

Examiner Enquiry Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan July
2017

07 June 2017

Hi Matthew,

I have started work on the above, and have some initial questions for you and the qualifying body. I have used the clerk at Great Glen as the first point of contact, please advise me if this should alter?

1. There is reference to a Village Design Statement for Great Glen. I can't immediately find this online so can an electronic version be sent to me please. Has this been included as originally written in the neighbourhood plan, or has the text been amended?
2. One of the Reg16 responses refers to two documents from the District Council concerned with Local Green Space, dated 2014 and 2016. I have only found one fairly informal background paper – which does not seem to be dated. Can you please confirm and send whatever the District has prepared on this subject.
3. I have not received any comments from the District at the Reg16 stage – were none made, or is this an oversight?
4. Does the highway authority or the LPA have existing parking standards?

That's all for now, many thanks in advance,

Liz
Examiner
Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan.

LPA response 8/6/2017

Liz

Thank you, Lesley Sanderson (Clerk to the Parish Council) is the point of contact in locally.

I will answer the queries I can in order.

1. Village Design Statement – The Qualifying Body should be able to provide this – Lesley, can you send this document to Liz please?
2. The Local Green Space background paper was completed in autumn 2015 after a call for sites of sites suitable for Local Green Space from parishes in 2012 and 2013. The sites in Great Glen that are proposed to be designated as LGS in the new Local Plan are the post office green and land outside the chemist (LGS/GRTG/1 and LGS/GRTG2). We consider that this does not prevent the Neighbourhood Plan from designating further sites, and we will amend sites in the Local Plan to ensure there is no duplication of designation as LGS. The link to the document is here http://www.harborough.gov.uk/directory_record/1166/local_green_space_background_paper . I am able to send a hard copy if required.
3. There were no additional comments from HDC officers for the 2017 submission for regulation 16. Officers had made extensive comments on draft plans throughout preparation and at regulation 14. I can confirm that all HDC Planning Policy and Development Management Officers were notified of the consultation.
4. The Highway Authority has parking standards in their 6Cs design guide <https://resources.leicestershire.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/the-6cs-design-guide>

Examiner Enquiry Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan July 2017

Hope this helps

Regards

Matthew

8 June 2017

Many thanks Matthew.

Could you also please confirm whether or not Harborough accepts it doesn't have a 5 year land supply currently?

Best wishes

Liz

Examiner

LPA Response 9 June 2017

Liz

I can confirm Harborough does not have a five year housing land supply. The attached is the position as at 30 Nov 2016. There has been an update, but it has not yet been published.

Regards

Matthew

9 June 2017

Hi Matthew,

I see the reference in the Bovis Homes submission to a 2016 document is the Background Paper – I have noted the date of Autumn 2015 on this. They also refer to a 2014 "Green Space Submission Report" 2014 – do you have this, is it a committee report?

Best wishes

Liz

Examiner

LPA Response 9 June 2017

Liz

The 2014 reports were briefing notes to the Executive Advisory Panel. I attach the report from Jan 2014 and July 2014 with appendices.

Please note that the Local Green Space designations were officer recommendations only . I also attach the notes of the meetings.

The sites proposed to be included in the Local Plan for Great Glen are as follows:

Table D.9Local Green Space

Location	Reference	Title
GI4r Great Glen	LGS/GRTG/1	Post Office Green Great Glen

Examiner Enquiry Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan July
2017

GI4s

LGS/GRTG/2

Grassed Area Outside Chemist GG

Regards

Matthew

Attachments

[8a LGS simple report](#)

[8 Local Green Space briefing note Jan 2014](#)

[6 Local Green Space Briefing note June 2014](#)

[Appendix 1 v2 193 pages LGS Assessment and recommendations](#)

[Local Planning 22-07-2014 Notes](#)

[Notes 30 Jan 2014](#)

11 June 2017

Hi Again Matthew,

From the introduction to the GGNP the following suggests that a previous plan was withdrawn after an initial Reg16 consultation by Harborough District Council, and thus this is a re-submission – presumably by mutual agreement. Is this correct?

