

# HARBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

## GREAT GLEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN DECISION STATEMENT

### 1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an Independent Examination, Harborough District Council now confirms that the Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum
- 1.2 This decision statement can be viewed at:

#### **Harborough District Council Offices**

The Symington Building,  
Adam & Eve Street,  
Market Harborough  
Leicestershire  
LE16 7AG

Open - Mon/Tues/Thu/Fri: 8.45am - 5pm. Wed: 9.30am - 5pm

#### **Market Harborough Library**

Leicestershire County Council  
The Symington Building  
Adam and Eve Street  
Market Harborough , LE16 7LT  
Tel: 0116 305 3627  
Fax: 0116 305 0670  
E-mail: [marketharboroughlibrary@leics.gov.uk](mailto:marketharboroughlibrary@leics.gov.uk)

Monday → Closed  
Tuesday → 10am - 6pm  
Wednesday → 10am - 6pm  
Thursday → 10am - 6pm  
Friday → 10am - 6pm  
Saturday → 10am - 4pm  
Sunday → Closed

#### **Great Glen Library**

Ruperts Way, Great Glen, LE8 9GR  
Tel: 0116 305 3597  
Fax: 0116 259 2948  
E-mail: [greatglenlibrary@leics.gov.uk](mailto:greatglenlibrary@leics.gov.uk)

Monday → 2pm - 5pm  
Tuesday → 2pm - 7pm  
Wednesday → Closed  
Thursday → 10am -12 noon  
Friday → Closed  
Saturday → 10am - 1pm

### 2. Background

- 2.1 In March 2014 Great Glen Parish Council, as the qualifying body, applied for Great Glen Parish to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area for the purpose of preparing a neighbourhood plan. The Neighbourhood Area application was approved by Harborough District Council (the Council) on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2014 in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012)
- 2.2 Following the submission of the Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan to the Council, the Plan was publicised and representations were invited. The six week consultation period closed on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2017.
- 2.3 The Council, with the agreement of the Qualifying Body, appointed an independent examiner, Ms Liz Beth, to review whether the Plan met the Basic Conditions required by legislation and should proceed to referendum.

2.4 The Examiner's Report concludes that, subject to making the modifications proposed by the Examiner, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

### **3. Decision and Reasons**

3.1 At its meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2017 the Executive Committee agreed that the Examiner's recommended modifications should be accepted and that the amended Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a referendum (see Council resolution at Appendix 1).

3.2 The District Council has made the modifications, proposed by the examiner, to secure that the draft plan meets the basic conditions. Appendix 2 sets out these modifications and the action to be taken in respect of each of them.

3.3 The Council agrees with the Examiner's recommendation that there is no reason to extend the Neighbourhood Plan area (Great Glen Parish) for the purpose of holding the referendum.

3.4 The Examiner has concluded that with the specified modifications the Plan meets the basic conditions and other relevant legal requirements. The Council concurs with this view the Plan complies with the provision made by or under sections 38A and 38B of the 2004 Act. Therefore to meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 a referendum which poses the question

**'Do you want Harborough District Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Great Glen to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?'**

will be held in the Parish of Great Glen.

3.5 The date on which the referendum will take place is agreed as **23<sup>rd</sup> November 2017**

## **Appendix 1: Council Resolution in respect of Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan 9<sup>th</sup> October 2017**

### ***Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan Proposal Decision***

RESOLVED that: ***(draft resolution 16/10/2017)***

i) the Independent Examiner's recommended changes to the Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan are accepted in full as set out in the schedule at Appendix A to the report, and the recommendation that the amended Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a referendum of voters within the Parish of Great Glen to establish whether the Plan should form part of the Development Plan for the Harborough District be noted.

ii) the holding of a referendum relating to the Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2017 that will include all of the registered electors in the Great Glen Parish be approved.



