and 5th tier villages do not have settlement boundaries but Policy S3 as worded does allow limited development to support existing services through infill and consolidation. However, there is a lack of consistency between the explanation and the policy itself and not enough clarity as to the type of development that might be acceptable. MM4 provides that necessary effectiveness, consistency and guidance by referring to infill and consolidation at an appropriate scale, brownfield sites on the edge of settlements and affordable housing

exception sites.” The Inspectors Report ‘Main Modifications’ and as a result pages 35 & 36 in the Local Plan state: [Page 7: MM4] “In all cases, development should be commensurate with the scale and function of the settlement, can be accommodated through infill and consolidation of the existing built framework of the settlement or is well related to the existing pattern of development and surrounding land uses; would not lead to prominent intrusion into the countryside; or constitutes exception sites affordable housing (Policy HC5).” We consider that by defining a “built framework boundary” the KINP supports and adds value to the Local Plan.”

I note however that nowhere does the Inspector question or criticise the absence of settlement boundaries for 4th and 5th tier villages and very explicitly his comments note that acceptable development will not necessarily be confined within the existing built framework. The Inspector and the Local Planning Authority have doubtless had regard to the NPPF expectation (para 9) that “Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area”. Policy P1 as drafted is therefore not consistent with the Inspector’s comments or in general conformity with the adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan. However, I believe that I must further note that the Kirk Ireton Conservation Area extends to include significant areas of local countryside (areas also addressed within the Landscape Sensitivity Study) and this is therefore already an important factor influencing decisions on development proposals for Kirk Ireton (as distinct from many other 4th and 5th tier villages). The Conservation Area Appraisal makes it clear that the built framework and the adjacent countryside should be viewed together not separately and this implies that in some places new construction within but on the edge of the built framework may be as unacceptable as development that intrudes into the open countryside; an in/out delineation of the built-up area is inappropriate.

Within element b) of Policy P1 the term “countryside” only has the planning policy meaning derived from the Local Plan. Local Plan Policy S4 says that “countryside” covers the whole Neighbourhood Area since no part is within “defined settlement development boundaries, and sites allocated for development as defined on the Policies Map”. Whilst Policy S4 does go on to say that permission will be granted for “Housing in fourth and fifth tier villages in accordance with Local Plan Policy S2” Kirk Ireton cannot deny its position in the strategic settlement hierarchy as a fourth tier village. The Qualifying Body has agreed that element b) should be deleted.

Within element c) of Policy P1 it is implied rather than stated that development of fields designated as low sensitivity in the Landscape Sensitivity Study may be appropriate and would certainly be preferred to more sensitive areas. The Plan does not go so far as to assess these low sensitivity fields to arrive at preferences for land allocation in the event that housing requirements are identified “to help maintain existing services and facilities and to meet the housing needs of the settlement” (Local Plan Policy S2). However the Plan seems to support the use of the Landscape Sensitivity Study to identify the least intrusive sites (if any) and the Local Plan adopts the same approach since it is a requirement of Policy S2 that development “would not lead to prominent intrusion into the countryside”.

Therefore I must conclude that those parts of Policy P1 that can meet the Basic Conditions are, in all important respects, already encompassed within the Local Plan Policies. The NPPF (para 16f) says that Plans must “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)”. Having said that, it is evident that the Landscape Sensitivity Study has important conclusions of which developers should be aware and providing the wording is not at odds with the Local Plan expectation, Policy P1 might have a remaining purpose. The Qualifying Body has said “We wish to endorse the Conservation Character Appraisal and the Landscape Sensitivity [Study] within any final version of our development policy”.

Recommendation 10:**10.1** Reword “Policy P1: Development” as follows

‘Development proposals for the village of Kirk Ireton must be appropriate for a rural location and demonstrate particular attention to two important documents that address the character of the settlement and its setting: The Conservation Area Appraisal 2014 [provide a footnote source reference] and the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2015 [provide a footnote source reference] and successor documents’.

10.2 Replace the reference to “Appendix F” in paragraph P1.01 with a source reference for the questionnaire results.

10.3 Delete paragraph P1.18 and renumber subsequent paragraphs.

10.4 Delete the first two sentences of paragraph P1.21.

10.5 Delete the map on page 17.

10.6 Provide a source reference for the map on page 18 (and amend any page reference to it within the text).

As reworded Policy P1 meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy P2 – Protecting Views

An issue with the wording of Policy P2 is how the decision maker is to distinguish between “detrimental” and non-detrimental impacts. I believe that the local authority is fair to comment: “Further supporting evidence and justification is required for this policy. For instance is there evidence to suggest that the views identified have a specific value such that they should be protected by the Neighbourhood Plan? What criteria have been applied to determine which views are sensitive/valued and warrant retention?” A representation comments: “The whole section and reference to views would seem somewhat arbitrary. Whilst recognising the importance of views, it should also be recognised that views evolve and that sensitivity should be to maintaining a connection to the wider landscape and to the characteristics of the conservation area. It is unrealistic to believe that views will not change at a micro level.”

