



**Intelligent Plans**  
and examinations

# **Report on Eaton Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2030**

**An Examination undertaken for Cheshire East Council with the support of Eaton Parish Council on the January 2020 submission version of the Plan.**

Independent Examiner: Andrew S Freeman BSc(Hons) DipTP DipEM FRTPI

Date of Report: 10 June 2020

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 29 Monmouth Street, Bath BA1 2DL  
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

## Contents

	Page
<b>Main Findings - Executive Summary</b>	3
<b>1. Introduction and Background</b>	3
• Eaton Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2030	3
• The Independent Examiner	4
• The Scope of the Examination	4
• The Basic Conditions	5
<b>2. Approach to the Examination</b>	6
• Planning Policy Context	6
• Submitted Documents	6
• Site Visit	7
• Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	7
• Modifications	7
<b>3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights</b>	7
• Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	7
• Plan Period	7
• Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	7
• Development and Use of Land	8
• Excluded Development	8
• Human Rights	8
<b>4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions</b>	8
• EU Obligations	8
• Main Issues	9
• Introduction	9
• Issue 1: Built and Natural Environment	10
• Issue 2: Transport and Infrastructure	13
• Issue 3: Local Economy	13
• Other Policies	13
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	14
• Summary	14
• The Referendum and its Area	14
• Overview	14
<b>Appendix: Modifications</b>	15

## **Main Findings - Executive Summary**

From my examination of the Eaton Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- the Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Eaton Parish Council;
- the Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – Eaton Neighbourhood Area;
- the Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2020 to 2030; and
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

## **1. Introduction and Background**

### *Eaton Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2030*

- 1.1 Eaton is a small village within the unitary area of Cheshire East Council. It lies to the north of Congleton astride the busy A536 between Congleton and Macclesfield. Parts of the Parish of Eaton are more functionally related to Congleton and have been excluded from the designated area. The Neighbourhood Plan Area itself, focussed on Eaton village, is rural in character with an estimated population of 231 in 107 dwellings.<sup>1</sup>
- 1.2 The village is surrounded by open countryside. To the southeast, there are open views towards The Cloud (Bosley Cloud), a prominent area of high ground that rises above the Cheshire Plain. More distantly, to the south, Mow Cop can be seen. Within the confines of the Parish is the sand and gravel quarry at Eaton Hall where the area of existing and proposed working in the west of the Parish occupies more than a third of the designated area.

---

<sup>1</sup> Eaton Neighbourhood Plan, Paragraph 2.2.

- 1.3 The designation as a neighbourhood area was approved in October 2016 although residents' views were canvassed earlier, in July 2016. A Steering Group subsequently oversaw the Plan preparation and consultation through a variety of means. The draft Plan was subject to formal consultation (Regulation 14) between 28 September 2019 and 11 November 2019. The draft submission Plan contains a Vision, 10 objectives and 15 policies across four topic areas.

#### *The Independent Examiner*

- 1.4 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Eaton Neighbourhood Plan by Cheshire East Council, with the agreement of Eaton Parish Council.
- 1.5 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with over forty years' experience. I have worked in both the public and the private sectors. I am an independent examiner and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

#### *The Scope of the Examination*

- 1.6 As the independent examiner, I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
  - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
  - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.7 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ("the 1990 Act"). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions;
  - Whether the Plan complies with provisions under Section 38A and Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"). These are:
    - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
    - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
    - it specifies the period during which it has effect;

- it does not include provisions and policies for “excluded development”;
- it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;
- whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the Plan proceed to referendum; and
- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) (“the 2012 Regulations”).

1.8 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

### *The Basic Conditions*

1.9 The “Basic Conditions” are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood 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 development plan for the area;
- be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations; and
- meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

1.10 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

## 2. Approach to the Examination

### *Planning Policy Context*

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Cheshire East Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010–2030; also, saved policies from the Congleton Borough Local Plan 2004. In addition, there is an emerging development plan document in the form of the draft Site Allocations and Development Policies Document. However, whilst the Plan is not being examined against emerging strategic planning policy, the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that the reasoning and evidence informing an emerging plan may be relevant to the consideration of the Basic Conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested. Where a neighbourhood plan is brought forward before an up-to-date local plan is in place, the PPG further advises that the local authority and qualifying body should discuss and aim to agree the relationship between policies in the adopted and emerging plans, and aim to minimise conflicts.<sup>3</sup> I take account of this guidance in my assessment of the Plan.
- 2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The PPG offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. A revised NPPF was published on 19 February 2019 and all references in this report are to the February 2019 NPPF and its accompanying PPG.<sup>4</sup>