## Appendix 2: Schedule of Modifications Recommended in the Examiner's Report

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
Examiners recommendations: text to remain in <i>italics</i> , new text highlighted in <b>Bold</b> and text to be deleted shown but <del>struck through</del> . Instructions are <u>underlined</u> .					
1		Community Actions		<u>Community Actions 1 - 4 are to be listed separately at the back of the Plan. either as a Section 9. or an appendix. NB: Action 4 needs to be correctly numbered (currently '34').</u>	In order to comply with the Basic Conditions and have regard to the NPPG
2	Policy GG1	General Policy Principle	Where there are no policies in this Plan relevant to a development proposal, the provisions of national and district-wide planning policies apply.	In order that the Plan complies with the Basic Conditions, I recommend that <u>Policy GG1 is deleted. and this policy becomes a final sentence in the paragraph 7.1 on Strategy.</u>	This is not a policy , it is stating the position as it is. It is confusing to have it presented as a policy - it could be construed as proposing something different.
3	Policy GG2	Housing Provision	- Having regard to the high number of dwellings already constructed and existing sites with planning permission between 2011 and 2016, Great Glen has exceeded its housing requirement over the Plan period. Therefore until such a time as there is an increase in housing need across the Harborough District or unless there is a failure to deliver the existing commitments, further housing development in the Parish will be restricted to Windfall development in line with Policy GG3..	I recommend that in order that the GGNP complies with the Basic Conditions <u>Policy GG2 is deleted.</u> To maintain consistency and the sense of the Plan's rationale, I recommend that the <u>last paragraph on page 21 also be deleted. Policies to be renumbered throughout.</u>	This policy is not accurate, in that it is asserting a position that does not in fact exist. The LPA does not currently have a 5 year housing land supply so that its housing policies in any case are out of date. It is not possible in these circumstances to state that Great Glen has exceeded its housing requirement , and in any case a neighbourhood plan cannot set a maximum

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
					limit on new housing. The policy is contrary to the NPPF(para 47) as it does not promote the sustainable provision of housing, and it is therefore contrary to the Basic Conditions.
4	Policy GG3	Housing Provision Windfall Sites	<p>Small residential development proposals on infill and redevelopment sites will be supported subject to proposals being well designed and meeting all relevant requirements set out in other policies in this Plan and District-wide planning policies and where such development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Comprises a restricted gap in the continuity of existing frontage buildings or on other sites within the built-up area of Great Glen or where the site is closely surrounded by buildings;</li> <li>b) Does not involve the outward extension of the built-up area of Great Glen;</li> <li>c) Helps to meet the identified housing requirement for Great Glen;</li> <li>d) Respects the shape and form of Great Glen in order to maintain its distinctive character and enhance it where possible;</li> <li>e) Retains existing important natural boundaries such as trees, hedges and streams;</li> <li>f) Does not reduce garden space to an extent where it adversely impacts on the character of</li> </ul>	<p>I recommend that <u>criteria c) of Policy GG3 is deleted, and criteria h) is modified as shown</u> in order that the policy complies with the Basic Conditions in terms of clarity of intent:</p> <p><i>"h) If it involves two or more dwellings, provides for at least one <del>home</del> <b>small dwelling with two or fewer bedrooms for every one larger dwelling (i.e. three or more bedrooms).</b>"</i></p>	Criteria c) of this policy is not necessary, as any calculation of housing requirement has an allowance for windfall sites.

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>the area, or the amenity of neighbours and the existing and future occupiers of the dwelling where relevant;</p> <p>g) Does not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring occupiers by reason of loss of privacy, loss of daylight, visual intrusion or noise in line with Harborough District Council Supplementary Planning Guidance; and</p> <p>h) If it involves two or more dwellings, provides for at least one home with two or fewer bedrooms for every one large dwelling (i.e. three or more bedrooms).</p>		
5	Policy GG4	Housing Mix	<p>New housing development proposals should provide a mixture of housing types specifically to meet identified local needs in Great Glen. Priority should be given to smaller family homes (3 bedrooms or fewer), starter homes, and those suitable for older people (especially those who wish to downsize). There will be a presumption against larger homes (more than 4 bedrooms).</p>	<p>I recommend that <u>Policy GG4 should be modified as shown</u> in order that it meets the Basic Conditions with regard to clarity of policy and being evidenced based:</p> <p><i>"New housing development proposals should provide a mixture of housing types specifically to meet identified and evidenced current local needs in Great Glen..... There will be a presumption against larger homes with more than 4 bedrooms."</i></p>	<p>The policy has been criticised for inflexibility, but the wording 'presumption against' would allow for exceptions to the homes of more than 4 bedrooms should material considerations indicate circumstances allowed an exception to policy. So that the policy is properly evidenced based, the reference to 'identified local need' should include a reference to being evidenced, as required by the NPPG.</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
					In order that the policy complies with the NPPF requirement for clarity, the definition homes with more than 4 bedrooms as 'larger' should be dropped, and an internal consistency with Policy GG3 maintained.
6	Policy GG5	Affordable Housing	Development proposals for new housing should provide at least 40% high quality affordable housing to meet identified needs and to be in accordance with district wide planning policies. Priority should be given to: a) The provision of Starter homes, homes for young people and older people while self-build projects will be considered favourably; and b) Local residents in the allocation of affordable housing. If it is not possible to provide affordable housing on site, in exceptional circumstances it will be acceptable to provide funding in lieu of affordable housing on-site if this leads to the provision of additional affordable housing in the Parish.	<u>Policy GG5 is recommended to be altered as shown</u> in order that it meets the Basic Conditions with regard to being evidenced based and is accurate in the scope of affordable housing projects: <u>The first sentence to read:</u> <i>"Development proposals for new housing should provide at least 40% high quality affordable housing to meet identified and evidenced local needs and to be in accordance with district wide planning policies....."</i> <u>Criteria a) to read:</u> <i>"a) The provision of Starter homes, homes for young people and older people while self-build projects will be considered favourably; and "</i>	November 2014 a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) was issued that stated affordable housing should only be required on sites of over 10 dwellings. The relevant HCS policy is Policy CS3, in which the site threshold for the policy's application is 1 dwelling - its examination and adoption pre-dates the WMS. Policy GGS is therefore consistent with the strategic policy of the development plan. Priority for local residents will be little more than an aspiration due to a lack of