The Qualifying Body has responded: “We are anxious to preserve this policy; it was popular in the consultation process” and they have provided a revised wording for the Policy (which I have slightly adapted for clarity). This helps to clarify the issue of detriment and removes any suggestion that the views presently illustrated 1 -18 are all equally valued. Also it is evident that the situation of Kirk Ireton on high ground means that long distance views assume a particular significance. The Qualifying Body has also suggested amendments to the supporting material. Having said this, it remains the fact that the primary assessment of planning applications will be against Policies PD2 and PD5 in the adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan.

Recommendation 11:**11.1** Reword “Policy P2 – Protecting Views” as follows:

‘Development proposals should not be detrimental to views of the village, views from the village or the heritage value of the landscape. The potential impact on views should be assessed and addressed by taking into account the sensitivity of land to development as identified in the Landscape Sensitivity Study and also the principles within and views highlighted by the Conservation Area Character Appraisal.’

11.2 Replace the reference to “Appendix F” in paragraph P2.03 with a source reference for the questionnaire results.

11.3 Delete paragraphs 2.05 and 2.06 as well as the content of pages 20 – 24 (although a selection of titled photographs may be used within the document to liven the presentation and illustrate the Parish).

As reworded Policy P2 meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy P3 – Conservation Area

It is helpful that the Neighbourhood Plan draws attention to the Conservation Area Character Appraisal, although this document is already part of the planning decision making. I note that the equivalent Local Plan Policy PD2 says it will: “Requir[e] development proposals in Conservation Areas to demonstrate how the proposal has taken account of the local distinctive character and setting of the Conservation Area including open spaces and natural features and how this has been reflected in the layout, design, form, scale, mass, use of materials and detailing, in accordance with Character Appraisals where appropriate”. Often differences of wording can give rise to confusion with decision makers not knowing which guidance to follow. However, the common element here is the Character Appraisal document from which “key characteristics” mentioned in Policy P3 may be derived. The Qualifying Body has suggested a revised wording.

The local authority has commented that “A localised list of notable buildings to which the policy may apply would be seen to add value to the Neighbourhood Plan” and the Qualifying Body has responded with an extended list.

Recommendation 12:

12.1 Reword “Policy P3 – Conservation Area’ as follows;

‘Development proposals within the Conservation Area should promote, reinforce and enhance the area’s local distinctiveness and be sensitive to the heritage context in terms of design, materials, scale, massing, density, light pollution and access. The guidelines within the Kirk Ireton Conservation Area Character Appraisal must be addressed. Particular attention should be paid to any impacts on principal landmarks as identified on the adjacent map and its key.’

12.2 Delete the italicised wording beginning “Adapted from...” beneath the P3 Policy.

12.3 Replace the reference to “Appendix F” in paragraph P3.07 with a source reference for the questionnaire results.

12.4 Amend the map on page 27 to extend the list of landmark properties and locate them all on the map: as listed by the Qualifying Body these are:

Holy Trinity Church and churchyard gates, Barley Mow public house, Stable Shop, Primary School, Village Hall and Old Post Office, Manor House and Northfield Farm, Church Farm, Green Farm, Lukes Cottage, Pebble Cottage, Old Rectory, Yew Tree Cottage, 1 Broadway, Vesta Lynn, Old Methodist Chapel.

12.5 Provide a source reference for the map on page 28.

As amended Policy P3 meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy P4 – Business Development

The quotation from the NPPF is not part of a neighbourhood level Policy and should be within the supporting text. As with Policy P2, it is unclear how the decision maker is to distinguish between proposals that are “adversely affecting” and those that are positively

contributing. Whilst there is detail on this within the Local Plan (eg Policy EC10) that is not specifically addressing Kirk Ireton. From the supporting information it would appear that the most significant element of the P4 Policy wording relates to development being of an appropriate scale, and the Qualifying Body agreed this was the case.

Recommendation 13:

13.1 Reword “Policy P4: Business Development as follows:

‘Business and tourism developments that demonstrate appropriate regard for the rural character and rural infrastructure of the Neighbourhood Area will be supported’.

