



KILSBY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Summary of responses received at Regulation 16 stage (submission)

Regulation 4(3)(b)(iii) of the Neighbourhood Planning (Referendum) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

The following table comprises a summary of the responses received to the submission consultation of the Kilsby Neighbourhood Plan.

All of the responses summarised below were considered by the examiner when preparing his assessment of, and recommendations towards, the Kilsby Neighbourhood Plan. Where significant representations were received the summary and conclusions provided by the respondent have been used to populate the tables below. The summary of comments reflects the views put forward by the consultee and are abridged as faithfully as possible to ensure that the purpose of the original representation is maintained. The responses can be reviewed in full on the DDC website at: <https://www.daventrydc.gov.uk/living/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/kilsby/>

Responses received to the submission consultation that were submitted to the Independent Examiner.

Respondent	Support/Object/ Comment	Summary of response
Andy Tompkins	Support	Has read the plan several times and totally agrees with its contents.
Alan and Jenny Fisher	Support	<p>Vision and Objectives- has regard to national policy and contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Compiled following considerable consultation of the villagers who wish to conserve history and character of the village. Plan is also in accordance with local development plans which focus growth at Northampton and, more locally, Daventry.</p> <p>Policy K2- Think it is important to include 'green' policies that support health and leisure activities. Support these policies as important to linking communities and providing leisure options.</p>
Anglian Water	Comment and Object	<p>Objective 7 – Objective refers to the use of CIL charges towards new and improved infrastructure including utilities provision however contributions towards water supply improvements are required through provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 and will not be required to form part of CIL charges.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6.2 – Replace the wording in paragraph 4.6.2 with the following; 'Currently there is limited capacity within the water supply network to</p>

		accommodate further growth. Applicants are advised to contact Anglian Water to discuss the available capacity within the water supply network and whether there is a need for upgrades or reinforcements to enable a development to come forward’.
Ann Thomas	Support	Has welcomed the chance to put forward ideas for taking Kilsby forward and hopes the wishes of the village are heard when it’s time to make decisions about its future.
Brenda Beeston	Support	Fully supports the Neighbourhood Plan
Chris Baulch	Comment	Regarding a site off Daventry Road a query was raised as to how the plan would have influenced decision making for this site had it been in place earlier with.
Christopher Spry	Support	Page 4 – Page 22 4.1.2 –Page 24 4.1.11 – page 24 Policy K1 – believes in the need to manage any future sustainable developments in the village
David Edgerton	Object	Proposals do not enhance the village or protect it and will not promote walking and cycling. Need to protect the village from encroachment from DIRFT.
David George	Support	Page 24, para 4.1.11, Policy K1 – due to the possibility of losing the shop possible alternatives should be put in Page 30, para 4.2.13, policy K3 – Fully endorsed this policy and hopes that when the NDP is adopted it will be strong enough to stop attempts at building inappropriate

			<p>housing estates.</p> <p>Page 30, para 4.3.11, Policy K5 – encourages lobbying of relevant agencies, District and County Councillors and MP to try and reduce speed of vehicles on the A361 and the A5.</p>
Daventry Council	District	Comment	<p>Para 2.9 – reference should also be made to the saved policies of the Daventry District Local Plan</p> <p>Policy K3 – policy does not need to repeat the wording of policy R1 and reference to policy R1 should be moved to the supporting text. Furthermore clarity as to how the settlement boundary relates to confines should be inserted in the supporting text and reference to ‘in’ should be changed to ‘at’ to ensure it applies to all residential development.</p>
Gladman		Object	<p>The Kilsby Neighbourhood Plan seeks to resist future development outside of the defined settlement boundary without regard to the number of units that may be allocated in the Part 2 Local Plan and therefore it constrains the delivery of sustainable development including housing. Consequently Gladman contend that the Kilsby Neighbourhood Plan proposes an approach that does not comply with either the Framework or PPG and is not based on robust, up-to-date evidence. It cannot be appropriate to ‘make’ the plan without having regard to national planning policy and guidance, furthermore it will not contribute to sustainable development and is not in conformity with policy SA of the JCS which seeks to provide a ‘presumption in favour’ in line with Framework.</p> <p>The Kilsby Neighbourhood Plan is not sufficiently growth focused and is inflexible by not supporting any development outside of the existing confines of the village and the failure to consider possible site allocations, including the site promoted by</p>