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
					further definition of what that means in practice. However it does indicate local wishes to a developer, and a local lettings policy, by promoting stronger communities, has had due regard to policy in the NPPF (para 69).
7	Policy GG6	Design Quality	<p>Development proposals must demonstrate a high quality of design, layout and use of materials in order to make a positive contribution to the special character of the Parish in accordance with the approved Great Glen Village Design Statement:</p> <p>a) New development should enhance and reinforce the local distinctiveness and character of the area in which it is situated and proposals should clearly show how the general character, scale, mass, density and layout of the site, of the building or extension fits in with the aspect of the surrounding area. Care should be taken to ensure that the development does not disrupt the visual amenities of the street scene and impact negatively on any significant wider landscape views. Three-storey houses will not be acceptable;</p> <p>b) New buildings should follow a consistent</p>	<p>In order that Policy GG6 meets the Basic Conditions therefore, I recommend that it is modified as follows: <u>The last sentence of Criteria a) to be altered to:</u>  ....."Three-storey houses are unlikely to suit the scale and mass of existing development will not be acceptable"</p> <p><u>Criteria d) and e) in Policy GG6 to be deleted.</u></p> <p>Criteria j) to begin: "Development is encouraged to incorporate...."</p>	<p>A recent WMS (March 2015) has stated that neighbourhood plans should not set technical standards for energy efficiency and other construction matters that are dealt with in the Building Regulations. Although this policy is not setting specific standards, the wording 'should' implies a duty to follow the policy</p>

<b>Modification No.</b>	<b>Policy No.</b>	<b>Policy Title</b>	<b>Submission Draft Policy Text</b>	<b>Suggested Revised Policy Text</b>	<b>Reason</b>
			<p>design approach in the use of materials, fenestration and the roofline to the building. Materials should be chosen to complement the design of the development and add to the quality or character of the surrounding environment;</p> <p>c) New housing should reflect the character and historic context of existing developments within the Parish. However, contemporary and innovative materials and design will be supported where positive improvement can be robustly demonstrated without detracting from the historic context;</p> <p>d) For developments of 5 or more, minimum rear garden sizes are to be 50 sq m for a 2b terrace; 60 sq m for a 3b terrace; 85 sq m for a small semi or detached (120m<sup>2</sup>) and 100 sq m for a large semi/detached (over 120 sq m);</p> <p>e) The minimum space between dwellings should be 2.2m;</p> <p>f) Redevelopment, alteration or extension of historic farmsteads and agricultural buildings within the Parish should be sensitive to their distinctive character, materials and form;</p>		