13.2 Move the paragraph in the Policy box commencing “The NPPF....” to form a new paragraph between P4.03 and P4.04; renumber the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

13.3 Replace the reference to “Appendix F” in paragraph P4.02 with a source reference for the questionnaire results.

As reworded Policy P4 meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy P5 – Parking

I note that this Policy does not identify land which could add to the current number of off-street parking spaces within the village. The local authority has commented that “the informal parking at Peats Close, Kirk Ireton” is in the ownership of Derbyshire Dales District Council. The Council objects to the proposal “seeking to retain Peats Close for village car parking in perpetuity [as it] may prejudice the ability of the District Council to utilise this area of land in the future to deliver the corporate aspirations for affordable housing ...”. Having viewed this site I see that the area concerned is unsurfaced, accessed via a hammerhead and appears to have been taken over to supplement on-street parking. For Policy P5 element b) to be deliverable in relation to Peats Close there would need to be evidence of owner agreement or co-operation, but there is not. Element a) of Policy P5 says that any displaced spaces should be replaced and this would be effective for the stated objective of the Policy; the Peats Close land would be under the same requirement as any other in Kirk Ireton. The village parking area on the other hand would be difficult to replace “in the immediate vicinity” and therefore that same Policy element assures its retention (although that is probably already assured through ownership). Element c) in Policy P5 is not required because it merely states what is already the case.

Recommendation 14:

14.1 Within Policy P5;

14.1.1 Delete the opening words “Protection of Car Parking -”.

14.1.2 Replace “the defined existing built framework” with ‘the village’.

14.1.3 Replace “on a site will only be permitted where” with ‘will be required to make’ and delete “is made”.

14.1.4 Move the last sentence of element a) to replace the present element b).

14.1.5 Delete element c).

14.2 Provide a footnote source reference for the “Rural Space Profile” referenced in paragraph P5.04.

14.3 Delete the map on page 31.

As amended Policy P5 meets the Basic Conditions.

Acknowledgements

On the contents page this section is listed as Section 9 but this has been omitted from page 32; the two should be consistent. Any part of paragraph 1.07 that is for retention should be added on this page.

Recommendation 15:

Under the heading “Acknowledgements”:

15.1 Bring the titling on page 32 and within the Contents page into line (Section 9 or not?).

15.2 Add back here any part of paragraph 1.07 that is to be retained.

Appendices KINP A & KINP B

Some confusion has arisen within the Plan document through references to KINP A being shown as “Appendix F”. However there is no expectation that the Residents’ Survey results should be part of the Plan document. It will be sufficient to provide an accessible on-line location – perhaps as part of the Consultation Statement or certainly referenced within it - and a source reference at suitable points within the document. This also true of the content of Appendix KINP B (referenced within the document as Appendix G).

Recommendation 16:

Delete Appendices KINP A & KINP B, suitable references to the on-line location of their content having been provided with the body of the Plan document.

European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) Obligations

A further Basic Condition, which the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan must meet, is compatibility with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations.

There is no legal requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan to have a sustainability appraisal. The Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report carried out by Derbyshire Dales District Council for the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan (January 2019) considered whether or not the content of the Plan required a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plan and Programmes Regulations 2004. In accordance with Regulation 9 of the SEA Regulations 2004, Derbyshire Dales District Council determined: “it is considered unlikely that there will be considerable significant environmental effects arising from the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan, (as submitted and assessed as part of this screening exercise KINP – Pre Submission Version – September 2018) that have not been considered in the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan, adopted in December 2017. The KINP does not allocate any sites, or propose projects or development. Therefore sensitive natural or heritage sites cannot be affected by the proposals contained within the KINP.... In conclusion it is considered that a strategic environmental assessment will not be required.” In making this determination, the District Council had regard to Schedule 1 of the Regulations and carried out consultation with the relevant public body who concurred with the screening opinion. Particularly in the absence of any adverse comments from the statutory body or the Local Planning Authority (either at the Screening or the Regulation 16 Consultation) I can confirm that the Screening undertaken was appropriate and proportionate, and that the Plan has sustainability at its heart.

The Basic Conditions Statement submitted alongside the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan includes, as regards the European Convention on Human Rights, an Equality Impact Assessment which illustrates that care had been taken throughout the preparation and drafting of the Plan to ensure that the views of the whole community were embraced to avoid any unintentional negative impacts on particular groups.

NB I do however note that the editing of Section 5 of this Assessment has not been updated and that should be completed so that the on-line version provides an accurate record.

Recommendation 17:

Review and update Section 5 of the Equality Impact Assessment and ensure that the on-line copy includes the amended content.

I therefore confirm that the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan has regard to fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the ECHR and complies with the Human Rights Act 1998. No evidence has been put forward to demonstrate that this is not the case.

