

## Hungarton Neighbourhood Plan

### Summary of representations submitted by Harborough District Council to the independent examiner pursuant to Regulation 17 of Part 5 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

Name	Policy/page	Full Representation
Nick Wakefield Planning Advisor The Environment Agency		No comments
Sean Mahoney, Natural England Apex Court City Link Nottingham NG2 4LA		<p>Thank you for consulting Natural England on the Hungarton Neighbourhood Development Plan which has now been submitted to Harborough District Council for Examination.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>We have already commented on the Hungarton Draft Neighbourhood Plan in response to a consultation from Hungarton Parish Council. Natural England does not consider that the plan will have any likely significant effects on any internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites and welcomes the broad thrust of the plan and some of the specific policy proposals. It is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and set within the context of Harborough District Council's existing Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan. We particularly welcome the section on the natural and historical environment and the policies contained therein which aim to protect and enhance green space and support biodiversity.</p>

<p><b>Jennifer Hadland Savills (UK)ltd 26 Coniscliffe Road Darlington DL3 7JX</b></p>	<p><b>Policy S1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development (page 11 of the consultation document)</b></p> <p><b>Policy S2 – General Policy Principle (page 11 of the consultation document)</b></p> <p><b>Policy H1 – Housing Provision (page 13 of the consultation document)</b></p>	<p>We support, in principle, the inclusion of this policy as it is considered to be line with policy and guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Policy S1 sets out a positive vision for the future of the area which is in line with the NPPF’s Core Planning Principles.</p> <p>In accordance with guidance and legislation, Neighbourhood Plans have to meet a number of conditions before they can legally come into force. These conditions are to ensure plans are legally compliant and take account of wider policy considerations. For Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they must have regard to national planning policy</li> <li>• they must be in general conformity with strategic policies in the development plan for the local area (i.e. such as in a core strategy)</li> <li>• they must be compatible with EU obligations and human rights requirements.</li> </ul> <p>As highlighted within the consultation document, the Neighbourhood Plan is not intended to replace the Policies contained within the NPPF or the Harborough Core Strategy or emerging Local Plan. The policies are proposed to sit alongside national and local policy providing policies which are specific to Hungarton. As such, we support the principle of Policy S2.</p> <p>The policy wording, however, may wish to be amended so that rather than referring to policies which are not covered by the Neighbourhood Plan, Policy S2 becomes a blanket Neighbourhood Plan policy. We propose the policy should be amended to state that “<i>National and Districtwide planning policies continue to apply and the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan, where relevant, is to provide additional policy / guidance in respect of future development in Hungarton Parish.</i></p> <p>Whilst we fully support the future small scale growth of Hungarton, to ensure that the village continues to support the existing services and facilities, and that development will be commensurate to the scale of the existing built up area, we suggest some amendments to the current wording of the policy.</p> <p>To ensure that the Plan complies with existing national and local policy and guidance, and carrying through the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in Policy S1, we suggest the removal of the text ‘a <i>maximum of</i>’ in the Policy and for it to be substituted by the word ‘<i>approximately</i>’.</p>
---	--	--

	<p>Development Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to change. As set out at paragraph 16 of the NPPF “...<i>Neighbourhoods should: plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan...</i>”. The proposed amendment will ensure that the Plan complies with the NPPF by providing some flexibility which is a necessity for Development Plans to be found sound at Examination.</p> <p>Furthermore, individual site assessments have not yet taken place with regard to the proposed small scale housing allocations. Once the technical works have been undertaken, landowners / stakeholders will be in a better position to understand what each site can accommodate when considering it from a design and commercial perspective. It is important for the proposed allocations to be effectively used.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to the policy should sufficiently enable Policy H1 to be flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time to ensure that allocations for future development are viable and therefore deliverable. According to the draft document, only 12 dwellings have been built in Hungarton between 2001 and 2011. To ensure the village remains a vibrant settlement (preventing the closure of community facilities and providing new accommodating to enable families to stay in the village) more housing is needed.</p> <p>As set out at paragraph 58 of the Local Plan, “<i>Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;</i></li> <li>• <i>establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;</i></li> <li>• <i>optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;</i></li> <li>• <i>respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;</i></li> <li>• <i>create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and,</i></li> <li>• <i>are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping</i>”. (Emphasised by us).</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion, we support policy H1 in principle, however, consider that the word “maximum” does</p>
--	---