<b>Modification No.</b>	<b>Policy No.</b>	<b>Policy Title</b>	<b>Submission Draft Policy Text</b>	<b>Suggested Revised Policy Text</b>	<b>Reason</b>
8	Policy GG6	Design Quality	Village design statement	In order that the Plan generally meets the Basic Conditions with regard to clarity and not being too prescriptive I recommend that <u>the extract from the VDS currently sitting in the body of the GGNP from pages 29 - 52 is removed</u> . As much of the analysis is a very useful evidence base, the extract could form an appendix to the Plan if so desired.	The GG VDS is now referenced in Policy GG6, and a section of it has been transcribed into the body of the Plan. There is no need to incorporate some of this work into the main body of the Plan in order to give it extra status, as seems to be assumed (page 27). The reference to the need to have due regard to the VDS in Policy GG6 gives it status. The incorporation of some of the guidelines from the VOS into the text of the Plan is confusing. They could be mistaken for policies, and the numbering system, when out of the VDS context, does not sit well. Additionally, some of the wording of the guidelines is more prescriptive than government guidance in the NPPF would allow (para 59).
9	Policy GG7	Non-Nationally Designated Heritage	Development proposals that affect an identified non-designated buildings or structure of local historic or architectural interest, or its setting, will be required to conserve or enhance the	<u>Policy GG7 is recommended to be revised as shown below</u> in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and complies with the NPPF with regard	There is an understood hierarchy of protection in the NPPF heritage section (paras 126 - 141) and the policy is

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
		Assets of Local Historical and Architectural Interest	character and setting of that building or structure (see Figure 3 below and Appendices 5 and 6).	to clarity of policy and due regard to the hierarchy of protection for heritage assets. "POLICY GG7: <del>NON-NATIONALLY DESIGNATED-LOCAL HERITAGE ASSETS OF-LOCAL HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL INTEREST</del> <i>Development proposals that affect the an identified non-designated buildings or and structures of local historic or architectural interest listed below , or its their setting, will be expected to conserve the historic and architectural interest in those development proposals. required to conserve or enhance the character and setting of that building or structure (see fig 3 below and Appendices 5 and 6) List of buildings and structures from page 56-57 to be included within the policy.</i>	currently worded as if the assets were nationally designated. With a slightly reduced emphasis however the policy will comply with the intent of the NPPF. To make it clear that the policy deals with local heritage assets the title of the policy should change, the assets have not been formally designated yet
10	Policy GG12	Protection of Local Green Space	Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or have an adverse effect on, an identified Local Green Space (listed below and mapped in figure 4 and Appendix 8, will be resisted unless a) a replacement site, with equivalent Local Green Space value is provided	In order that Policy GG12 complies with the Basic Conditions and has regard to the NPPF, I recommend the following modifications to the policy: POLICY GG12: DESIGNATION	The policy as currently drafted is not actually designating the proposed LGS. It is also muddled in that it talks of replacement sites, and then mentions that for historic

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>or created in accordance with District and national planning policies, and b) the community would gain equivalent or better environmental, recreational and health benefits from the replacement.</p> <p>In the case of historical environment assets, it should be recognised that it is impossible to recreate these on an alternative site.</p> <p>GG/LGS/01 Burton Brook Community WildSpace</p> <p>GG/LGS/02 Grazing fields southwest of St Cuthbert's Church</p> <p>GG/LGS/03 Great Glen Hall parkland, lake and ornamental woodland</p> <p>GG/LGS/04 Grazing field and marsh south of Oaks Road</p> <p>GG/LGS/05 Grazing field north and west of sewage works</p> <p>GG/LGS/06 Glen Farm 'set-aside' fields</p> <p>GG/LGS/07 Manor Farm ridge and furrow field</p>	<p><del>PROTECTION OF LOCAL GREEN SPACES</del></p> <p><del>Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or have an adverse effect on, an identified</del></p> <p><b>the following designated</b> Local Green Spaces <b>(shown in figure 4) will not be permitted unless in very special circumstances.</b> <del>(listed below and mapped in figure 4 and Appendix 8, will be resisted unless a)</del></p> <p><del>a replacement site with equivalent Local Green Space value is provided or created in accordance with District and national planning policies, and b) the community would gain equivalent or better environmental, recreational and health benefits from the replacement. In the case of historical environment assets, it should be recognised that it is impossible to recreate an alternative site.</del></p> <p>GG/LGS/01 Burt on Brook Community WildSpace</p> <p>GG/LGS/0 2 Grazing fields</p>	<p>assets it is not possible to recreate them. A key feature of LGS is that it is not possible to replace, hence the high level of protection offered by the designation.</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
				<p>southwest of St Cuthbert' s Church</p> <p>GG/LGS/03 Great Glen Hall parkland, lake and ornamental woodland</p> <p>GG/LGS/04 Grazing field and marsh south of Oaks Road</p> <p>GG/LGS/05 Grazing field north and west of sewage works</p> <p>GG/LGS/06 Glen Farm 'set aside ' fields</p> <p>GG/LGS/07 Manor Farm ridge and furrow field</p> <p><u>Figure 4 should be altered to show the revised situation with LGS designation. Generally text supporting this policy will need to acknowledge that only three sites are accepted for designation.</u></p>	
11	Policy GG13	Other Important Open Space	The sites listed (Appendix 9) and mapped (figure 5 below, with a larger map as Appendix 10) have been identified as being of local significance for their environmental features (natural and/or historical). The sites	In order to comply with the basic conditions and the NPPF requirement that neighbourhood plans are positive. <u>I recommend that Policy GG13 is deleted.</u>	Environmental protection of local biodiversity interest is provided by Policy GG16, and I can see no legitimate purpose served in this additional

