



## WELFORD 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 Welford Neighbourhood Plan.

All of the responses summarised below were considered by the examiner when preparing his assessment of, and recommendations towards, the Welford 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/welfordneighbourhoodplan>.

<b>Responses received to the submission consultation that were submitted to the Independent Examiner.</b>		
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Support/Object/ Comment</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
Northamptonshire County Council	Comment	Within the Neighbourhood Plan document, probably under the Planning Context section, reference should be made to the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan being part of the development plan and secondly, that as a consequence minerals and waste matters are not covered in the Neighbourhood Plan.
Environment Agency	Comment	We have no comments to make on this consultation.
Highways England	Comment	The Neighborhood Plan does not propose a level of growth that will have any impact on the operation of the Strategic Road Network. Raise concerns that traffic calming on the A5199 could conflict with the role of the route as an Emergency Diversion Route for the A14 and M1. Therefore measures such as Interactive Traffic Signs should be considered prior to any physical constraints.
Daventry District Council	Comment	Page 16, Paragraph 2.13 - Amend final sentence – “Development of greenfield sites that are poorly designed and don’t respond positively to their surroundings can disrupt the profile and skyline of the village and detract from its intrinsic character”
	Comment	Page 18, Paragraph 2.20 - The title ‘On being the right size’ should be amended as this implies that the village do not want any growth which is contrary to the Vision of the Plan which seeks to achieve ‘modest new development’. A suggested amendment is to change this title to ‘Maintaining a sense of community’.
	Comment	Page 36 and 37, Map 2 - The legend on page 36 is not consistent with the descriptive legend in the top left corner of Map 2 in relation to the colour of listed buildings. This should be amended to be consistent and provide clarity.
	Comment	Policy W1 - Criteria (h) should be amended as follows: Within the village, in the setting of listed buildings, Article 4 areas, and other areas of heritage interest, development proposals should preserve or enhance the character of the village, street and setting within which they are to be located. Article 4 areas are not necessarily all areas of historic interest, therefore this does not fit with the intent of the criteria. Any areas with or without Article 4 directions will be subject to the

		<p>rest of this policy.</p> <p>Amending the latter part of (h) to say proposals 'should preserve or enhance' will ensure consistency with Section 72 of the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990. The Council is currently completing a review of Conservation Areas across the District and has prepared a schedule of works for this to ensure those most in need are completed earlier. The designation of a conservation area is a statutory process that can only be completed by the Council. Therefore the Council propose the final paragraph is amended to say the following: "Designation of a conservation area for Welford would be supported."</p>
	Objection	<p>As set out in our response to the Regulation 14 consultation we consider that there are areas of the village that have been incorrectly included. These should not be as their character has more affinity with the open countryside than the built form of the village.</p> <p>The plan attached proposes amendments to make the confine more reflective of guidance provided by the Council on drawing confines which builds on the definition of confines set out in Para 4.90 of the Daventry District Local Plan which provides guidance for defining confines where these have not been mapped. This proposed change to the confines also includes a revision to the boundary at the Newlands Road site to accurately reflect the boundary of the planning permission.</p>
	Comment	<p>Page 44/45, Policy W4 - Local green space designations WP4/1 and WP4/5 include a youth centre and club house respectively. It is important to be aware that the local green space designation is a very restrictive policy designation (para 76 - 78 of the NPPF) and when established has to be managed in a consistent manner to the policy for Green Belts where development is inappropriate except for in very special circumstances. Consequently it is not considered to be appropriate where it could prevent expansion or alteration of these facilities in the future. The boundary should either be amended to exclude the building and adjoining land or alternatively designate the areas as important open space instead. This will ensure the plan meets the Basic Conditions by allowing for the future sustainable development of community facilities.</p>
	Comment	<p>Page 48, Policy W5 - Criterion (c) does not follow from the first sentence. Suggest amending to read as follows:</p> <p>c) protecting mature and established trees and incorporating them into landscaping schemes wherever possible.</p>
	Comment	<p>Page 52, paragraph 5.24 - Suggest the final sentence is deleted. 'This is based on the relatively</p>