Taking all of the above into account, I am satisfied that the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with EU obligations and that it does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with, the ECHR.

Conclusions

This Independent Examiner's Report recommends a range of modifications to the Policies, as well as some of the supporting content, in the Plan. Modifications have been recommended to effect corrections, to ensure clarity and in order to ensure that the Basic Conditions are met. Whilst I have proposed a significant number of modifications, the Plan itself remains fundamentally unchanged in the role and direction set for it by the Qualifying Body.

I therefore conclude that, subject to the modifications recommended, the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan:

- has regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Plan for the area;
- is compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations;
- does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017(d).

On that basis I *recommend* to the Derbyshire Dales District Council that, subject to the incorporation of modifications set out as recommendations in this report, it is appropriate for the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to referendum.

Referendum Area

As noted earlier, part of my Examiner role is to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. I consider the Neighbourhood Area to be appropriate and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore ***recommend*** that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the Neighbourhood Area as approved by the Derbyshire Dales District Council on 5th September 2014.

Recommendations: (this is a listing of the recommendations exactly as they are included in the Report)

Rec	Text	Reason
1	Review the “Contents” page once the text has been amended to accommodate the recommendations from this Report; add footnote source references for the “Basic Conditions Statement” and the “Community Engagement and Statutory Consultation Statement”.	For clarity and accuracy
2	<p>Under the heading “1 Introduction and Acknowledgements”:</p> <p>2.1 Delete “and Acknowledgements” from the title.</p> <p>2.2 In paragraph 1.03 replace “adopted” with ‘made’.</p> <p>2.3 In paragraph 1.05 delete “Appraisal*” and its footnote, replace “the village” with ‘the Neighbourhood Area’ and delete reference to “Appendix F”.</p> <p>2.4 Move any relevant part(s) of paragraph 1.07 to Section 9.</p> <p>2.5 Add in place of the content of paragraph 1.07: ‘The Parish Council will monitor the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that its objectives are being delivered. At least every 5 years the Plan will be reviewed to see whether a new or modified Plan is required.’</p>	For clarity and accuracy
3	<p>Under the heading “2 Neighbourhood Plan Area Map”:</p> <p>3.1 In the title and last sentence delete “Plan”.</p> <p>3.2 Review the need for this section to be italicised.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
4	Under the heading “4 Groups, Activities & Amenities” add a footnote source reference for the content of “Appendix G” and delete “Appendix G” (and omit Appendix G/KINP B from the Plan document).	For clarity
5	<p>For Section 5 headed “Planning History”:</p> <p>5.1 Alter the title to “Planning Context”.</p> <p>5.2 Delete the sub-headings “The Past” and “The Present” as well as paragraphs 5.1 to 5.03; renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.</p> <p>5.3 In the last sentence of paragraph 5.04 delete “very”.</p> <p>5.4 Add to paragraph 5.05 between the second and third sentences: ‘This Neighbourhood Plan is required to have regard to national planning policy and guidance and be in general conformity with the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan.’</p> <p>5.5 In paragraph 5.06 replace “An adopted” with ‘A ‘made’.</p> <p>5.6 Footnotes: Move the footnote source reference for the Conservation Area Appraisal to the Policies section. Provide the source reference for the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan that has been</p>	For clarity and accuracy

	omitted at the foot of the page.	
6	<p>Under the heading “6 Community Engagement”:</p> <p>6.1 Delete paragraph 6.02 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly), the second and third sentences of paragraph 6.03, and the third sentence of paragraph 6.12.</p> <p>6.2 Amend the reference to “all households” in the first sentence of paragraph 6.11 to ‘all households in the Neighbourhood Area’.</p> <p>6.3 Insert a new paragraph between paragraphs 6.12 and 6.13 as follows: ‘The draft copy of the Neighbourhood Plan was presented in a two day ‘Open Weekend’ in the Village Hall on the 4th & 5th Nov 2017. More than 70 villagers attended the meeting over the two days. After further consultations with interested parties, in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, the Neighbourhood Plan was published for pre-submission consultation between 19th November 2018 and 2nd February 2019.’</p> <p>6.4 In place of the reference to an Appendix C in paragraph 6.13 provide a source reference to the on-line copy of the Consultation Statement.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
7	Delete section 7 and renumber subsequent sections accordingly.	For clarity and accuracy
8	<p>Under the heading “8 [amended to 7 as above] The Kirk Ireton Community Vision”:</p> <p>8.1 Replace the “and” before “a village hall” with a comma and after “modern village” insert: “and the issue of adequate off-street parking will have been addressed”.</p> <p>8.2 Delete the second sentence of paragraph 8.02 and paragraph 8.03.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
9	Reword the text under “Policies” on page 11 as follows: ‘All policies should be read in conjunction with the Derbyshire Dales District Council’s adopted policies. No Neighbourhood Plan policy will be applied in isolation; account will be taken of all relevant policies.’	For clarity and accuracy
10	<p>10.1 Reword “Policy P1: Development” as follows ‘Development proposals for the village of Kirk Ireton must be appropriate for a rural location and demonstrate particular attention to two important documents that address the character of the settlement and its setting: The Conservation Area Appraisal 2014 [provide a footnote source reference] and the Landscape Sensitivity Study 2015 [provide a footnote source reference] and successor documents’.</p> <p>10.2 Replace the reference to “Appendix F” in paragraph P1.01 with a source reference for the questionnaire results.</p> <p>10.3 Delete paragraph P1.18 and renumber subsequent paragraphs.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3