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>are ecologically important in their own right, their historical features are extant and have visible expression, and they are locally valued.</p> <p>Development proposals that affect any of these sites will be expected to seek to protect or enhance their identified features.</p>	<p>If figure 5 is retained as part of appendix 9, <u>it will be necessary to alter the boundary of sites of local environmental interest 19 and 37 so that they do not include land that is outside the neighbourhood area.</u></p> <p>Under the terms of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, a neighbourhood plan cannot deal with land outside of the defined neighbourhood area. I recommend that <u>figure 5 is removed from the main text of the Plan for clarity.</u></p> <p>Remaining policies would be better explained with a figure setting out relevant sites for that policy. Thus a separate figure for Public Open Space in the way figure 6 shows clearly the ridge and furrow features.</p>	<p>overarching policy. I find Policy GG13 overly protective and negative in approach contrary to the requirements of the NPPF (para 184), and thus it does not comply with the Basic Conditions.</p>
12	Policy GG14	Ridge and Furrow Fields	<p>Development proposals that adversely affect or damage the identified areas of well preserved ridge and furrow earthworks identified as surviving ridge and furrow (see figure 6 below and Appendix 11) will be resisted.</p>	<p><u>Policy GG14 is recommended to be reworded as follows</u> in order that it complies with the basic conditions: "<i>Development proposals should seek to preserve that adversely affect or damage the identified areas of well -preserved ridge and</i></p>	<p>The policy protecting the ridge and furrow is justified by evidence of local and regional importance therefore, but needs to be framed in more positive language, and offer proportionate protection for</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
				<p><i>furrow earthworks identified as surviving ridge and furrow (see in figure 6 below and Appendix 11 wherever possible. will be resisted</i></p>	<p>features that do not have a recognised national status of protection. I recommend therefore that the wording is made more positive and the qualifying clause " wherever possible" is added to the policy. This will ensure that the policy complies with the NPPF requirement that neighbourhood plans are positive the NPPF hierarchy of protection for historic and environmental assets is maintained.</p>
13	Policy GG15	Public Open Space	<p>The Parish Council will actively work with the District Council and other stakeholders to bring the ratio of 'area of public open space to population size' in Great Glen closer to recognised standards.</p> <p>Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, a public open space will not be supported, unless the public open space is replaced by an equivalent or better provision in an equally suitable location or it can be demonstrated to the Parish Council that the public open space or is no longer required by the community.</p>	<p><u>Policy GG15 is recommended to be reworded as follows for clarity:</u>  <i>The Parish Council will actively work with the District Council and other stakeholders to bring the ratio of 'area of public open space to population size' in Great Glen closer to recognised standards.</i>  <i>Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, a the following areas of public open space (map x) will not be supported, unless the</i></p>	

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>Housing development proposals of five or more dwellings will be required to include adequate green space provision based on current district standards as an integral part of that development. Alternatively, if an existing open space is located within reasonable walking distance, then a commuted sum may be accepted for the enhancement of that area.</p>	<p><i>public open space is replaced by an equivalent or better provision in an equally suitable location or it can be demonstrated to the Parish Council that the public open space is no longer required by the community:</i></p> <p><b>Bridgewater Drive amenity green space, Great Glen Recreation Ground, Great Glen play area, St Cuthbert's Churchyard, Cromwell Road play area Memorial Green, St Cuthbert's C of E School playing field.</b></p> <p><i>Housing development proposals of five or more dwellings will be required to include adequate green space provision based on current district standards as an integral part of that development. Alternatively, if an existing open space is located within reasonable walking distance, then a commuted sum may be accepted for the enhancement of that area.</i></p>	
14	Policy GG16	Biodiversity	a) Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or have a substantial adverse effect on, a significant site of biodiversity value will be	I recommend that <u>Policy GG16</u> is altered as shown below in order that it complies with the basic conditions	Wildlife corridor 1 through the built-up area along the River Sence is a clear and good

