

## HARBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

### GREAT BOWDEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN DECISION STATEMENT

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an Independent Examination, Harborough District Council now confirms that the Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018
- 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

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

**The Shoulder of Mutton , Great Bowden**  
**Weltons Stores and Post Office, Great Bowden**  
**Bowden Village Stores, Great Bowden**

#### 2. Background

- 2.1 In Sept 2015 Great Bowden Parish Council, as the qualifying body, applied for Great Bowden 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 5<sup>th</sup> December 2015 in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012)
- 2.2 Following the submission of the Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan to the Council, the Plan was publicised and representations were invited. The consultation period closed on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017.
- 2.3 The Council, with the agreement of Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan Group, appointed an independent examiner, Mrs Rosemary Kidd, 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> April 2018 the Councils Executive agreed that all the Examiner's recommended modifications should be accepted as presented to the Executive Committee in the Examiners report, 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 Bowden 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 Bowden to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?'**

will be held in the Parish of Great Bowden.

- 3.5 The date on which the referendum will take place is agreed as **21 June 2018**

**Appendix 1: Council/Executive Resolution in respect of Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan 9<sup>th</sup> April 2018**

*GREAT BOWDEN Neighbourhood Plan Proposal Decision*

**RESOLVED that:**

- (i) the Independent Examiner’s recommended changes to the Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan, as set out in the schedule at Appendix A to the report, be accepted, along with the recommendation that the amended Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a referendum of voters within the Parish of Great Bowden to establish whether the Plan should form part of the Development Plan for the Harborough District; and**
- (ii) the holding of a referendum relating to the Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan on 21st June 2018, that will include all of the registered electors in Great Bowden 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
Where modifications are recommended, they are highlighted in bold print, with any proposed new wording in italics.					
1		General formatting		<p>Select a clearer, more legible colour for the text of the Plan's policies.</p> <p>Place the Community Actions in an Appendix to the Plan with the heading that states that these actions do not form part of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Include an explanation of the role of the Community Actions in the Introduction.</p> <p>Prepare a Policies Map, with Inset Maps where appropriate, that clearly shows the boundaries of all sites referred to in the Policies with a clear key linked to the relevant Policy.</p>	clarity
2		Section 1	<p>.....Once 'made', these plans will become part of the strategic development plan produced by district councils and therefore carry full legal weight in the determination of planning applications.</p>	<p>Replace the last sentence of the first paragraph with: " ....part of the local development plan. <i>Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. (NPPF paragraph 196)</i></p> <p>Revise the second paragraph to read ".....within the <i>Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 as amended.</i>"</p> <p>Revise the second bullet point of paragraph three to read: ".....strategic policies of the development plan for</p>	Accuracy

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
				Harborough District and....". Delete comma after "the". Revise paragraph five to read "Neighbourhood planning allows local communities to ....priorities." and move the paragraph to a position before "The Plans carry..."	
3	Policy H1 –	Housing Provision	POLICY H1: HOUSING PROVISION - Having regard to the high number of dwellings already constructed and existing sites with planning permission since April 2016, the Parish 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 which is reflected in an agreed increase in the housing target for Great Bowden, 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 H3.	revise Policy H1 to read: <b><i>"New housing development will be limited to commitments, windfall development within the Limits to Development, Rural Exceptions Sites and housing in the countryside that satisfies NPPF paragraph 55. Additional sites for housing development will be brought forward in a review of the Neighbourhood Plan following an increase of the housing target for Selected Rural Villages in a review of the Harborough Local Plan or the failure of a housing commitment to be developed."</i></b> Delete the seventh paragraph of the justification to the policy ("Although the emerging Local Plan....."). Replace the paragraph with up to date information on recent housing completions and commitments.	Policy H1 is considered to be negatively worded and misleading as there is no housing requirement for the parish. Clarity.
4	Policy H2 –	Limits of Development	POLICY H2: LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT – Development proposals within The Plan area on sites within the Limits to Development, or in terms of new sporting or	Revise Policy H2 as follows: <b>Replace "Fig. 2" with "Policies Map". Revise the Limits to Development map to include all sites that are housing</b>	clarity