	<p><b>Policy H2 – Housing Allocations (page 15 of the consultation document)</b></p>	<p>not comply with the NPPF and should be replaced with “approximately”. This will ensure that the policy provides enough flexibility to ensure that the identified development sites are used in the most efficient and effective manner to create viable and deliverable development sites during the Plan period.</p> <p>Our client is the owner of Site (b) ‘Agricultural Store at Hope Farm, Main Street’. We therefore fully support the proposed allocation of the site for small scale residential development. However, there are elements of the policy which raise concerns in respect of bringing the site forward for development.</p> <p>Firstly, in line with our comments above in respect of Policy H1, it is proposed that the first paragraph of Policy H2 is amended to say “<i>Development will be permitted for approximately five additional dwellings subject to the following criteria</i>”. Rather than committing development to 5 dwellings.</p> <p>In respect of site allocation (b), the policy states that the development is to provide three dwellings in total. Again, to provide some flexibility, the text should be amended to include ‘<i>approximately three dwellings</i>’, rather than committing the development yield at this stage.</p> <p>Another area of concern is stipulating that the proposed development should be for two 2/3 bed starter homes and one home for older people. Whilst the policy could state that this is a preference of the community, development will need to be commercially led.</p> <p>Starter Homes will be set by legal agreements and will provide an alternative form of affordable housing. Prescribing the development on Site b) to be Starter Homes could restrict developer interest in bringing the site forward. As with any development, a scheme has to be financially viable to be delivered. Prescribing the tenure and type of development is considered overly onerous and restrictive.</p> <p>To ensure that the proposed sites come forward during the Plan period it is therefore proposed that reference to housing type and tenure should be removed. With regard to Site b), criterion 1), and 4) should therefore be deleted along with the final section of the Policy which sets out the eligibility for Starter Homes. It will be Central Government who will set out the occupant eligibility; not via the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Finally, in respect of Policy H2, we suggest that criterion 2 for Site b) should be amended to read “<i>all mature hedging and trees shall be retained where appropriate</i>”. Until arboricultural surveys and other technical works are completed it is difficult to confirm what works will be required (including mitigation measures) to bring the site forward.</p> <p>In conclusion, we suggest Policy H2 is amended to read as follows in respect of Site b):</p> <p><b><i>Policy H2: HOUSING ALLOCATIONS - Land is allocated for housing development at three locations as shown on the proposals map (figure 2). Development will be permitted for approximately five additional dwellings subject to the following criteria:</i></b></p> <p>...</p> <p><b><i>b) For the Agricultural store at Hope Farm, Main Street, development will be permitted</i></b></p>
--	--	---

	<p><b>Policy H4 – Limits to Development (page 18 of the consultation document)</b></p> <p><b>Policy H5 – Housing Mix (page 19 of the consultation document)</b></p> <p><b>Policy H7 – Building Design Principles (page 24 of the Consultation document)</b></p>	<p><b>subject to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The development providing approximately three dwellings in total;</b></li> <li><b>2. All mature hedging and trees being retained where appropriate; and,</b></li> <li><b>3. On-site car parking provision for 2 cars per dwelling.</b></li> </ol> <p>...</p> <p>The amendments proposed to the Development Limits is welcomed.</p> <p>In line with our comments above, it is not considered necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to specify the housing mix per development site. The housing mix will be established as the relevant planning applications progress. To ensure development is viable and therefore developable, developer interest will be essential. If the Neighbourhood Plan is too onerous then it will restrict market interest in the site and therefore prevent the sites coming forward. Harborough Council, whilst preparing its emerging Local Plan is required to undertake detailed evidence to support the Local Plan and its policies at Examination. As part of the evidence the Council has to prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). It is this document which should assist with the housing mix on larger scale housing sites. On small scale sites such as those proposed at part of the Neighbourhood Plan (or windfall sites which come forward during the Local Plan period throughout the district), it should be the market which dictate the housing mix per site, not the Neighbourhood Plan. We therefore suggest that Policy H5 is removed from the Plan.</p> <p>Design principles and building requirements are set out by Central Government / Local Government legislation (e.g. Building regulations). As such, design would be dealt with as part of the application process and any relevant / necessary conditions which would be attached to Planning Permissions. It is therefore considered that Policy H7 is unnecessary and should be deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan. We have no concern over the Design Guidance on page 24 and 25 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan being set out, however, it would need to be made clear that the criterion listed as design guidance is only preference of the local community. It should not be prescriptive to future design / development.</p>
--	---	---

