

Broughton Astley Regulation 16 summary of responses

Respondent	Summary of Representation	
<p>1. Mr P Ackerman</p>	<p><u>Site Allocation BANP 1a & 1B</u> <u>Site A/BA/MXD/02</u> <u>Site A/BA/MXD/03</u></p> <p>Site A/BA/MXD/03 is a level 3b flood plain, site A/BA/MXD02 is adjacent to a level 2 and 3 flood risk zone and has a higher elevation, as a consequence any pluvial, fluvial, surface water runoff from the site, which is inevitable will severely impact on the flooding of up to 160 properties in the village, many are already in a moderate and significant flood risk area. There are more suitable sites within the village for development which would not impact on the flood risk.</p>	
<p>2. Amanda Anderson, Medical and Pharmacy Contracts Manager (Leicestershire), NHS England (Leicestershire and Lincolnshire Area)</p>	<p><u>Wellbeing - Policy Statement W1- Improved Healthcare Facilities</u></p> <p>Re: NHS Dentistry - The Oral Health Needs Assessment and Strategy refresh will look at areas with little or no NHS dentistry provision and inform future commissioning and procurement processes.</p> <p>Re: GP Surgery – Current practice has capacity issues and further housing growth will exacerbate this issue. Current site has been developed to its maximum and other opportunities need to be explored. The affordability of a solution is unlikely to be addressed through s106 contributions alone. Important that any alternative location for a new surgery facility is accessible to the existing and new population. Any proposed relocation will be the subject of patient engagement and due consideration by NHS England Area Team.</p>	
<p>3. Mrs L Blockley</p>	<p>Welcomes stronger policy on maintaining separation between Sutton–in-the-Elms and Broughton Astley but would like to see the separation area extended to include the area of the golf course.</p>	
<p>4. Natural England</p>	<p>Welcomes the neighbourhood plan and considers that it provides a strong framework for achieving the sustainable development of Broughton Astley. Advises that every effort should be made to prevent any harm to the Local Wildlife Sites (Broughton Astley Grasslands and Hayfield and Primethorpe Meadows), located opposite proposed development sites for leisure & community use and housing.</p> <p>Opportunities to incorporate features into new build or retro fitted buildings which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes should also be considered as part of any new development proposal.</p>	

<p>5. Chloe Renner, Bidwells (on behalf of Davidsons)</p>	<p>Davidsons is largely very supportive of the plan and all the effort that has gone in to its preparation; however we feel that there are a number of outstanding issues that need to be addressed to ensure that the plan is both robust and deliverable.</p> <p>Have concerns over the allocation of sites, particularly in relation to the process of site identification and assessment. The site prioritisation process remains unclear with no new information in the Submission version. There is a lack of transparency in relation to the scoring of the sites and concerns over the assessment criteria. Further information is required for the ranking and classification of sites, with more robust and transparent work undertaken. Furthermore, the environmental and physical constraints need to be carefully considered alongside local preferences for sites.</p> <p>The time limit on the reserve site should be removed and it should be considered as an allocated site as the site is suitable for development now. Need for a Design Brief is unnecessary as discussions have already taken place with Parish Council at length. Reference to occasional flooding should be removed as unsubstantiated.</p> <p>Welcome the Parish Council's willingness to accept additional dwellings, above the 400 dwellings allocated within the Core Strategy within the plan period to 2028 and to provide sustainable development. However it is unlikely that all the facilities identified will come forward as a result of developer contributions alone. Other sources of funding should be considered along with prioritisation of facilities. Unreasonable contributions should not be required as this will limit all development.</p> <p>Agree with separation area. Disused railway line does not need further protection.</p> <p>The plan should inform the District Council's Site Allocations Plan. It is ultimately the District Council's responsibility to allocate land, and as such they should continue to progress with their site allocations document in tandem to the progression of the Neighbourhood Plan, particularly as The Big Plan can provide a valuable source of local information and feedback directly from the parish.</p>	
<p>6. Claire Searson, English Heritage</p>	<p>Welcome recognition of, and reference to, the protection of heritage assets within Policy Statement EH1.</p>	
<p>7. Lance Wiggins, Landmark Planning (on behalf of Broughton Astley Golf and Leisure Ltd)</p>	<p>The objective of improving employment opportunities which provide 'added value' for the community (bullet point 5) is supported. The Policy Statement set out in E1 is supported, particularly iii where land at Broughton Way is allocated for a mixed employment/service and leisure use as this will create employment for local people and contribute to the village economy.</p> <p>Support for provision of new healthcare facility and considers employment land at Broughton Way</p>	

	<p>would be suitable for a new healthcare facility as complementary to additional employment provision on site. Greater flexibility would be provided within the Plan by referring to the new healthcare facility being provided on either site 1B or on the proposed Employment Area.</p> <p>The allocation of land for a supermarket of between 20-30,000 sq.ft. within site 1A rather than within the Proposed Employment Area is clearly the biggest concern. EMP1 was allocated for retail facilities in the consultation draft and there is no explanation of the change. It is not explained why the allocation of land for a food retail store on site 1A is considered to be policy compliant in this respect. This brings into question the viability of site EMP1 as food operator was to be anchor for other uses.</p> <p>Site owners have long supported new development in Broughton Astley and remain committed to this and support the allocation of the site for commercial, industrial, retail and community uses in the Examination Version of the Plan. Details provided on the proposed mix of uses on an indicative masterplan.</p>	
<p>8. Mr J Marlow</p>	<p>Overall accepts and supports the policies outlined but much more needs to be said regarding implementation and when things will happen.</p> <p>Concern over the implementation of the affordable housing policy. It requires more creative thinking as to how suitable accommodation for the elderly can be achieved. Should not be left to 'market forces'.</p> <p>Supports statement S1 (Shopping) but needs early commitment from District Council to ensure that the multi-agency 'village centre' strategy is implemented, particularly in respect of parking and service arrangements.</p> <p>Transport and traffic management issues are outlined at page 11 under Key Issues, but however successful the efforts to improve Broughton Astley turn out to be, much will depend on a reciprocal resolve by the District and County Council to tackle the useful pattern of public transport in Leicestershire. In essence it is focussed on Leicester at its heart, with scant attention to cross-country movements.</p> <p>Support for Leisure and Wellbeing objective, environment policy (although archaeological considerations must be taken into account), Community Infrastructure policy (although it should also cover the retention of essential services as libraries in face of cuts in County services) and for the proposed allocations for new development.</p>	
<p>9. Sport England</p>	<p>Positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities provision is important. The Neighbourhood Plan needs to reflect national policy for sport as set out in the national</p>	

	Planning Policy Framework with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74 to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields.	
10. Claudia Clemente, Barton Wilmore (on behalf of the Crane Estate)		
11. M Flood, Insight Town Planning (on behalf of William Davis Ltd)		
12. Joanne Althorpe, Pegasus (on behalf of David Wilson Homes)		
13. Environment Agency		
14. Rob Thorley, GVA (on behalf of Jelson Homes)		
15. Leicestershire County Council		
16. Midlands Co-op		
17.		

Orchard Medical Practice		
18. Wm Morrison		