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			recreational facilities close or adjacent to the Limits to Development as identified in Fig. 2, will be supported where they respect the shape and form of Great Bowden and comply with the policies of The Plan. Land outside the defined Limits to Development will be treated as open countryside, where development will be carefully controlled in line with local and national strategic planning policies.	<b>commitments.</b>	
5	Policy H3 –	Windfall Sites	POLICY H3: WINDFALL SITES – Development proposals for infill and redevelopment sites (three dwellings or fewer) will be supported where: a) They are within the Limits to Development of Great Bowden; b) They help to meet the identified housing requirement for Great Bowden in.....	<b>Revise Policy H3 as follows: Delete “(three dwellings or fewer)” from the second line of the policy.</b>	No reason is given to justify limiting the size of sites to a maximum of three. It is considered that this limitation is unnecessary and unduly prescriptive and the suitability of each site should be considered on its own merits.
6	Policy H5	AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION -	POLICY H5: AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION - Development proposals for new housing where there is a net gain of 11 or more dwellings should provide at least 40% affordable housing (or other figure as required by the emerging Local Plan) in accordance with district-wide planning policies that are suitable to meet the current and future housing needs of the parish.	<b>Revise Policy H5 as follows: Revise the first paragraph to read: “Development proposals for new housing should make provision for affordable housing in accordance with the emerging (or subsequently adopted) Local Plan policies.” Delete paragraphs 3 and 4.</b>	it is recommended that rather than repeat the provisions of Local Plan Policy H2 (which has not yet been adopted and may be subject to change), the

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>Development proposals that make affordable housing available for local people through shared ownership and starter homes will be supported.</p> <p>Priority for affordable housing should be given to those with a “local connection” to the parish</p> <p>In the event that no-one comes forward within a period of six weeks, the residence criteria can be extended to people living across the District.</p> <p>Developments should be ‘tenure blind’, so that affordable housing is indistinguishable from other dwellings and are distributed throughout the development wherever possible.</p>		<p>Neighbourhood Plan Policy H5 should state that affordable housing should be provided in accordance with the emerging / adopted Local Plan Policy.</p> <p>The third and fourth paragraphs of Policy H5 seeks to establish a “local connections” criteria for the parish. This is a housing policy concerning the letting of affordable housing and not a planning policy used in the determination of planning applications. As such it is not appropriate for inclusion in a neighbourhood plan policy.</p>
7	Policy	Design	POLICY H6: DESIGN STANDARDS -	<b>Revise Policy H6 as follows:</b>	Criteria (f) seeks

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
	H6 –	Standards	<p>Development proposals should 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.</p> <p>Development proposals must meet the relevant guidelines in the Village Design Statement and are encouraged to have regard to the following design principles to a degree that is proportionate to the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>b. New buildings should follow a consistent 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</li> </ul>	<p><b>Revise the second paragraph to read: “Development proposals should have regard to the Great Bowden Village Design Statement...”</b></p> <p><b>Delete “to meet the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) guidelines) from criterion (f).</b></p> <p><b>Delete the following from criterion (j): “low carbon energy technology and” and “ensuring appropriate provision for the storage of waste and recyclable materials.”</b></p> <p><b>Include examples of guidance on improving the provision for wildlife in the justification.</b></p>	<p>provision to be made for wildlife to meet the guidelines of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. Whilst this is a respected charity, it is not appropriate to include their guidelines in the policy itself.</p> <p>Criteria (i) and (j) of Policy H6 clearly go beyond the requirements of the strategic policies and seek to encourage the application of the principles to small scale developments.</p>



Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>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. Redevelopment, alteration or extension of historic farmsteads and agricultural buildings within the Parish should be sensitive to their distinctive character, materials and form;</p> <p>e. Proposals should minimise the impact on general amenity and give careful consideration to noise, odour and light. Light pollution should be minimised wherever possible. Proposals to install street lighting in undeveloped areas of the Parish that are currently dark at night (more than 50 metres from an existing street light) will not be supported. The use of on-street lighting will be appropriate and sympathetic to the context and consistent with the density and output of the lighting used in the surrounding area;</p>		

