

## Neighbourhood Plan

### Pre-submission consultation responses. April 2018

	Chapter/ Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
1	5.3		St Peters PCC	As a group we are happy with the descriptions and the scores relating to the church and its churchyard (31, 36 & 55)	Noted	None.
2			St Peters PCC	The agricultural land to the East of and adjacent to the churchyard (pages 37 & 38), has protection by virtue of being a SSSI (coloured purple on map) and by designation as an important open space LGS (Ref 151 coloured green on the map). There is one small area (coloured white on the map) which is surrounded by protected land. It would seem logical to the PCC that this area, which is adjacent to the grave yard, should be included in the zone labelled 151.	The white (uncoloured) area is part of field 152, most of which has statutory protection as a Scheduled Monument (not an SSSI). The LGS here is the entire land parcel numbered 151 (which also includes a small section of the Scheduled Monument). Site 152, despite its partial Scheduled Monument designation, does not score highly enough to be a LGS, and partial parcels are not considered eligible. The location of this undesignated area between two LGSs, the Listed church, the burial ground and the SM means it is effectively protected from damage to	None

					or loss of environmental value, for example through development.	
3			St Peters PCC	The description of the site of the Old Manor House, (page 37) located in the field to the East of the Churchyard, states that the area is accessed by footpath Y10. There is no public access to this area and footpath Y10 finishes to the north of the Lutterworth Road.	This appears to refer to site 151. Although public access is a criterion for a site's selection as a potential LGS the designation depends on a total score from 9 criteria. This site scores highly enough without being on a public right of way.	Remove reference to Y10 from the LGS table, site 151 and amend scoring in the environmental inventory
4				Page 55 refers to the number of spaces available for burials in the Churchyard and suggests that alternative facilities would be sought when the Churchyard is eventually full. The PCC would like to see the Plan comment on what type of alternatives exist.	Community Action CF1 says that the Parish Council will support the Church in expanding its facilities. It is not suggesting any alternatives of its own.	None.
5			Brian Spriggs	Map (page 24), shows the extent of the village envelope by a red line. This line excludes two early nineteenth century cottages – namely New Row Cottage and Ruby Cottage in South Close. These are the only non-agricultural properties not included in the Village Envelope. I pointed out this anomaly to the HDC representative at the Open Day held in the Village Hall. He agreed that this was an error and	Agreed	LtD to be amended as proposed.

				should be corrected. As there is no apparent logical reason for these cottages to be excluded from the Village Envelope, I suggest that the line be adjusted in the Final Document (see attached sketch map).		
6			Brian Spriggs	The map showing listed properties in Arnesby (page 44) does not include the Old Adult School, located on St Peter's Road to the south of Longacre. This property is grade 2 listed and is designated, for some unknown reason, as "the house to the South of Longacre" number 1061542. Once this has been corrected there is no need to identify the Old Adult School as a site in need of protection (page 45), because its listed status does that already.	The reference to 'the house to the south of Longacre' is a direct copy from the British Listed Buildings website. We will put the 'Old Adult School' in brackets alongside and remove it from figure 8.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
7			Brian Spriggs	There is some inconsistency in the number of listed properties in the Village. 10 (page 31), 13 (page 42) and 14 if you include the Turnpike milestone, which disappeared years ago. I believe 13 is the correct number.	Thank you for this comment. We will standardise the reference to 13 as suggested and remove the milestone from the map and narrative.	Change to be made as proposed.
8			Brain Spriggs	The comment on the School's relationship with the Village Hall (page 56) states that the School seeks a	Thank you for this comment. We will delete the part of the paragraph	Amendment to be made as proposed.