### *Submitted Documents*

- 2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:
- the draft Eaton Neighbourhood Plan 2020 -2030, January 2020;
  - a map of the Plan which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates (Figure A on Page 5 of the Plan);
  - the Consultation Statement, January 2020;
  - the Basic Conditions Statement, January 2020;
  - all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
  - The Strategic Environment Assessment Screening Report, March 2019, prepared by Cheshire East Council; and
  - the responses of Cheshire East Council (16 April 2020) and Eaton Parish Council (12 April 2020) to the questions annexed to my procedural letter of 30 March 2020.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> PPG Reference ID: 41-009-20190509.

<sup>4</sup> See paragraph 214 of the NPPF. The Plan was submitted under Regulation 15 to the local planning authority after 24 January 2019.

<sup>5</sup> View at: <https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-plans/neighbourhood-plans-a-f/eaton-neighbourhood-plan.aspx>

### *Site Visit*

- 2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 18 May 2020 to familiarise myself with it and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

### *Written Representations with or without Public Hearing*

- 2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

### *Modifications*

- 2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

## **3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights**

### *Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area*

- 3.1 The Eaton Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by Eaton Parish Council which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by Cheshire East Council on 28 October 2016.
- 3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for Eaton Neighbourhood Area and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

### *Plan Period*

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2020 to 2030.

### *Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation*

- 3.4 Details of plan preparation and consultation are set out in the Parish Council's Consultation Statement, dated January 2020. An application for designation of the Parish as a neighbourhood area was made in September 2016 and was followed by formal consultation. However, the Parish Council subsequently made representations suggesting that parts of the area more functionally related to Congleton should be excluded from the area. Designation in accordance with the revised proposals was made on 28 October 2016.

- 3.5 Early consultation in the form of a flyer and newsletter preceded designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Other events included preparation of a questionnaire together with various meeting and presentations. Formal pre-submission consultation under Regulation 14 took place between 28 September 2019 and 11 November 2019. The Consultation Statement records representations on 62 different matters including comments from 41 local residents; also, actions taken by way of response.
- 3.6 At the Regulation 16 stage, held between 29 January 2020 and 11 March 2020, representations were received from 14 different parties. The majority of these were statutory consultees although there were two representations from agents with an interest in the area.
- 3.7 I confirm that the legal requirements have been met by the consultation process. In addition, there has been regard to the advice in PPG on plan preparation and engagement.

#### *Development and Use of Land*

- 3.8 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with Section 38A of the 2004 Act.

#### *Excluded Development*

- 3.9 The Plan does not contain provisions and policies for "excluded development".

#### *Human Rights*

- 3.10 Eaton Parish Council is satisfied that the Plan has regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights and complies with the Human Rights Act 1998. Cheshire East Council has reached a similar conclusion. From my independent assessment, I see no reason to disagree.

## **4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions**

#### *EU Obligations*

- 4.1 The Neighbourhood Plan was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by Cheshire East Council which found that it was not necessary to undertake SEA. Having read the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report, I support this conclusion.
- 4.2 As part of the SEA, the Eaton Neighbourhood Plan was further screened for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), which also was not triggered. There are no sites of European significance within the Neighbourhood Plan Area but two such sites within 15km. However, it was concluded that due

to the nature of the policies, and that the Plan does not allocate sites for development, the effect of the Plan on these sites is not considered to be significant.

- 4.3 Natural England agreed<sup>6</sup> that the proposals contained within the Plan will not have significant effects on sensitive sites that Natural England has a statutory duty to protect. From my independent assessment of this matter, I have no reason to disagree.

#### *Main Issues*

- 4.4 Having regard to the Eaton Neighbourhood Plan, the consultation responses and other evidence, and the site visit, I consider that there are three issues relating to the Basic Conditions for this examination. These concern:
- Built and Natural Environment;
  - Transport and Infrastructure; and
  - Local Economy.

#### *Introduction*

- 4.5 Before I deal with the issues, I have a few observations to make with regard to the representations. First, the Eaton Neighbourhood Plan should be seen in the context of the wider planning system. This includes the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010 – 2030 and the emerging Site Allocations and Development Policies Document as well as the NPPF and PPG. It is not necessary, and it would be inappropriate, to repeat in the Neighbourhood Plan matters that are quite adequately dealt with elsewhere.<sup>7</sup>
- 4.6 Secondly, the Neighbourhood Plan does not have to deal with each and every topic raised through the consultation. In this regard, the content of the Neighbourhood Plan and the scope of the policies is largely at the discretion of the qualifying body, albeit informed by the consultation process and the requirements set by the Basic Conditions.
- 4.7 Thirdly, my central task is to judge whether the Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the Basic Conditions. Many of the representations do not demonstrate or indicate a failure to meet those conditions or other legal requirements. Similarly, many of the suggested additions and improvements are not necessary when judged against the Basic Conditions. Be this as it may, non-material changes, including suggestions and corrections set out in the representations, can be incorporated into the final version of the Plan.