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f. Development should be enhanced by biodiversity and relate well to the topography of the area, with existing trees and hedges preserved whenever possible. Provision should be made for wildlife including roof design, bird boxes and the use of hedges to meet Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) guidelines;</li> <li>g. Where possible, enclosure of plots should be of native hedging, wooden fencing, or stone/brick wall. Any enclosures that are necessarily removed through the development process should be reinstated in keeping with the original;</li> <li>h. Housing plots should accommodate storage containers compliant with the refuse collection system;</li> <li>i. Development should incorporate sustainable design and construction techniques to meet high standards for energy and water efficiency, including the use of renewable and low carbon energy technology; and</li> <li>j. Development should incorporate low carbon energy technology and sustainable drainage systems with maintenance regimes to minimise vulnerability to flooding and climate change; ensuring appropriate</li> </ul>		

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			provision for the storage of waste and recyclable materials.		
8	Policy H7 –	Brownfield Sites	<p><b>Support for brownfield sites</b> Economic derelict sites (brownfield sites remain across The Plan area and these often create a drag on its vibrancy and attractiveness. This is also a core principle of the NPPF (paragraph 17) which is to “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that is it not of high environmental value”. Development that addresses these issues will be supported. POLICY H7: SUPPORT FOR BROWNFIELD SITES – Within the Limits to Development, proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of redundant land or buildings will be supported over non-brownfield sites, where the site has limited environmental, amenity or ecological value.</p>	<b>Delete Policy H7 and the associated text.</b>	It is considered that whilst Policy H7 accords with national policy, it adds no locally specific policy requirements.
9	Policy ENV1 –	Areas of Separation	POLICY ENV 1: AREAS OF SEPARATION - To retain the geographical distinction and visual separation between Market Harborough and Great Bowden village, the two areas of open and undeveloped land shown on Fig. 4 are designated as Areas of Separation. Development proposals in the delineated areas should be controlled, and	<b>Revise Policy ENV1 to read:</b> <b><i>“Development in the Areas of Separation will be permitted where it would not compromise, either alone or in conjunction with other existing or proposed development, the effectiveness of the Area of Separation in protecting the identity and</i></b>	Community Action ENV1 is revised to clarify that it is an action for the Great Bowden Parish Council and to refer to “open land” rather than “open

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			any permitted developments will be located and designed to maintain and, wherever possible, enhance the separation of Great Bowden village from Market Harborough.	<b><i>distinctiveness of Great Bowden.”</i></b> <b>Show only the Area of Separation within the plan area on the Policies Map. Revise the map in the Figure for the Area of Separation in Market Harborough referred to under Community Action 1 to reflect that shown in the submission draft Harborough Local Plan.</b> <b>Revise Community Action 1 to read: “Great Bowden Parish Council will support the safeguarding of open land in Market Harborough shown on Figure XX as part of the Area of Separation between Great Bowden and Market Harborough.”</b>	space”
10	Policy ENV2 –	Protection of Local Green Space	POLICY ENV 2: PROTECTION OF LOCAL GREEN SPACE – Within the area of Local Green Space sites designated in this policy, detailed in the supporting information and identified on Fig. 5, development is ruled out, other than in exceptional circumstances. a) Churchyard of St Peter and St Paul parish church b) Great Bowden Cemetery c) Green Lane d) Great Bowden Recreation Ground e) Community Wood	<b>Revise Policy ENV2 to read: “The following areas shown on the Policies Map are designated as Local Green Space. List a), b), c), d) and e). “Development that would be harmful to the openness of a Local Green Space will only be permitted in very special circumstances.”</b>	To prevent conflict with other policies in the NDP
11	Policy ENV3 –	Other important open space	POLICY ENV 3: OTHER IMPORTANT OPEN SPACE - Important Open Spaces, listed below, will be safeguarded by	<b>revise Policy ENV3 as follows: “The following areas are designated as Important Open Spaces and shown on</b>	concerns that the policy as worded may be construed