				<p>formalisation of the agreement that it may use the Hall for lunches and other activities. As chairman of the Management Committee I am not aware that the school has sought such formalisation. The Management Committee have allowed the school access to the Hall during the school day, unless the Hall is required for a village based activity. The School currently gives £700 per annum to cover the cost of electricity used during their occupation of the premises. In addition the School has paid for sanding and sealing the floor. The Committee is pleased that the Hall can be used productively during the day when other uses are few and far between, but would not wish to see a formal hiring agreement as this would give the School priority and effectively rule out any village based uses, which must be the Committee's priority.</p>	<p>after 'The school uses the village hall daily for lunches, whole school assemblies and PE during bad weather'.</p>	
9			Brian Spriggs	<p>The comment (page 55) which states that a recently formed Social Committee manages the Village hall, is not strictly correct. The Village Hall Management Committee is the prime group running the Hall. The social Committee, established at the last</p>	<p>Noted. The narrative will be changed to say 'A Management Committee runs the Hall with a Social Committee formed in 2017 to investigate possible uses'.</p>	<p>Text to be changed as proposed.</p>

				AGM, is a sub- committee formed to investigate possible uses of the Hall.		
10			Brain Spriggs	The comment on the Playing Field (page 57), which states that the Parish Council leases the land from a private owner, is not correct. The land is leased by the Village Hall Management Committee.	Noted. Text to be changed to say 'This is currently leased by the Village Hall Management Committee'.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
11			Leicestershire CC	General Comments Policy H3 could mention parking provision to match existing provision as this may currently be greater than complying with Policy D1 and would reinforce Policy T1.	Agreed.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
12			Leicestershire CC	Policies CF2(c) and BE3(a) could include the wording 'within the site' or similar to further assist in reducing parking issues.	Agreed.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
13			Historic England	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We note that since the last consultation you have added some housing allocations, and we therefore refer you to the published advice available on our website, "Housing Allocations in Local Plans" as this relates equally to neighbourhood planning. This can be found at &lt;<a 455="" 534="" 891="" 913"="" data-label="Page-Footer" href="https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-&lt;/a&gt;&lt;/p&gt; &lt;/td&gt; &lt;td&gt;Noted&lt;/td&gt; &lt;td&gt;None&lt;/td&gt; &lt;/tr&gt; &lt;/table&gt; &lt;/div&gt; &lt;div data-bbox="> <p>Page 5 of 11</p> </a></p>		

				<p>environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/heag074-he-and-site-allocation-local-plans.pdf/&gt;</p> <p>If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>		
14			Harborough DC	Vision – suggest making the vision time constrained i.e. to the end of the Plan period, a series of objectives would then be the bullet points below the vision (page 17 and 18) and the policies deliver the objectives	Agreed. The vision is to be time-limited to 2031 in line with the Plan period.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
15			Harborough DC	Page 21 LTD – it is good to demonstrate how the policies have been derived in the methodology	Noted.	None.
16			Harborough DC	Page 23 – are some residential properties outside the LTD in the north of the village? It may be worthwhile considering incorporating these or justifying the exclusion.	These are mainly farm buildings that relate more to the countryside and are therefore correctly located outside the LTD line.	None.
17			Harborough DC	H1 site allocation – the criteria in the policy deals with local issues, which is what NDPs should aspire to do.	Noted.	None.
18			Harborough DC	Policy H1 - this policy could specifically state required mix e.g. 1x 4 bed, 3x 3bed and 2X2 bed. It could also ask for some homes to be built to accessible standards Building Regs M2.	It is considered that it is sufficient for the policy on housing mix to be applied once the final planning application is submitted and the final numbers of dwellings confirmed.	None

19			Harborough DC	H3 Windfall Housing - windfall of up to 2 may be considered too restrictive. It would depend on the site	Agreed – reference to be changed to windfall covering ‘individual dwellings or small groups of dwellings)	Change to be made as indicated.
20				D1 Design – b) car parking standards that differ from the Six C design standard will need evidence. Currently a two bed dwelling will require two car parking spaces, which is greater than that specified in the policy. One bed dwellings require a single car parking space. If the car parking does not differ from the Six standard then question whether this part of the policy is required.	Agreed.	Wording to be changed to refer to meeting the 6Cs standards.
21			Harborough DC	D1 c) consider rewording – Development should be enhanced by biodiversity – how will this be implemented through Development Management?	Agreed. Remove reference to biodiversity here - it is covered in ENV 4. Reword as: d) development proposals should, where possible, retain existing trees and hedgerows.	Amendment to be made as proposed.