---

<sup>6</sup> In an email dated 28 March 2019.

<sup>7</sup> See NPPF Paragraph 16 f).

4.8 The following section of my report sets out modification that are necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions. Some of the proposed modifications are factual corrections.<sup>8</sup> Others are necessary in order to have closer regard to national policies and advice. In particular, plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous.<sup>9</sup> In addition, the policies should be supported by appropriate evidence.<sup>10</sup>

#### *Issue 1: Built and Natural Environment*

- 4.9 The first policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, Policy BNE1, concerns new housing within the designated area. Infill housing will be permitted but only where, amongst other things, it does not involve the loss of undeveloped land that makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. This wording reflects that set out in Policy PG 10 of the emerging Site Allocations and Development Policies Document.
- 4.10 Important characteristics of the area include heritage assets, green wedges, local green spaces, gateways and views and vistas. However, the related text does not identify these matters and a potential developer could be left wondering what areas of undeveloped land are of importance within the context of the policy.
- 4.11 To add clarity, an addition to the evidence and justification supporting the policy should be made (proposed modification **PM1**). The opportunity has also been taken, under this modification, to remove from the policy superfluous reference to the 2019 "Settlement and Infill Boundaries Review" by Cheshire East Council.
- 4.12 On a further point, Policy BNE1 refers to the Infill Boundary for Eaton as defined at Figure C. However, this conflicts with Figure E, where the same boundary is described as the Settlement Boundary. Within the Development Plan, "Settlement Boundary" has a different meaning. For accuracy and consistency, the term "Infill Boundary" should be used. Proposed modification **PM2** refers.
- 4.13 The next policy under the Built and Natural Environment heading is Policy BNE2 – Local Green Gaps. The essential purpose of the policy is to maintain separation between Eaton and Congleton and safeguard the visual character of the landscape in the gap between the settlements.
- 4.14 The evidence tells me that Cheshire East Council has given consideration to the borough's strategic housing needs and this has led to the allocation and development of strategic sites on the Eaton side of Congleton. In this context, I consider that further significant building in the remaining gap would be totally undesirable. To my mind, it will be important to maintain

---

<sup>8</sup> Modifications for the purpose of correcting errors is provided for in Paragraph 10(3)(e) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.

<sup>9</sup> NPPF Paragraphs 15 and 16.

<sup>10</sup> PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

Eaton's rural setting and the contrast provided by intervening open countryside.

- 4.15 I appreciate that the Congleton Bypass could be seen as a boundary to the physical extension of Congleton. However, this would be to extend development on the western side of the A536 by a considerable distance beyond the planned limits of Congleton and towards Eaton, markedly compromising the laudable objectives of the green gap policy in an area that includes Cranberry Moss and other natural landscape. In this instance, no modification of the policy is necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions.<sup>11</sup>
- 4.16 Policy BNE3 addresses local character and design. In this regard, it should be clear that the policy applies to all related developments. As such, it is necessary to replace "should" with "shall" to indicate that the provisions are not optional. This is dealt with in proposed modification **PM3** as is the addition of "thresholds" after "gateways", to ensure consistency with Figure E.
- 4.17 The next policy under this issue is Policy BNE4 – Heritage. As in the previous paragraph, usages of "should" need to be replaced with "shall"; and, in order to be consistent with the policy, "Heritage Interpretation & Improvement Zones" in Figure E should be replaced by "Heritage Zones". For development management purposes, the Heritage Zones need to be accurately depicted, rather than being illustrated on an aerial photograph. As such, an appropriate plan is required. These matters are dealt with in proposed modification **PM4**.
- 4.18 The second paragraph of the policy refers to "historic assets". In having regard to the NPPF, the term "heritage assets" should be used. In addition, at Paragraph 5.43, textural amendments are necessary to ensure that mention is made of the important heritage assets in Eaton. Appropriate amendments are set out in proposed modification **PM5**.
- 4.19 Policy BNE5 deals with important views and vistas as illustrated on Figure E. I saw on my site visit that there are several fine views out from the village, over the open countryside or towards local landmarks, that are worthy of safeguarding. However, the policy talks of reinforcing, maintaining, retaining and framing views. Whilst such actions may be appropriate in certain circumstances, it is the unacceptable loss of visual amenity that should be avoided.
- 4.20 The policy needs to be amended to reflect the central requirement of a policy such as this and to specifically identify the views in question. Clarity is also needed through the use of "shall" rather than "should". Necessary changes are reflected in proposed modification **PM6**. In a