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>ensuring that development does not compromise their integrity or value.</p> <p>A. Green Lane (also designated as Local Green Space)</p> <p>B. Upper Green (Common Land CL70; de-registered Common Land CL76, and roadside verges)</p> <p>C. Central Village Greens (Common Land and Registered Village Green VG81)</p> <p>D. Nether Green (Common Land CL75)</p> <p>E. – G. Middle Green (Common Land CL71, 72, 73; de-registered CL77)</p> <p>H. Leicester Lane verge</p> <p>I. Great Bowden cemetery (also designated as Local Green Space)</p> <p>J. Community Wood (also designated as Local Green Space)</p> <p>K. Welham Lane allotments</p> <p>L. Great Bowden Academy playing fields and woodland</p> <p>M. Market Harborough lawn tennis club courts and facilities</p> <p>N. Churchyard of St. Peter and St. Paul (also designated as Local Green Space)</p> <p>O. Great Bowden Recreation Ground (also designated as Local Green Space)</p> <p>P. Fernie Hunt paddock</p> <p>Q. Buckminster Close paddock</p> <p>R. Green Lane paddock</p> <p>S. Corner paddock, Sutton and Welham Roads</p> <p>T. Main Street verge</p>	<p><b><i>the Policies Map. The areas shall be safeguarded as open spaces and enhanced to improve their quality and usage as open spaces.” Sites B, C, D, E, F, G, H, L, M, O, T, U, and V.</i></b></p> <p><b>Delete reference to “de-registered common land” from Site B and Sites E – G.</b></p> <p><b>In the second paragraph of the justification, delete “paddocks” from the first sentence and delete the second sentence (“The paddocks are regarded as....”).</b></p> <p><b>Correct the map headed MAP3 Map Showing Common Land (CL70 – CL75) to delete de-registered common land.</b></p>	<p>as intended to place a blanket restriction on the development of areas of agricultural land on the edge of the village which are not publicly accessible other than by public footpaths.</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			U. Main Street verges (four) V. Leicester Lane Allotments W. Christchurch paddock X. Cemetery field Y. Wood Yard paddock Z. Manege field		
12	Policy ENV4 -	PROTECTION OF OTHER SITES OF HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE	<p>POLICY ENV 4: PROTECTION OF OTHER SITES OF HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE – seven sites listed below and shown in Fig. 7 have been identified as being of at least local historical significance. They are important in their own right and are valued locally. Development proposals that affect them will be expected to protect the identified features.</p> <p>1. and 2. Green Lane group (Iron Age, Romano-British and medieval) 3. Green Lane paddock (medieval) 4. Dingley Road paddocks (Iron Age to medieval) 5. Buckminster Close, Nether Green (medieval to early modern) 6. Christchurch paddock (medieval to early modern) 7. Knights End Close (medieval)</p>	<p><b>Revise Policy ENV4 as follows:</b>  <b><i>“The following sites shown on the Policies Map contain evidence of local historic assets or archaeological potential. Development proposals that affect them should be appraised in accordance with national guidance and local strategic policy. The demonstrable benefits of development proposals must be balanced against the significance of the local historic asset. List sites 1 to 7.”</i></b>  <b>Add the following to the justification to the policy: “A summary of the heritage assets and archaeological potential is set out in Appendix X.”</b></p>	the policy is worded in a way that is not in accordance with national planning guidance and may place an unjustified burden on potential developers.
13	Policy ENV6	SETTING OF BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURE	POLICY ENV 6: SETTING OF BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES OF HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL INTEREST – The structures and buildings as listed and shown	<p><b>revise the title of Policy ENV6 to read: “Non-Designated Heritage Assets”.</b>  <b>The boundaries of all sites, structures and buildings should be shown on the</b></p>	To improve clarity

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
		S OF HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL INTEREST	<p>in Fig. 9 are non-designated heritage assets and their features and settings will be protected wherever possible. Any harm arising from a development proposal, or a change of land use requiring planning approval, will need to be balanced against their significance as heritage assets.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Canal bridge, Leicester Lane (NGR SP 732891)</li> <li>2. Railway over-bridge, Langton Road (NGR SP 743894)</li> <li>3. Railway footbridge</li> <li>4. Disused railway embankment south of A6 By-Pass (NGR SP 743896)</li> <li>5. Bridge over Langton brook (NGR SP 741908)</li> <li>6. Old turnpike Road (NGR SP 720904)</li> <li>7. Cemetery, Dingley Road</li> <li>8. Village Hall</li> <li>9. Bowden Stores – façade</li> <li>10. Bishop’s House</li> <li>11. Nos. 74 - 108 Main Street</li> <li>12. Green Lodge</li> <li>13. Navvies’ Row, Leicester Lane</li> <li>14. Nether Green Lodge</li> <li>15. Nether House</li> <li>16. Upper House</li> <li>17. Mud walls, Rectory House</li> <li>18. J.G. Pears factory site (NGR SP 720902)</li> <li>19. Victorian letterbox</li> </ol>	<p><b>Policies Map.</b>  <b>Site 18 (JG Pears Factory site) should be limited to the historic buildings only: the three storey 18th century building currently used as an office and the factory chimney. The background report for site 18 should clearly identify and describe the buildings and structure that are designated under this policy and they should be shown on a detailed map.</b></p>	