		<p>Gladman to the North of Rugby road result in a conflict with the NPPF in particular the objective to “boost significantly the supply of housing”. Gladman contend that such an approach directly contradicts the whole ethos of the Framework and will not enable the Kilsby Neighbourhood Plan to deliver even its limited development aspirations due to the strategy which it promotes.</p> <p>The SEA screening report is inadequate as it does not test reasonable alternatives including a pro-growth scenario.</p> <p>Consequently the Kilsby Neighbourhood gives rise to legal flaws and is liable to be subject to judicial review proceedings as it is contrary to the following basic conditions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
James Browne	Support	<p>Is in full agreement with the views expressed in the Neighbourhood Plan and feel that it reflects the views of the vast majority of village residents. Is aware that a great deal of work was undertaken in producing the plan to ensure all aspects of village life, concerns and aspirations were taken into account and therefore feels</p>

		that the document is a full representation of Kilsby residents views.
Jane George	Support	Supports the whole plan
John Acres	Support, Comment and Object	<p>General Comments- Cannot fault the efficiency of the Neighbourhood Plan Group in terms of the effectiveness of the consultation.</p> <p>Raises a concern about an incorrect description of their professional background in the consultation statement that implies a conflict of interest and requested that this should be formally amended in the Consultation Statement.</p> <p>Plan is well written, contains a wealth of information about the history and background of the village but is concerned about its content, policies and whether it achieves its aims.</p> <p>Concerned that the plan is too restrictive, it should consider how people's needs are addressed and should produce a strategy for modest organic growth which will support local services, especially with an ageing population. The original questionnaire was phrased in such a way that would have encouraged a negative attitude towards development encouraged by the action group campaign.</p> <p>The plan concludes that it is necessary to provide more affordable and social housing but not 'executive housing' but plans for neither as the restricted infill status restricts options for further housing.</p> <p>Vision and Objectives - The plan cannot achieve the vision and some of the objectives (number 2 relating to housing and 7 relating to CIL) as there is no scope for growth beyond that which has permission</p>

		<p>Policy K1 – second half of policy relating to CIL contributions to new facilities appears meaningless and unrealistic due to the lack of development proposed</p> <p>Policy K2- proposals 1, 3 & 5 are welcome but will be undeliverable without developer funding, furthermore proposals 4 & 7 and unnecessary as they are unused.</p> <p>Policy K3 – policy effectively excludes any development at all due to the criteria included</p> <p>Policy K4 – policy appears to be based on the views of the questionnaire rather than assessment of need. Policy is superfluous without ability to provide sites through policy K3.</p> <p>Policy K5- first part of policy is meaningless as there are no development proposals to deliver improvements and the second part is non-specific, supporting something that might happen rather than proposing it</p> <p>Policy K6- policy is misleading as it supports development within village framework but there aren't any sites for development. The highlighting of ridge and furrow, which is common throughout Northamptonshire and Warwickshire was designed to thwart development proposals which have been refused. Plan should mention the need to protect the cob walls and buildings in the village which reflect the village's traditional character.</p> <p>Policy K7- welcome the protection of named green spaces but probably unnecessary since they are publically owned.</p> <p>Policy K8 – generally positive but doesn't actually propose anything</p> <p>Policy K9- policy is completely impractical as there are no proposals which could</p>
--	--	--

		<p>provide necessary contributions to meet the future needs of the village. Reference to water capacity issues should not be included unless it is factually true, however there aren't any proposals that would adversely affect water supply in the village.</p> <p>Monitoring and Review- the plan must include a commitment to a review to ensure it can be changed in the future otherwise Kilsby will be closed for business.</p>
John and Lesley Loader	Support	In agreement with the plan
John Beeston	Support	Strongly supports the Neighbourhood Plan, has been impressed by the Parishes degree of involvement of the community and is therefore sure that it is a good representation of consensus needs of the community.
Joyce and Barry Strong	Support	Support the Neighbourhood Plan
David George (Kilsby Recreation Ground)	Support	Page 24, Para 4.1.11 Policy K1- trustees appreciate that the Recreation ground may not be suitable for all or any of the following but feel that the village lacks a proper playing field and pavilion/changing facilities and a parking area; a youth shelter; skateboard/3 wheeler scooter ramps; adult sports facilities
Kilsby Stitchers	Support	Page 24, policy K1- would like more parking in front of the chapel
Lloyd Thomas	Support	Having spoken to residents of the village it is clear that the Neighbourhood Plan is a complete document that represents views of vast majority as demonstrated by very

		high percentage of completed questionnaires that demonstrate support.
Margaret Couldrey	Support	<p>Plan should be accepted for future existence of Kilsby to retained as a rural area for the benefit of people wishing to live in a country environment which is sadly being destroyed around the UK due mainly to over development of green spaces.</p> <p>Also makes a comment raising concerns about further development in the Kilsby area and its possible impact on traffic congestion which has reached saturation point due to DIRFT and will worsen with development of the Rugby radio mast site.</p>
Michael and Barbara Lang	Support	Happy with the planning process suggested by the Kilsby Neighbourhood Plan document and pleased to note the limitation of development to being within the village boundary. Strongly opposed to development in open countryside.
Michelle Lees	Support	Proposals are realistic and in keeping with what makes Kilsby so special whilst considering the Villages need for improvements and to evolve.
Ron and Diana Smith	Support	Plan appears to meet the basic conditions and with the plan in place the village of Kilsby will have a clear path for its future development that is supported by the majority of its residents.
National Grid	Comment	No record of high voltage electricity assets, high pressure gas pipelines or Gas distribution intermediate/high pressure apparatus in the Neighbourhood plan area.