---

<sup>11</sup> As non-material changes, "or" should be deleted before "Eaton" and "(Appendix 2)" could be added after "Open Countryside".

change to Paragraph 5.55 (proposed modification **PM7**), possible actions, previously in the policy, can be highlighted.

- 4.21 Turning to Policy BNE6, this concerns Local Green Spaces. As drafted, the policy rules out most development “unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated”. However, the NPPF states that policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with Green Belt policy (Paragraph 101). This would allow development that is “not inappropriate”.
- 4.22 To ensure appropriate regard for national policy, the wording needs to be changed (proposed modification **PM8**). However, I agree that the four sites listed in the policy should be designated as Local Green Spaces as they meet the NPPF criteria for designation.
- 4.23 The next policy under the issue concerning the built and natural environment is Policy BNE7 – Dark Skies. In this regard, there are two necessary modifications:
- In common with the foregoing discussion, “should” needs to be replaced by “shall”.
  - The call for schemes to reduce energy consumption needs to be amended; a reduction cannot be effected in a new scheme.

Appropriate amendments to Policy BNE7 are set out in proposed modification **PM9**.

- 4.24 The final policy in the built and natural environment section is Policy BNE8 – Trees, Hedgerows, Watercourses, Lake and Ponds. There are two matters that require greater clarity. First, the policy requires the preservation of hedgerows, trees, watercourses, lakes and ponds which make a significant contribution to the amenity, biodiversity and landscape character of Eaton. However, the identification of the specific features to which the policy applies is not clear.
- 4.25 Secondly, the policy says that development that would have an adverse impact will not normally be permitted. However, there may be circumstance where a minor adverse impact would be acceptable. It is the significance of the impact that is relevant. These two points would be addressed in proposed modification **PM10**.
- 4.26 With the above modifications in place, the built and natural environment provisions would accord with national policy and be clearly written, accurate and supported by appropriate evidence. The Basic Conditions would be met.

### *Issue 2: Transport and Infrastructure*

- 4.27 Policy TI1 deals with sustainable transport. Where appropriate, developer contributions will be used to improve traffic safety. However, the evidence indicates<sup>12</sup> that the free flow of traffic should also be covered. This is addressed in proposed modification **PM11**.
- 4.28 In Policy TI2 – Footpaths and Access to the Countryside, there are three instances where amendment is necessary:
- As previously discussed, usage of “should” needs to be avoided and replaced by “shall”.
  - The second paragraph of the policy refers to the possibility of suitable alternatives to the loss or degradation of Public Rights of Way. However, it is Public Rights of Way that would be the subject of alternatives, not degradation.
  - The third paragraph of the policy refers to routes to “facilities” without any clear indication of the facilities covered.

Necessary amendments are set out in proposed modifications **PM12** and **PM13**.

- 4.29 In Policy TI3 – Communications and Infrastructure, there is a single use of “should” that needs to be changed in line with previous discussion. Proposed modification **PM14** refers. With this amendment in place, and those relating to Policies TI1 and TI2, the transport and infrastructure provisions would be clear and supported by appropriate evidence. The Basic Conditions would be met.

### *Issue 3: Local Economy*

- 4.30 Turning to the local economy, Policy LE2 addresses after-use at the Tarmac Eaton Hall sand extraction quarry. In the policy, this is simply referred to as “the quarry”. For clarity, the quarry should be named. The policy also supports high quality restoration having no detrimental effect. However, it is the absence of unacceptable impacts that is relevant.
- 4.31 Appropriate amendments are set out in proposed modification **PM15**. With these changes in place, the policy would be clear and unambiguous and there would be compliance with the Basic Conditions.

### *Other Policies*

- 4.32 There are three policies that have not been specifically addressed in this report. They are Policy C1 – Leisure and Countryside Pursuits; Policy C2 – Community Facilities; and Policy LE1 – Rural Economy. Having reviewed

---

<sup>12</sup> Response to Examiner’s Questions, Eaton Parish Council, 12 April 2020.