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
14	Community Action ENV3	NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS	<p>COMMUNITY ACTION ENV 3: NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS - The structures and buildings listed here (map above) are non-designated heritage assets. They are locally important for their contribution to the layout and characteristic mix of architectural styles in the village, and their features and settings will be protected wherever possible. Any harm arising from a development proposal, or a change of land use requiring planning approval, will need to be balanced against their significance as heritage assets.</p> <p>The Parish Council will survey the parish and identify other buildings that should have listed status and have these buildings formally listed.</p>	<p><b>Revise the title to: Reviewing the Listed Buildings of Historic Importance. Delete the first paragraph. Revise the second paragraph to read: “The Parish Council will survey the parish and identify other buildings <i>that may have potential to be listed as of national importance and work with Historic England to secure their listing where appropriate.</i>”</b></p>	recommended that the wording be revised to better reflect the process of working with Historic England in considering the suitability of listing other buildings as of national importance.
15	Policy ENV7 –	Protection of Important Views	<p>POLICY ENV 7: PROTECTION OF IMPORTANT VIEWS – The views listed are important for the setting of Great Bowden. Development should respect these important views which are also shown in Fig. 10:</p> <p>1. 360° from Leicester Lane north to the Langtons and south to Bowden Ridge The southern vista includes the important open country separating Bowden from Harborough;</p> <p>2. From Green Lane, from northwest to east, i.e. from the high ground of Kibworth Ridge to Upper Green;</p>	<p><b>Revise Policy ENV7 as follows: Revise the Policy to read: “Development should not have a significant adverse impact on the following views shown on the Policies Map: 1. <i>South of Leicester Lane to Bowden Ridge</i>; 3. and 4.” Revise the maps accordingly. Revise the position of viewpoint 4 to reflect the description.</b></p>	concerns that the policy may result in a blanket restriction on land within the viewpoints identified at Location 1 to the north, Location 2 and Location 5.



Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>3. 180° panorama south from Main Street to the rising land of Bowden Ridge, where very well preserved ridge and furrow can be seen clearly;</p> <p>4. From Welham Road/Sutton Road junction northwards, west to east, including Nether Green and a large paddock: characteristic Great Bowden scene linking the built environment with historic open spaces; and</p> <p>5. From Dingley Road southeast over the Welland valley floodplain to the river, This has been undeveloped boundary land for at least 11 centuries.</p>		
16	Policy ENV8 -	PROTECTION OF OTHER SITES AND FEATURES OF NATURAL ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE	<p>POLICY ENV 8: PROTECTION OF OTHER SITES AND FEATURES OF NATURAL ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE – Twenty-eight sites, listed below, and shown in Fig. 11 have been identified as being of at least local significance for wildlife. They are important in their own right and are locally valued. Development proposals that affect them will be expected to protect or enhance the identified features.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Great Bowden borrow pit (SSSI)</li> <li>2. Grand Union Canal (LWS)</li> <li>3. Old railway embankment ( pLWS)</li> <li>4. Dry ponds (pLWS)</li> <li>5. Langton Brook (pLWS)</li> <li>6. River Welland (pLWS)</li> <li>7. Ash tree 1, Welham Lane (pLWS)</li> </ol>	<p><b>Revise Policy ENV8 as follows:</b></p> <p><b>“... as shown on the <i>Policies Map</i>...”</b></p> <p><b>Delete “They are important in their own right and are locally valued.”</b></p> <p><b>Revise the last sentence to read: “Development proposals affecting site 1 will be considered against national and strategic local policies. Development proposals affecting the other sites should demonstrate that the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the impact on the site and the identified features.”</b></p> <p><b>Include all sites on the Policies Map showing their boundaries.</b></p>	<p>It is not appropriate to designate and safeguard sites simply because they are “locally valued”; the value of the sites must be clearly justified by robust evidence of its biodiversity interest.</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>8. Group of parkland trees (pLWS)  9. Horses railway bridge (fern site) (pLWS)  10. Langton Road railway bridge (fern site) (pLWS)  11. Collapsed willow, Welham Lane (pLWS)  12. Ash tree, Dingley Road (pLWS)  13. Railway bridge (fern site) (pLWS)  14. Ash trees, Green Lane (pLWS)  15. Lime trees, churchyard (pLWS)  16. Ash tree, Welham Lane 2 (pLWS)  17. Ash trees, Knights End ( LWS &amp; cLWS)  18. Ash trees, Langton Road (cLWS))  19. – 22. Species-rich and/or pre-Enclosure hedgerows (not mapped)  23. Priority habitat, good quality, species-rich semi-improved grassland  24. Priority habitat, good quality, species-rich semi-improved grassland  25. Priority habitat, good quality, species-rich semi-improved grassland  26. Priority habitat, good quality, species-rich semi-improved grassland  27. Priority habitat, good quality, species-rich semi-improved grassland  28. Ash trees, Dingley Road (cLWS)</p>		
17		Policy ENV9	POLICY ENV 9: WOODLAND, TREES AND HEDGES - Development proposals that damage or result in the loss of woodland (Fig. 11) or individual trees of arboricultural, landscape or ecological significance and amenity value will not be supported.	<b>Delete Policy ENV9.</b>	lack of robust evidence to substantiate the protection of the trees and hedgerows