	<p>10.4 Delete the first two sentences of paragraph P1.21.</p> <p>10.5 Delete the map on page 17.</p> <p>10.6 Provide a source reference for the map on page 18 (and amend any page reference to it within the text).</p>	
11	<p>11.1 Reword “Policy P2 – Protecting Views” as follows: ‘Development proposals should not be detrimental to views of the village, views from the village or the heritage value of the landscape. The potential impact on views should be assessed and addressed by taking into account the sensitivity of land to development as identified in the Landscape Sensitivity Study and also the principles within and views highlighted by the Conservation Area Character Appraisal.’</p> <p>11.2 Replace the reference to “Appendix F” in paragraph P2.03 with a source reference for the questionnaire results.</p> <p>11.3 Delete paragraphs 2.05 and 2.06 as well as the content of pages 20 – 24 (although a selection of titled photographs may be used within the document to liven the presentation and illustrate the Parish).</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
12	<p>12.1 Reword “Policy P3 – Conservation Area’ as follows; ‘Development proposals within the Conservation Area should promote, reinforce and enhance the area’s local distinctiveness and be sensitive to the heritage context in terms of design, materials, scale, massing, density, light pollution and access. The guidelines within the Kirk Ireton Conservation Area Character Appraisal must be addressed. Particular attention should be paid to any impacts on principal landmarks as identified on the adjacent map and its key.’</p> <p>12.2 Delete the italicised wording beginning “Adapted from...” beneath the P3 Policy.</p> <p>12.3 Replace the reference to “Appendix F” in paragraph P3.07 with a source reference for the questionnaire results.</p> <p>12.4 Amend the map on page 27 to extend the list of landmark properties and locate them all on the map: as listed by the Qualifying Body these are: Holy Trinity Church and churchyard gates, Barley Mow public house, Stable Shop, Primary School, Village Hall and Old Post Office, Manor House and Northfield Farm, Church Farm, Green Farm, Lukes Cottage, Pebble Cottage, Old Rectory, Yew Tree Cottage, 1 Broadway, Vesta Lynn, Old Methodist Chapel.</p> <p>12.5 Provide a source reference for the map on page 28.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
13	<p>13.1 Reword “Policy P4: Business Development as follows: ‘Business and tourism developments that demonstrate appropriate regard for the rural character and rural infrastructure of the Neighbourhood Area will be supported’.</p> <p>13.2 Move the paragraph in the Policy box commencing “The</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3

	<p>NPPF....” to form a new paragraph between P4.03 and P4.04; renumber the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.</p> <p>13.3 Replace the reference to “Appendix F” in paragraph P4.02 with a source reference for the questionnaire results.</p>	
14	<p>14.1 Within Policy P5;</p> <p>14.1.1 Delete the opening words “Protection of Car Parking -”.</p> <p>14.1.2 Replace “the defined existing built framework” with ‘the village’.</p> <p>14.1.3 Replace “on a site will only be permitted where” with ‘will be required to make’ and delete “is made”.</p> <p>14.1.4 Move the last sentence of element a) to replace the present element b).</p> <p>14.1.5 Delete element c).</p> <p>14.2 Provide a footnote source reference for the “Rural Space Profile” referenced in paragraph P5.04.</p> <p>14.3 Delete the map on page 31.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
15	<p>Under the heading “Acknowledgements”:</p> <p>15.1 Bring the titling on page 32 and within the Contents page into line (Section 9 or not?).</p> <p>15.2 Add back here any part of paragraph 1.07 that is to be retained.</p>	For clarity
16	Delete Appendices KINP A & KINP B, suitable references to the on-line location of their content having been provided with the body of the Plan document.	For clarity
17	Review and update Section 5 of the Equality Impact Assessment and ensure that the on-line copy includes the amended content.	For clarity and accuracy