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>expected to apply the sequential test of avoid, mitigate and compensate.</p> <p>b) Development proposals will be required, where feasible and as part of Planning Conditions, to contribute to the protection and enhancement of the biodiversity of the Parish, through for example the incorporation of native plants or the creation of new habitats in the scheme design; and</p> <p>c) The Plan will designate two wildlife corridors as shown (map below and Appendix 13) (1) through the built-up area along the River Sence; (2) connecting the Stoneygate School grounds with the River Sence at its confluence with Burton Brook. Development proposals which impact on these sites will be resisted</p>	<p>and is clear in intent and positive in its approach to sustainable development :</p> <p>a) <del>Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or have a substantial adverse effect on a significant site of biodiversity will be expected to apply the sequential test of avoid, mitigate and compensate.</del> <b>will be expected to protect local habitats and species and where possible and viable, to create new habitats for wildlife and promote and Increase biodiversity;</b></p> <p>b) <del>Development proposals will be required where feasible and as part of Planning Conditions to contribute to the protection and enhancement of the biodiversity of the parish, through for example the incorporation of native plants or the creation of new habitats in the scheme design; and</del></p> <p>eb) <del>The Plan will designate two wildlife corridors as shown (map below and Appendix 13) through the built-up area along the River Sence</del> <b>will be maintained and promoted</b></p>	<p>example of a corridor that needs protection. However wildlife corridor 2 is mainly within the open countryside, and I do not accept that restrictive policy covering the whole of this designated area is compatible with the requirement that a neighbourhood plan is a positive document.</p> <p>The policy will protect biodiversity on land within this corridor, but in order that the policy complies with the Basic Conditions and is positive, the restrictive policy on all the land included in corridor 2 needs to be removed, and only one corridor designated.</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
				<p>as a biodiversity resource and support (2) connecting the Stoneygate School grounds with the River Sence at its confluence with Burton Brook Development proposals which impact on these sites this corridor will be resisted. Appendix 13 and map to be redrawn showing only corridor 1.</p>	
15	Policy GG17	Important Trees and Hedges	<p>Development proposals that may damage or result in the loss of trees and hedges of good arboricultural, ecological and amenity value should ensure that the identified trees and hedges are protected and integrated into the design of the development. Proposals should be accompanied by a tree survey that establishes the health and longevity of any affected trees. The Parish Council will continue to identify trees and woodland of value, as above, for recommendation to the Planning Authority for Tree Preservation Orders. Four species-rich, ancient hedges identified as of high historical and ecological importance (figure 7 below and Appendix 14) will be recommended to the District Council as candidates for Tree Preservation Orders.</p>	<p><u>Policy GG1 7 to be altered as follows:</u></p> <p><i>Development proposals should protect and integrate into the design of t hat development existing that may damage or result in the loss of trees and hedges of good arboricultural, ecological and amenity value. Should ensure that the identified trees and hedges are protected and integrated into the design of the development.</i></p> <p><b>Proposals that impact on valued trees and hedges should be accompanied by a tree survey that establishes the health and longevity of any affected trees.</b></p> <p><del>The Parish Council will continue to</del></p>	<p>The second paragraph and part of the third paragraph of this policy are not policy, but potential action points. They could be part of the justification , or another Community Action, but need to be removed from the policy text in order that the policy complies with the NPPF requirement that policy is directed at what is and is not acceptable in a development (para 154).</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
				<p><del>identify trees and woodland of value , as above, for recommendation to the Planning Authority for Tree Preservation Orders.</del></p> <p><i>Four species-rich, ancient hedges are identified as of high historical and ecological importance (figure 7 below and Appendix 14) and should be protected from development that would adversely affect them.</i></p> <p><del>will be recommended to the District Council as candidates for Tree Preservation Orders</del></p>	
16	Policy GG19	Energy Efficiency	<p>Development proposals that are compliant with the aims of a low carbon economy, and contribute to mitigating and adapting to climate change including through sustainable design, water efficiency, drainage and construction techniques and practices will be viewed positively, where (either in isolation or cumulatively) the proposal:</p> <p>a) Does not have an adverse impact on the amenity of local residents and uses (such as noise, visual impact, shadow flicker, water pollution, odour, air quality, emissions);</p> <p>b) Does not have an adverse impact on the location, in relation to visual impact and</p>	<p><u>Policy GG19 is recommended to be altered as follows:</u></p> <p>..... a) Does not have an <b>unacceptable</b> adverse impact on the amenity of local residents and uses (such as noise, visual impact, shadow flicker, water pollution, odour, air quality, emissions);</p> <p>b) Does not have an <b>unacceptable</b> adverse impact on the location, in relation to visual impact and impact on the character and sensitivity of the surrounding landscape; .....</p>	4.41 In order that Policy GG19 complies with the Basic Conditions and does not unreasonably impact on viability, criteria a) and b) are recommended to be amended