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			Development that harms the areas of species-rich hedgerows identified in the map below will not be supported.		
18		Policy ENV10	<p>POLICY ENV 10: BIODIVERSITY</p> <p>a) Development proposals 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;</p> <p>b) The wildlife corridors shown in Fig. 12 and listed in the supporting information will be maintained, promoted and supported as a biodiversity resource. Development proposals which impact on this corridor will be resisted.</p>	<p><b>Revise Policy ENV10 part b) to read “shown on <i>the Policies Map</i>” and the last line to read “<i>the corridors</i>”.</b></p> <p><b>Delete reference to various unmapped hedgerows from the background evidence report.</b></p>	<p>the description of “various hedgerows” is considered to be imprecise.</p> <p>Correction for typographical error.</p>
19		Policy ENV11	<p>POLICY ENV 11: FOOTPATHS AND CYCLEWAYS - Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, the existing network of footpaths and cycleways will not be supported.</p> <p>‘Urbanisation’ of the rural character and setting of existing footpaths and cycleways as a consequence of diversion around or absorption into new development will be resisted.</p> <p>The creation of new footpaths, or the enhancement of existing footpaths, to encourage walking from the new developments to the village amenities for leisure and wellbeing, is supported.</p>	<p><b>Revise Policy ENV11 as follows:</b></p> <p><b>Revise the first two paragraphs to read: “<i>Development proposals should include measures to facilitate and encourage safe access by cycle and on foot; and the protection of, connection to, and extension where practicable of existing pedestrian and cycle routes.</i>”</b></p> <p><b>“Where the diversion of a footpath or cycleway is necessary, or where a route is absorbed into a development proposal, the route should be designed and bounded to retain its character.”</b></p>	<p>It is considered that the wording in the first part of the policy and its lack of flexibility does not accord with the emerging strategic policy approach which seeks to ensure that new development proposals are designed to protect existing off-road routes.</p>
20		Policy ENV12.	POLICY ENV 12: RIVERS AND FLOODING	<b>Delete Policy ENV12.</b>	the policy is not

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>– Development proposals of appropriate scale and where relevant will be required to demonstrate that:</p> <p>a) Its location takes geology, flood risk and natural drainage into account, including undertaking a hydrogeological study whose findings must be complied with in respect of design, groundworks and construction;</p> <p>b) Its design includes, as appropriate, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), other surface water management measures and permeable surfaces;</p> <p>c) It does not increase the risk of flooding downstream.</p>		clear and unambiguous and does not add any local requirements
21		Policy CAF1	<p>POLICY CAF1: PROTECTION OF EXISTING COMMUNITY AMENITIES &amp; FACILITIES - Proposals that will result in the loss of an existing community facility or amenity will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a) There is no longer any need or demand for the existing community facility; or</p> <p>b) The existing community facility is no longer economically viable; or</p> <p>c) The proposal makes alternative provision for the relocation of the existing community facility to an equally or more appropriate and accessible location within the Parish.</p>	<p>revise Policy CAF1 to read:  <b><i>“Proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of an existing community facility, public house or shop should demonstrate that:”</i></b>  Delete the sections in the justification on Sport and Leisure and Other Amenities, except for the paragraph on public conveniences. Move the text to the justification of Policies ENV3 and ENV11 as appropriate.</p>	Policy revised to be worded positively
22		Policy CAF3	<p>POLICY CAF3: EXPANSION OF GREAT BOWDEN ACADEMY - Proposals for the expansion of Great Bowden Academy will</p>	<p><b>Delete criterion c) from Policy CAF3.</b></p>	The third criterion states that the development