		limited range of facilities in the village and the poor public transport'. This sentence does not meet the Basic Conditions as it does not have regard to national policy that requires plans to plan positively for the development required in the area. This sentence is not considered to be positive.
	Comment	Page 57, Policy W9 - Community facilities are buildings or spaces where activities for community benefit are the primary use. We would question the inclusion of the garage in the list of community facilities to be protected.
	Comment	There are inconsistencies between the proposed amendments detailed in the consultation statement and the submission version of the neighbourhood plan. A schedule was attached to the response setting these out.
Welford Parish Council	Support	p18, para 2.20 - Title 'On Being the Right Size' should be retained but can be in inverted commas. This title refers to the title of a book which is referenced in the text. We do not agree with the change suggested by Daventry DC.
	Support	P41, Map 3 - We refer to the revised map submitted by DDC as part of their response to this consultation. We have reviewed our map, having regard to whether the sites in question have more affinity with the open countryside than the built form of the village and have re-assessed some of them as follows: Doctor's Barn: we accept that the garden part of this site, which is not consented, should be designated as open countryside. However the house itself should stay within the village confines. Old Barn, West St: The field with a lake in it and the orchard field should be designated as open countryside. However the central section of the extended garden should be within the village confines. The changes that we are suggesting to our map are shown on a revised map which is attached. We are happy for the examiner to arbitrate over the final boundaries but hope that this will be undertaken in conjunction with a visual inspection.
	Support	Re DDC's suggested amendment of latter part of (h): Welford Parish Council and the NDP Steering Group have already discussed a plan of action for identifying possible conservation areas with a planning consultant, and we would also expect there to be a village consultation process. We would welcome involvement in the review of conservation areas being conducted by Daventry DC, who would designate any conservation areas agreed upon. We believe the text in the plan should remain unaltered.

	Support	P52 para 5.24 - The sentence contested by DDC in their response to this consultation should be revised to 'Welford has very limited public transport facilities.'
	Support	P 57, Policy W9 - Re response from DDC on community facilities. The garage was rated by villagers as the fourth most important community facility (result of village questionnaire/survey). The importance attached to the garage is, in part, a reflection of the poor provision of public transport in the village.
Gladman	Comment	Gladman seeks to clarify the relationship of the neighbourhood plan to both national and local policy requirements highlighting areas in which we feel that the document currently lacks clarity. In this regard, we consider that the Plan would benefit from modifications to several policies to ensure that it can be found consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions.
	Comment	<p>Policy W2</p> <p>Gladman do not support the use of a settlement boundary if it would act to preclude the delivery of otherwise sustainable development opportunities from coming forward. In addition this policy would appear to be at odds with policy W1a which suggests that development proposals are acceptable adjacent to the settlement's edge.</p> <p>A distinction needs to be made between developments proposals adjoining existing built up areas/committed sites should be permitted where the adverse impacts of development do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development. In addition, this policy should instead relate only to development proposals outside and not adjoining existing built up areas to provide clarity on development not adjoining existing settlements where countryside policies in respect of development in the countryside would apply.</p> <p>Alternative policy wording was provided.</p> <p>Gladman take this opportunity to inform the Parish Council that ridge and furrows are often truncated by modern farming practices. Whilst recognising the community's ambition to conserve ridge and furrow networks, there appears to be no evidence supporting the Plan to demonstrate that the neighbourhood area is covered by particularly good examples. This evidence is needed to provide clarity on how this policy will be applied in a consistent manner through the development management process.</p>
	Comment	<p>Policy W3</p> <p>Gladman consider that this policy lacks sufficient evidence to demonstrate why these views are of particular importance to the local community. Opinions on landscape are highly subjective,</p>