22			Harborough DC	D1 bullet point g) reads awkwardly as the requirements for SUDS are very different to waste storage. It may be easier to read as an extra bullet point. I note there is no mention of avoidance of light pollution.	<p>Agreed. Bullet point g) to be split into two as proposed.</p> <p>In addition, a new design criterion shall be introduced as follows New development should incorporate measures for controlling light pollution, including managing the detrimental effects on wildlife. There should be no decorative uplighting on houses; street and footpath lighting should be located at low level; security lights should be operated by intruder-triggered sensors; site and sports facility lighting should be off during agreed curfew hours between March and October (following best practice guidelines (e.g. Bats and Lighting Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Wildlife Trust 2014); and maximum light spillage onto known bat foraging areas should be 1 lux'.</p>	Changes to be made as proposed.
23			Harborough DC	Environmental policies generally – some Examiners may pick up the cumulative effect of environmental policies when development proposals	Noted. There is already prioritisation, through having different levels of protection according to the	None.



				<p>are considered. Although the Plan states on page 34/35 'Care was taken during preparation of the Plan to ensure that the policies (and the sites and areas of environmental significance covered by them) were not unduly restrictive on development during the Plan's lifetime', when the policies are overlaid the restrictions may be considered too onerous. Consider whether the policies can be reworded or the sites prioritised to take account of any cumulative effects.</p>	<p>type of site/feature referred to by the various policies.</p> <p>The 'other environmental' sites and the ridge and furrow sites are based very largely on existing designations. The policies seek to highlight these features not to create a blanket restriction – and it should also be noted that these sites are largely in the countryside where development is to be controlled in any event. These policies help to offer local detail to that control</p> <p>....</p>	
24			Harborough DC	Environment Inventory might be better in an appendix	Agreed	Description of environmental protections is moved to the supporting information.
25			Harborough DC	ENV2 evidence for sites needs to be clearly referenced, either in appendix or supporting document	Agreed. The description in the policy has been amended to reflect this.	Policy amended to say '38 sites (as described in the environmental inventory, and shown in map Fig. 5 above) have been identified as being of local significance for biodiversity (species and habitats) and / or history.

						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. Planning permission will be refused unless the need for and the benefits arising from the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss'
26			Harborough DC	ENV4 policy would benefit from including the importance of connectivity of habitats to improve resilience (i.e. corridors). This is not clear in the policy. Land that provides connectivity may not be as high environmental value, but allows an important function. Streams and hedges are particularly important.	A wildlife corridor hasn't been proposed because there isn't a case for one. There are no significant groups of priority habitats and only one area of community habitat creation, and (there is no current Phase 1 Habitat Survey) there are no mapped Local Wildlife Sites or wildlife corridors on the HDC 2018 LP policies map.	None
27			Harborough DC	ENV 6 Ridge and Furrow – noted that this policy has prioritised the best examples of ridge and furrow.	Noted.	None

28			Harborough DC	ENV7 may be seen as too restrictive as currently worded. Development should enhance the views through design of development.	Policy wording along the lines recommended have been rejected at examination at Medbourne. Will amend the neighbourhood plan though to help clarification	Amendment to be made as follows: "To be supported, development proposals must not significantly harm these views where seen from publicly accessible locations".
29			Harborough DC	ENV8 footpaths and bridleways – are there any specific enhancements that are required? The Plan can identify these and seek to enhance where appropriate through developer contributions or other grants streams. It may be worthwhile considering bow any improvement will be delivered	There are no specific enhancements identified.	None
30			Harborough DC	The plan is well laid out with consistent numbering for policies and figures. Policies are distinct from text.	Noted.	None.
31			Harborough DC	Consider whether some of the supporting information in the text of the Plan could be incorporated as appendices. This will make the Plan shorter and easier to use in determining planning applications.	The detail explanation of the environmental protections has been moved to the supporting information.	Amendment made as recommended.
32			Harborough DC	The evidence base must be updated on the website prior to submission of the Plan.	Noted.	Evidence base to be updated on submission of the Neighbourhood Plan.