	<p><b>Policy ENV1 – Protection of Local Green Spaces (page 27 of the consultation document)</b></p> <p><b>Policy ENV12 – Rivers and Flooding (page 48 of the consultation document)</b></p>	<p>Our client is the landowner of the following fields identified in draft Policy ENV1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘The Paddock’ (Home Close) (05)</li> <li>• Paddock opposite old Post Office (10)</li> <li>• Gilbert’s Close (paddock behind Swedish houses) (11)</li> </ul> <p>Current local policy on ‘Open Space’ identifies Site 5 as important open land. We acknowledge that Site 5 has already therefore been subject to a similar land designation and therefore have no objection to this being carried through in to the Neighbourhood Plan. We do, however, contest the proposed allocation of Sites 10 and 11 as Local Green Spaces. As such, we request that these sites are not allocated as Local Green Space in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Finally, Policy ENV12 is also considered overly onerous. Validation requirements for planning application, setting out the accompanying documents required to support a planning application for determination, are set by Local and National Government. This includes assessments relating to potential Flood Risk of development sites etc. As this is covered by National and Local policy, and validations requirements are already identified, it is proposed that Policy ENV12 can be deleted.</p>
<p><b>Sport England Sport Park, 3 Oakwood Drive, Loughborough, Leicester, LE11 3QF</b></p>		<p><b>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above Neighbourhood Consultation.</b></p> <p><b>Planning Policy in the National Planning Policy Framework identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process and providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type and in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities provision is important.</b></p> <p><b>It is important therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74 to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields (see link below), as set out in our national guide, ‘A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England – Planning Policy Statement’.</b></p> <p><b><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/</a></b></p> <p><b>Sport England provides guidance on developing policy for sport and further information can be found</b></p>

	<p>following the link below:  <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</a></p> <p>Sport England works with Local Authorities to ensure Local Plan policy is underpinned by robust and up to date assessments and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports delivery. If local authorities have prepared a Playing Pitch Strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports strategy it will be important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the recommendations set out in that document and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support the delivery of those recommendations.  <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/</a></p> <p>If new sports facilities are being proposed Sport England recommend you ensure such facilities are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.  <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p>
<p>Gladman  Developments Ltd  Gladman House  Alexandria Way  Congleton  Business Park  Cheshire  CW12 1LB</p>	<p>This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the submission version of the Hungarton Neighbourhood Plan (HNP). Gladman requests to be added to the Council's consultation database and to be kept informed on the progress of the emerging neighbourhood plan. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and relationship with national and local planning policy. In this regard the response will focus on Policy ENV1: Protection of Local Green Spaces of the HNP.</p> <p>Policy ENV1 seeks to designate 6 parcels of land as Local Green Space (LGS). In order to designate land as LGS the Parish Council must ensure that it is able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet the national policy requirements set out in the Framework. The Framework makes clear at paragraph 76 that the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development for the wider area. Paragraph 76 states that:</p> <p>'Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.'</p> <p>Further guidance is provided at paragraph 77 which sets out three tests that must be met for the designation of LGS and states that:</p> <p>'The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation</p>

	<p><b>should only be used:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where the green space is reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</li> <li>• Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</li> <li>• Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.'</li> </ul> <p>The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the advice and guidance contained in the PPG. Gladman notes paragraph 007 of the PPG which states:</p> <p>'Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used to in a way that undermines the aim of plan making.'</p> <p>Of further note is paragraph 015 of the PPG(ID37-015) which states:</p> <p>'Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently, blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name.'</p> <p>Designation of LGS should not be used as a backdoor approach to designate new areas of Green Belt without sufficient evidence, as the designation of Green Belt is inherently different and must meet a set of stringent tests for its allocation (paragraphs 82 to 85 of the Framework). The issue of whether LGS meets the criteria for designation has also been explored in a number of Examiner's Reports across the country and highlight the following decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report identifies that both sites proposed as LGS in the neighbourhood plan 'in relation to the overall size of Alrewas Village' to be an extensive tract of land. The Examiner in this instance recommended the deletion of the proposed LGSs which measured approximately 2.4ha and 3.7ha.</li> <li>- The Blackwell Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report recommended the deletion of two LGS designations measuring approximately 19ha and 32ha respectively and found both designations did not have regard to national policy which states that LGS should only be used where the area concerned 'is not an extensive tract of land.'</li> </ul>
--	---



		<p>- The Sedlescombe Neighbourhood Plan Examiners report recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately 4.5ha as it was found to be an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>- The Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately 5ha and also found this area not to be local in character. Thereby failing to meet 2 of the 3 tests for LGS designation.</p> <p>The Parish Council have produced an Environmental Inventory as evidence to support the current designations of LGS in the plan however Gladman contends that this does not fully demonstrate how each parcel meets each of the three tests for LGS and therefore is not sufficiently robust to support the inclusion of LGS designations. The analysis of each parcel of land has been over complicated to score each parcel of land out of four, on nine different criteria, where sites scoring 25/36 or more (70%) are considered appropriate. This analysis fails to consider whether each site is an extensive tract of land therefore meaning the methodology is incorrect. Indeed, relative to the size of Hungarton some of the parcels included may be considered extensive tracts of land. Further, Gladman questions why 25/36 or more (70%) is considered an appropriate threshold; land should only be designated for LGS where each of the three tests are demonstrably met.</p> <p>Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Gladman is concerned that the inclusion of the LGS designations is done so without sufficient robust evidence and suggests the policy should be removed from the plan. Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.</p>
<p>Thurnby and Bushby Parish Council c/o Sue Bloy (Clerk) 17 Shetland Way Countesthorpe Leics, LE8 5PU</p>	<p>Entire Plan</p>	<p>At the meeting of the Parish Council held on Monday 9 January 2017, it was agreed to support the plan but that the PC had no comments to make.</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council Mrs Nik Green County Hall Glenfield LE3 8RA</p>		<p>Leicestershire County Council is supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process. Due to the current resources available, we are only able to provide general comments at this stage:-</p> <p>Highways General Comments The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth.</p>