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>be supported provided that:</p> <p>a. Expansion would not create severe access related or traffic circulation problems that cannot be mitigated;</p> <p>b. The development would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents or other adjacent users;</p> <p>c. The development does not conflict with other policies or proposals within The Plan; and</p> <p>d. Safe Routes to Schools' schemes and similar initiatives are introduced wherever possible and appropriate utilising developer contributions where appropriate.</p>		<p>should not conflict with other policies or proposals of The Plan. It is considered that this criterion is unnecessary as the NPPF states that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p>
23		Policy T1	<p><b>POLICY T1: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT</b> - The provision of traffic management solutions (which are appropriate to the character of the rural area) to address the impact of additional traffic arising, separately or cumulatively, from developments within Great Bowden will be supported. This includes either directly provided solutions or the use of developer contributions towards the costs of provision.</p>	<b>Delete Policy T1.</b>	<p>Policy T1 does not accord with national planning guidance and it is recommended that it be deleted.</p>
24	Policy T2	WELHAM LANE	<p><b>POLICY T2: WELHAM LANE</b> - The closure of Welham Lane to 4-wheel traffic is supported.</p>	<b>Delete Policy T2.</b>	<p>Policy T2 does not accord with national planning guidance and it is</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
					recommended that it be deleted.
25	Policy T3	PARKING PROVISION AND NEW DWELLINGS	<p>POLICY T3: PARKING PROVISION AND NEW DWELLINGS</p> <p>At least two off-street car parking spaces shall be provided for each new dwelling. A minimum of three such spaces should be provided for four- bedroom or larger dwellings.</p> <p>The provision of tandem parking in new developments is not supported.</p> <p>(Last Para) However, looking ahead it is important that developers understand that all new developments must be self-sufficient when it comes to parking and there should be no necessity for new residents or their visitors to park on the roads.</p> <p>(Third Para) The reception class size at the village school is also increasing by 5 children per year for the next four years. Alongside an increase of new residents with the volume of new cars that the new housing will bring, parking is of major concern and this is reflected in the responses to the village questionnaire.</p>	<p><b>Delete the first paragraph of Policy T3. Include the following in the justification: “Off street car parking spaces shall be provided in new residential development in accordance with the Leicestershire County Council Parking Standards and Guidance.”</b></p> <p><b>Revise the final paragraph of the justification under the heading Parking to state “...self sufficient with sufficient off road parking spaces being provided to minimise the need to park on the roads”.</b></p> <p><b>Delete the first sentence of the third paragraph of the justification. (“The reception class....”)</b></p>	<p>It is not feasible to avoid car parking on residential estate roads in all cases. It is recommended therefore that this paragraph be revised to refer to sufficient off road parking spaces being provided to minimise on street parking.</p> <p>It is noted that the last line of paragraph 2 of the justification is repeated in the next paragraph.</p>
26	Policy T5	SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL	<p>POLICY T5: SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL</p> <p>The creation of a ‘safe routes to school’ scheme by identifying, clear pedestrian routes to the village school and pre-school and providing the relevant safe crossing</p>	<b>Delete Policy T5.</b>	Policy T5 does not accord with national planning guidance and it is recommended that

