

**South West Kettering (Headlands Community) Neighbourhood Plan Examination Report**  
**Schedule of Comments on Fact Check Draft**

Page / Para	Report	Comments
P13 / para 49	'...was designated by East Northamptonshire Council'	Factual correction: ...was designated by <i>Kettering Borough Council</i>
P14 / para 53	'...part of the basis for planning and development control decisions.'	Planning terminology: part of the basis for planning and development <i>management</i> decisions.
P16 / para 64	'Taking the above into account and for clarity, I recommend the following changes (in italics) to the introductory section of the Neighbourhood Plan'	Clarification: For better direction to the reader as the Report starts in earnest, and for consistency with wording in para 15 regarding format of recommendations, could paragraph 64 be revised to read:  'Taking the above into account and for clarity, I recommend the following changes ( <del>in italics</del> ) to the introductory section of the Neighbourhood Plan. As noted above, my recommendations are presented as bullet points and highlighted in <b>bold print</b> , with any proposed new wording in <i>italics</i> .'
P19 / para 73	'In a similar respect, I am also mindful that the final paragraph of Policy 1 introduces new requirements relating to " <i>variety</i> " and " <i>multifunctionality</i> " without any supporting information'	Factual correction:  This sentence makes reference to ' <i>variety or multi-functionally</i> ' as wording in the Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. The original wording for Policy 1 does not include such provision. I think the confusion has arisen because it is wording in Policy HWC2 (Protection of Community Facilities) of the Adopted SSP2.  To avoid confusion please delete paragraph 73 of the Report
P21 / para 81	'...for Neighbourhood Plan policies to cross-reference other adopted policies.'	Planning terminology:

		<p>The context of the analysis is appreciated but technically, local plan policies are ‘<i>adopted</i>’ and neighbourhood plan policies are ‘<i>made</i>’. Perhaps for clarity the sentence could be revised to read:</p> <p>‘...for Neighbourhood Plan policies to cross-reference other <i>development plan</i> policies.’</p>
P22 / para 87	<p>‘...Policy 3 provides a vague reference requiring consistency with principles set out in the Kettering Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2007). However, the Kettering Conservation Area Character Appraisal is simply that. It does not set out a defined list of principles with which development proposals must be “<i>consistent</i>.”’</p>	<p>Clarification:</p> <p>The Qualifying Body were keen to emphasise the importance of the Kettering Conservation Area Appraisal to both developers and decision makers through their policy wording. However, the rationale for removing reference to this document from the policy wording is understood given the analysis provided in paragraph 87 of the Fact Check Report.</p> <p>It may also be useful to add, as a matter of clarity, that Policy 12 (Heritage) in the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan (KTCAAP) already makes a provision requiring decision makers and developers to have regard to the Kettering Conservation Area Appraisal. Thus, as noted in paragraph 76 of the Report, there is no need for the Neighbourhood Plan to repeat such requirements as the development plan is read ‘as a whole’.</p>
P27 / para 117 / bullet 2	<p><b>‘Replace with a newly worded Policy 5:</b></p> <p><b><i>“All new development must be of good design. Development must respect the distinctive character of the Character Area within which it is located, taking account of the SWK Character Area information set out within and appended to the Neighbourhood Plan. Development must not harm highway safety.”</i></b></p>	<p>Clarification:</p> <p>As per your recommendation on P30 / para 129 / bullets 1 and 2, paragraph numbering will be updated. This will include numbering sub-sections in the Plan to ease navigation of the document and for referencing purposes.</p> <p>As such could there be a slight revision to the newly worded Policy 5 to add clarity for the end-reader:</p> <p>‘All new development must be of good design. Development must respect the distinctive character of the Character Area within which it is located. <i>Development proposals will demonstrate how they have taken account of the information about the Character Areas as set out in sub-section XX and Appendix B.</i> Development must not harm highway safety.’</p>

P30 / para 129 / bullet 5	<b>'Page 30, Section 7, delete bullet 1 ("A designated...Council.")'</b>	<p>Clarification:</p> <p>The wording of bullet 1 in the Qualifying Body's procedure for monitoring may lack clarity as to its purpose. This step is about the Town Council delegating the responsibility of processing planning applications affecting the Neighbourhood Area to one individual. This will ensure a single point of contact and a consistent approach in the application of neighbourhood plan policies.</p> <p>It wasn't the intention of the Qualifying Body to require North Northamptonshire Council to write to that individual. As noted above, the wording in this step lacks clarity if that was the Examiner's interpretation. With this explanation in mind would it be more appropriate to reword bullet 1 rather than deleting it outright?</p>
------------------------------	--	---