Natural England	Comment	No concerns
Patrick McGuire	Object	<p>Section 4.3 – Proposals to improve road safety are clearly positive but feel that the measures proposed fall well short of what is required. The reference to traffic calming measures is too vague and does not address the severity of the problem. Plan should emphasise the following;</p> <p>a) light controlled pedestrian crossing on the A361</p> <p>b) the need for a bypass to run from the A361 to the A5 to the east of the village.</p> <p>c) deregulation of the A361 thereby barring the increasing HGV traffic from using the A361 through the village.</p>
Paul and Elain Morrice	Support	Plan is a very well-constructed document, it is important that the village retains its boundaries to keep its identity and does not become part of the urban sprawl threatening our countryside.
R Perry	Support and Comment	<p>Agrees with the majority of the plan but believes that the plan should also address the problem of insufficient parking spaces on new housing developments through the following standards;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 spaces for 1 and 2 bedroom properties - 3 spaces for 3 bedroom properties

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 spaces for 4 and 5 bedroom properties <p>New developments should also include a large general car/van park which should be sized in proportion to the scale of the development.</p>
Rob Chamberlain	Support	Commends the Parish Council, is pleased that desire for village to grow in a sustainable manner comes out in the consultation and the housing needs survey provides useful evidence of need. Protection of heritage assets wherever they are is paramount to protect the important history for children and grandchildren.
Severn Trent	Comment	No specific comments to make but would like to comment further when plans are more developed as they will be in a position to offer more detailed comments.
Terry Dougan	Support	Supports the whole plan as believes it meets the basic conditions and reflects the views of the majority of residents in the Parish to provide a sustainable future for the village up to 2029
Tim Rose	Support	Decision and conclusions are sensible and very much what the people of Kilsby feel and want.
Tom and Christine Clay	Support	Agree with the need for a plan led by Kilsby people and have been fully involved with the development of the plan at every stage. Agree with the analysis and support it being adopted as the way forward for the village, in particular they are keen to recover the restricted infill only status and would like to see attempts made to reduce amount and speed of traffic through the village.

Tom and Kate Hindle	Support	<p>Extensive consultation has been carried out and the plan is a fair representation of the views of the majority of residents. Housing development should be focused on urban areas although Kilsby is not averse to new build as evidenced by the eleven houses on the former Lasalign sites. With the addition of the 40 houses off Daventry Road it is considered that Kilsby should retain its status as an infill village.</p>
Turley on behalf of Richborough Estates	Object and Support	<p>General Comments - Client is promoting land to North and South of Barby Road, Kilsby. Has a number of significant concerns regarding the compliance of the plan with the policy contained in the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance and how the policies in the plan conform with the strategic policies of the WNJCS. Does not therefore consider that the plan meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>Introduction and Background – Limited opportunities to deliver sustainable sites within the existing confines</p> <p>Draft Vision and Objectives – supports acknowledgement that growth is need to ensure the village remains vibrant and sustainable but does not consider that this can be met through small scale developments, in particular as these will not provide the range of benefits, for example increased spending and contributions to infrastructure. Broadly supports draft key objectives and acknowledges importance of considering historic buildings but this should not prevent delivery of sustainable development. Further development will help to deliver improved bus services.</p> <p>Policy K1- aspiration for a medical facility within Kilsby cannot be met with the overall ambition to only permit small scale development.</p> <p>Policy K2 – Supports confirmation that proposals to improve accessibility for walking</p>

		<p>and cycling and enhancement of routes linking residential areas to community facilities will be supported. Also supports identification of green routes but questions where the funding will come from as they can only be delivered with funding from new developments.</p> <p>Policy K3- as currently worded the policy seeks to constrain development and therefore it fails to meet the basic conditions of having regard to national policy, contributing to the achievement of sustainable development, and being consistent with the strategic policies of the development plan through applying a cap on development. Client specifically objects to criterion f) which seeks to restrict residential development to sites within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Policy K5 – Supports identification for proposals for new residential developments to make an appropriate financial contribution towards local transport improvements but these will only be funded by large scale developments.</p> <p>Policy K6 – Does not support the four scenarios where development can occur outside the settlement boundary</p> <p>Policy K9 – Without new development it is unlikely that improvements to services and facilities will be funded.</p>
Vicky James	Support	<p>Well structured, well-argued plan that accurately reflects feelings and aspirations of Kilsby inhabitants. Made particular comments on the following;</p> <p>-Road Infrastructure- A361 cannot sustain further development and there is a strong argument for further discussion regarding the downgrading of the A361 to a B road and ideally a by-pass to the village</p> <p>-Heritage and Community – exceeding the proposed 10% growth would result in a</p>

		<p>loss of character of the village, its sense of community and heritage. Strong sense of community and heritage leads to high demand for down-sizing to allow residents to stay in the village.</p> <p>- Increase of industrial development at DIRFT means it is very important to maintain green buffer zone around the village rather than lose it to housing estates.</p>
--	--	---