	<p>Like very many local authorities, the County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding.</p> <p>To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems.</p> <p>Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provide as a commuted sum.</p> <p>With regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p> <p>The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk Management</b> The County Council are fully aware of flooding that has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding, review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a statutory consultee on major planning</p>
--	--

	<p>applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure that the onsite drainage systems are designed in accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage solution.</p> <p>The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation.</li> <li>• Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development.</li> <li>• Require development to resolve existing flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)).</li> <li>• Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map).</li> <li>• Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding.</li> <li>• How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff.</li> <li>• Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>All development will be required to restrict the discharge and retain surface water on site in line with current government policies. This should be undertaken through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites when considering the housing density to ensure that the potential site will not limit the ability for good SuDS design to be carried out. Consideration should also be given to blue green corridors and how they could be used to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, including benefits to surrounding areas.</p> <p>Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path, and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.</p> <p>LCC in our role as LLFA will object to anything contrary to LCC policies.</p> <p>For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning Practice</p>
--	--

	<p><b>Guidance webpage.</b></p> <p><b>Planning</b>  <b>Developer Contributions</b>  If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Draft North Kilworth NP and the draft Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances of your community. This would in general be consistent with the relevant District Council's local plan or its policy on planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of new development and enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations, where applicable.  <a href="http://www.northkilworth.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/nk-draft-low-resolution-1.pdf">www.northkilworth.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/nk-draft-low-resolution-1.pdf</a>  <a href="http://www.greatglen.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/uploads/175670305aeaf48650823074.pdf">www.greatglen.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/uploads/175670305aeaf48650823074.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Mineral &amp; Waste Planning</b>  The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development.</p> <p>Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood.</p> <p>You should also be aware of Mineral Consultation Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals Local Plan and Mineral and Waste Safeguarding proposed in the new Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Plan. These proposed safeguarding areas and existing Mineral Consultation Areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect mineral resources or waste operations. The County Council can provide guidance on this if your neighbourhood plan is allocating development in these areas or if any proposed neighbourhood plan policies may impact on minerals and waste provision.</p> <p><b>Education</b>  Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two mile (primary) and three mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places.</p> <p>It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school. However, in the changing educational</p>
--	---

	<p>landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.</p> <p><b>Property</b>  <b>Strategic Property Services</b>  No comment at this time.</p> <p><b>Adult Social Care</b>  Suggest reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and look for developments to include bungalows etc of differing tenures. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.</p> <p><b>Environment</b>  No comment at this time.</p> <p><b>Communities</b>  Consideration of community facilities in the draft Plan would be welcomed. We would suggest where possible to include a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. Consideration could also be given to policies that seek to protect and retain these existing facilities more generally, support the independent development of new facilities and relate to the protection of Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations.</p> <p>The identification of potential community projects that could be progressed would be a positive initiative.</p> <p><b>Economic Development</b>  We would recommend including economic development aspirations with your Plan, outlining what the community currently values and whether they are open to new development of small businesses etc.</p> <p><b>Superfast Broadband</b>  High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a superfast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable, but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life.</p> <p>All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to superfast broadband (of at least 30Mbps) Developers should take active steps to incorporate superfast broadband at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure superfast broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete.</p>
--	--

<p>National Grid. Robert Deanwood Consultant Town Planner Amec Foster Wheeler E&amp;I UK Gables House Kenilworth Road Leamington Spa Warwickshire CV32 6JX Tel: 01926 439078 <a href="mailto:n.grid@amecfw.com">n.grid@amecfw.com</a></p>		<p><b>Hungarton Neighbourhood Plan Consultation SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID</b></p> <p>National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p><b><u>About National Grid</u></b></p> <p>National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customer. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.</p> <p><b><u>Specific Comments</u></b></p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified the following high pressure Gas Distribution pipeline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1205 Stretton Lane To Potter Hill – HP Pipeline</li> </ul> <p>From the consultation information provided, the above gas distribution pipeline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.</p> <p><b>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure</b></p> <p>Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites.</p>