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>impact on the character and sensitivity of the surrounding landscape;</p> <p>c) Is of an appropriate scale which reflects the size, character and level of service provision within Great Glen; and</p> <p>d) Is subject to proposals being well designed and meeting all relevant requirements set out in other policies in this Plan and District-wide planning policies.</p>		
17	Policy GG20	Parking	<p>At least two off-street car parking spaces should be provided within the curtilage for each new dwelling developed within the Village of Great Glen. Three such spaces should be provided for four-bedroom or larger dwellings.</p>	<p><u>Policy GG20 to be altered as follows:</u></p> <p><b>Where appropriate, at least two off-street car parking spaces should be provided within the curtilage for each new dwelling developed within the Village of Great Glen. Three such spaces should be provided for four-bedroom or larger dwellings.</b></p>	<p>The policy is consistent with previous highway standards, but may not always be appropriate. In order that Policy GG20 complies with the Basic Conditions and the requirement of the NPPF that policy should be realistic (para 154) and not too burdensome (para 173), it is recommended the policy includes a caveat for reasonableness.</p>
18	Policy GG23	Traffic Management	<p>Development proposals will only be permitted where the traffic generation and parking impact created by the proposal does not result in an unacceptable direct or cumulative impact on congestion or on road and pedestrian safety. Traffic management measures such as traffic calming, improved signage, restriction of on-</p>	<p><u>The title of the policy to be altered to 'Traffic Management Impact'</u></p>	<p>Traffic Management is a highways issue not a land use issue, but the policy is broadly dealing with the traffic impact of development, which is a land use issue. The policy will comply with the Basic Conditions</p>

<b>Modification No.</b>	<b>Policy No.</b>	<b>Policy Title</b>	<b>Submission Draft Policy Text</b>	<b>Suggested Revised Policy Text</b>	<b>Reason</b>
			road parking and other improvements, all of which should be of a design appropriate to the character of the Parish, will be encouraged as part of any relevant scheme.		ions and requirements that planning policy deals with land use issues if the title is altered to 'Traffic Impact'
19	GG24	Developer Contributions	Financial contributions towards off-site provision of neighbourhood infrastructure obtained either through the Community Infrastructure Levy or negotiated planning obligations will, as appropriate, be used for the following: a) Funding of a new Community Centre; b) Affordable housing as set out in Policy GG5; c) Provision of a community allotment; d) Improvements to public open space as described in Policy GG 15; e) Improvements to traffic management within the Village as described in Policy GG 22& 23; and f) Enhancements to the network of footpaths and cycle ways as outlined in Policy GG18	<u>Policy GG24 to be deleted but reinstated as text in the justification or a Community Action.</u>	4.47 At present however there is no CIL requirement for Harborough District Council, so the proposed policy is dealing with a potential future scenario, not a current reality. This does not meet the requirements of the NPPF para 154 in that it is not currently realistic, and so the policy does not comply with the Basic Conditions. The aspirations of the parish council with regard to any future CIL receipts is a very useful inclusion in a neighbourhood plan however, and so I recommend that the policy is altered to a paragraph or boxed text and either placed within the Plan at an appropriate place or becomes a Community Action,
20		Monitoring	An earlier review will be necessary depending	There is minor error in the last	Accuracy

<b>Modification No.</b>	<b>Policy No.</b>	<b>Policy Title</b>	<b>Submission Draft Policy Text</b>	<b>Suggested Revised Policy Text</b>	<b>Reason</b>
		and Review	on the outcome of the strategic housing allocations.	sentence, which should read "An earlier review <del>will</del> <b>may be necessary</b> ....."	