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			places leading to schools and village amenities is supported.		it be deleted.
27	Policy T7	SUPPORTING PUBLIC TRANSPORT	<p>POLICY T7: SUPPORTING PUBLIC TRANSPORT</p> <p>The provision of travel packs to new residents to include information on cycling and walking routes, public transport timetables and a 6 months' free bus pass per adult will be required on all developments with more than 5 houses.</p> <p>The provision of bus shelters and benches in keeping with the village and sited close to developments will be supported.</p>	<p>revise the first paragraph of Policy T7 as follows:</p> <p><b>“.....per adult <i>should be provided on developments of more than 5 dwellings in accordance with Leicestershire County Council’s policy on Developer Contributions.</i>”</b></p>	The policy should be worded to include a degree of flexibility rather than to make it a requirement as developer contributions are subject to assessment and negotiation.
28	Policy EMP1	SUPPORT FOR EXISTING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES	<p>POLICY EMP1: SUPPORT FOR EXISTING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES: - There will be a presumption against the loss of commercial and retail premises or land (A - Class, B-class and sui generis) which provide employment opportunities within Great Bowden. Applications for a change of use to an activity that does not provide employment opportunities will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a) The commercial premises or land in question has not been in active use for at least 12 months; and</p> <p>b) The commercial premises or land in question has no potential for either reoccupation or redevelopment for employment generating uses and as demonstrated through the results both of a full valuation report and a marketing</p>	<p>Revise Policy EMP1 as follows:</p> <p><b>“<i>Planning applications for the change of use of or for the redevelopment of land or buildings of commercial or retail use (Use Classes A and B and sui generis) to a use that does not provide employment opportunities should demonstrate that: criteria a) and b).</i>”</b></p>	to ensure that it is clear and unambiguous so that it can be applied consistently by decision makers.

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			campaign lasting for a continuous period of at least six months.		
29	Policy EMP2	NEW EMPLOYMENT	<p>POLICY EMP2: NEW EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES – In supporting additional employment opportunities, new development will be required to:</p> <p>a) Be sited in existing buildings, on areas of previously developed land or within the boundary of planned limits of development for Great Bowden; and</p> <p>b) Be of a size and scale not adversely affecting the character, infrastructure and environment of the village itself and the wider Plan area, including the countryside; and</p> <p>c) Not involve the loss of dwellings; and</p> <p>d) Not increase noise levels, fumes, odour or other nuisance to an extent that they would unacceptably disturb occupants of near-by residential property; and</p> <p>e) Not generate severe levels of traffic movement and provides on-site car parking for all employees and visitors; and</p> <p>f) Contribute to the character and vitality of the local area; and</p> <p>g) Any extension or free standing building shall be designed having regard to policies in this Plan and should not detract from the quality and character of the main building by reason of height, scale, massing, location or the facing materials used in their construction; and</p>	<p><b>revise Policy EMP2 as follows:</b></p> <p><b>Delete the word “planned” from criterion a).</b></p> <p><b>Delete the paragraph commencing “Within the limits to development...” after criterion h) and the subsequent criteria i) to k).</b></p> <p><b>Include the aspiration for a community home working hub as a Community Action.</b></p> <p><b>Correct the punctuation of the policy so that there is only an “and” at the end of the penultimate criterion.</b></p>	<p>Criterion a) refers to “planned” limits to development. It is considered that the word “planned” is unnecessary as the revised limits will be approved when this plan is made.</p> <p>Other recommendations for accuracy</p>



Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>h) Be well integrated into and complement existing businesses. Within the limits to development, the following types of employment development will be supported:</p> <p>i) Small-scale expansion of existing employment premises across the Parish subject to the conditions listed above;</p> <p>j) Small-scale new build development on brownfield sites within the Parish;</p> <p>k) The creation of a facility, for example using an existing community facility, which assists small or home-based businesses in the parish by providing a hub with high speed internet, meeting rooms and suitable parking.</p>		
30	Policy INF1	DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS	<p>POLICY INF 1: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - Planning applications for new developments within The Plan area must demonstrate, where appropriate, that they can contribute towards the delivery of community services. This may be through contributions via Section 106 agreement or through payment of any future Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) where applicable. New development will be supported by the provision of new or improved infrastructure as set out in policies as above.</p>	<p><b>Revise Policy INF1 to read:</b>  <b><i>“Where policies in this plan require contributions to community infrastructure, they will be made through contributions through Section 106 agreements or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) where applicable in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS12 or a successor policy in the emerging Harborough Local Plan in accordance with the Council’s Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.”</i></b></p>	<p>Policy too prescriptive. It would be clearer to make reference to the policies and guidance as set out in the District Council’s Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan policies and the Planning Obligations SPD.</p>