		<p>therefore, without further evidence to demonstrate why these views are considered special will likely lead to inconsistencies in the decision making process.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not set out justification or reasoning why these views are of particular importance to the local community and the basis of how these views were selected. The Guidance states that 'Proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. The evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft neighbourhood plan.'</p> <p>Accordingly, Gladman consider that this matter should be investigated and based on appropriate evidence prior to the Plan being submitted for Examination.</p>
	Comment	<p>Policy W4</p> <p>Gladman recommend that the proposed public open spaces that are not LGS should be removed from this policy and are included in their own separate policy.</p>
	Comment	<p>Policy W5</p> <p>In addition to the comments already raised, Gladman question criteria a) and b) given that no evidence supports the Plan with regards to important landscape features such as ridge and furrow fields or open land which is of particular significance to the form and character of the village.</p> <p>Paragraph 113 of the Framework refers to the need for criteria based policies in relation to proposals affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas, and that their protection should be commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and contribution to wider networks. As currently drafted Gladman do not believe that this landscape policy aligns with the Framework. This policy should be revisited to ensure that it is consistent with the approach set out within the Framework prior to the Plan being submitted for Examination.</p>
	Comment	<p>Policy W7</p> <p>Policy W7 lists criteria that new housing development will be required to meet. Gladman reiterate are concerns regarding open land and valued views of the countryside. No evidence has been prepared by the Steering Group to demonstrate why the identified views should be protected. Further, Gladman question the ability to protect 'open land' this requirement would appear to be rather onerous and does not allow for the flexibility to sustainable development opportunities promoted throughout the Framework.</p> <p>Further, criteria e) seeks to apply an unusual policy test requiring 'appropriate and effective</p>

		community involvement' prior to the submission of an application. However, the supporting text provides no clarification how this will be determined through the development management process and what would be regarded as effective community involvement. Notwithstanding this, this is not a land use policy, as such, it should form no basis within Policy W7. Development proposals will still be consulted on as part of their statutory requirements.
Anglian Water	Comment	No comments relating to the content of the neighbourhood plan.
Natural England	Comment	Welcomes reference to the Bosworth Mill Meadow SSSI and Local Wildlife Sites. The policy should seeks to protect the SSSI and LWS, rather than relying on high tier plans and seek enhancements where appropriate. Alternatively, the policy should at least make specific reference to the relevant core strategy policy it is following.
Northamptonshire County Council – Flood and Water Management	Support	Support the creation of WP4/6 Newlands Road and the protection of WP4/7 Northampton Road as green infrastructure plays a critical role in managing flood risk. Both sites are in close proximity to areas which are identified as being a high risk of flooding from surface water and therefore their presence will help to minimise this risk. If any works are to be undertaken on WP4/7 we would like to recommend the installation of Sustainable Drainage Systems be considered.
	Support	Support the policy that new development proposals are required to conserve and enhance local landscape character and biodiversity by preserving, amongst other, aquatic habitats. Consent and permission procedures are in place to support this process and could be referred to within the Neighbourhood Plan.
Hilary Hunt - Resident	Comment	I note that only Articles 1, 6 and 14 of the Human Rights Act are referred to in the Basic Conditions Statement. Although there is an statement that the WDNP is fully compatible with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) it is not clear if the subsequent paragraph, detailing those three Articles, is an example or a definition of the level of compliance. I consider that Articles 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17 and Article 2 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act would all also apply to a Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that it meets all human rights obligations.

		<p>The WDNP Basic Conditions statement does not mention what will happen if the government abolishes the Human Rights Act. If this happens, we would want to have recourse to Article 13 of the ECHR - “the right to an effective remedy”. [This Article is not in the Human Rights Act as the Act itself is de facto out effective remedy. If it is abolished, we need to still have this right documented.</p> <p>I would like to be assured with evidence that the independent examiner for the WDNP is qualified to examine the compatibility with all human rights, to protect, respect and secure those rights for all of us for the life of this Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
--	--	---