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 29 Monmouth Street, Bath BA1 2DL

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

the provisions of these policies, I consider that these accord with NPPF policy, in particular that set out in Paragraphs 83 and 84 under the heading of supporting a prosperous rural economy.

- 4.33 All other policies have been considered in the foregoing discussion. With the modifications that I have recommended, the Plan would meet the Basic Conditions. Other minor changes (that do not affect the Basic Conditions) could be made by the Parish Council and Cheshire East Council of their own volition.

## **5. Conclusions**

### *Summary*

- 5.1 The Eaton Neighbourhood Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

### *The Referendum and its Area*

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Eaton Neighbourhood Plan as modified has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

### *Overview*

- 5.4 It is evident that a considerable amount of time and effort has been devoted to the development and production of this Plan and I congratulate those who have been involved. The Plan should prove to be a useful tool for future planning and change in the Eaton Neighbourhood Area over the coming years.

*Andrew S Freeman*

Examiner

## Appendix: Modifications

<b>Proposed modification number (PM)</b>	<b>Page no./ other reference</b>	<b>Modification</b>
PM1	Pages 12 and 13	<p>In Policy BNE1, remove the words "CEC 'Settlement and Infill Boundaries Review (2019)' "</p> <p>Add the following two sentences at the end of Paragraph 5.6: "In this context, the heritage assets, green wedges, local green spaces, gateways and views and vistas, all as identified in the Plan, are important to the area's character. Related undeveloped land will be addressed under the terms of Policy BNE1."</p>
PM2	Page 24	<p>In the Key to Figure E, change "Settlement Boundary" to "Infill Boundary".</p> <p>Change the infill boundary so that it is the same as that shown in Figure C</p>
PM3	Page 20	<p>Throughout Policy BNE3, replace "should" with "shall".</p> <p>Replace "gateways" with "gateway thresholds".</p>
PM4	Page 25	<p>Throughout Policy BNE4, replace "should" with "shall".</p> <p>Replace "A heritage zone is" with "Heritage zones are"; and, in the second usage of zone, change to "zones".</p> <p>Insert within the Neighbourhood Plan a new plan of an appropriate scale showing the heritage zones and cross-refer to this plan in Policy BNE4.</p>
PM5	Pages 25 and 26	<p>In Policy BNE4, replace "historic assets" with "heritage assets".</p> <p>In the first sentence of Paragraph 5.43, replace "Further historic assets" with "Other heritage assets". At the end of the sentence, add: "together with mill stones and mile markers".</p>

PM6	Page 27	In the final sentence of Policy BNE5, substitute "shall" for "should". Replace all other text with the following: "Through its layout and design, new development shall respond positively to opportunities to connect to the wider landscape. In views of Christ Church Tower and in the important views and vistas identified on Figure E, there shall be no unacceptable loss of visual amenity."
PM7	Page 28	Add the following at the end of Paragraph 5.55: "In Eaton, and in connecting to the wider landscape, the reinforcement, maintenance, retention or framing of views may be appropriate."
PM8	Page 29	In Policy BNE6, replace "unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated" with "in accordance with Green Belt policy".  In Paragraph 5.58, after "very special circumstances", insert "or as otherwise provided for by national policy".
PM9	Page 32	In Policy BNE7 change both usages of "should" to "shall".  Replace "reduce" with "minimise".
PM10	Page 34	In Policy BNE8, replace "adversely impact" with "have a significant adverse impact".  In the final paragraph of the policy, replace "Significant trees include" with "For the purposes of this policy, significant trees are".  After "Plough Inn", insert "; the woodland belts which are the remains of the Eaton Hall Estate;".  After the first sentence, insert "They include the trees the subject of Tree Preservation Orders as illustrated on Figure I."  Replace "include the River Dane, its banks and riverine surroundings, the quarry lakes" with "are the River Dane, its banks and riverine surroundings, the quarry lakes (Eaton Hall sand and gravel quarry)".

PM11	Page 37	In Policy TI1, substitute "the safety and free flow of traffic" for "traffic safety".
PM12	Page 40	In Policy TI2, replace "should" with "shall". After "suitable alternatives", insert "to loss".
PM13	Page 40	At the end of Paragraph 6.12, add "Routes to facilities such as the church, Parish Hall, the Millennium Park and Play Area, The Plough and bus stops would be provided."
PM14	Page 41	In Policy TI3, replace "should" with "shall".
PM15	Page 47	In Policy LE2, replace "the quarry" with "the Tarmac Eaton Hall Quarry". Replace "detrimental" with "unacceptable".