“This is a re-submission of the Neighbourhood Plan to address consultation responses made during the Regulation 16 consultation and a revised housing target being considered by Harborough District Council in the preparation of the new Local Plan, which is scheduled for Adoption in September 2018”

A brief outline of the circumstances of the plan development would be appreciated – or a link to a document explaining it.

Many thanks

liz

LPA response 12 June 2017

Liz

The withdrawal of the initial Reg. 16 submission (July 2016) by GGPC was by mutual agreement.

The second submission in January 2017 has been determined by the LPA not to require a full SEA. I have attached the screening and determination.

All the statutory bodies have been notified as part of the screening process and reg 16 consultation. You will not that Historic England have acknowledged the removal of the Reserve Site policy in the latest submission and have no further comments to make.

The attached document shows the timeline and the responses to consultation of the statutory consultees.

I trust this will be sufficient, but if any further information is required please let me know

Regards

Examiner Enquiry Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan July
2017

Matthew

Attachments

[Great Glen SEA determination May 2017](#)

Further LPA response 19 June 2017

Liz

You are correct that the Plan was withdrawn by the QB after the first Reg 16 consultation.

Please find attached the final screening report and determination for Great Glen NDP.

The determination of the LPA is that a full SEA is not required.

The Statutory Consultees have been consulted twice (2015 and 2016) on the policies of draft plans, and one comment on the July 2016 version from Historic England suggested that a full SEA may be required because of the Reserve Site that had been added between the first and second screening reports. (Note HE had no objections to the findings of the first screening report in 2015 without the Reserve Site)

As a consequence of this comment the QB withdrew the plan, made some amendments to delete the Reserve Site and resubmitted the Plan.

We have been able to undertake the screening and determination based on the previous responses from the Statutory Consultees, and have now issued this determination to HE, NE and EA.

In addition, Historic England responded to the Regulation 16 consultation in March 2017 stating:

Great Glen Neighbourhood Development Plan

Thank you for consulting us on the Great Glen Neighbourhood Development Plan (re-submission document).

Further to our letter of 4 October 2016, we note the omission of the housing allocations and offer no further comments.

This has been included in the summary of responses for regulation 16.

I hope this is satisfactory and that the text in the report is self explanatory.

If you need any further information please let me know.

Regards

Matthew

Enquiry 19 June 2017

Thanks Matthew,

This has dealt with the issue of SEA. However I cannot find any reference to consideration of whether or not an Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) is required or not in the document. You

Examiner Enquiry Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan July
2017

will be aware that both SEA and HRA relate to EU directives, and thus bear directly on whether or not the basic conditions have been met. Have you had any correspondence with Natural England on the subject of HRA?

Many thanks
Liz
Examiner Great Glen NP

LPA response 19 June 2017

Liz

I believe Page 3 of the determination deals with this. Sean Mahoney from Natural England responded in 2015

Natural England
Sean Mahoney

4/12/2015 *Planning consultation: Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report*

Thank you for your consultation on the above document which was received by Natural England on 20 November 2015.

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.

Natural England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the screening report to determine whether or not the Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan (GGNP) requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

I can confirm that Natural England concurs with the report's conclusion that it is unlikely there will be any significant environmental effects arising from the Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft that were not covered in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Adopted Harborough Core Strategy. As such, the Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan does not require a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). Natural England also agrees that the Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft alone, or in combination with other plans, is unlikely to have an adverse impact on any Natura 2000 sites either alone or in combination and therefore no further assessment work under the Habitats Regulations is required.

I have not had any further correspondence with Natural England on this matter, but I am more than happy to clarify with Natural England if this is not sufficient.

I also attach the detailed assessment of each policy of the Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan policies against:

- Core Strategy,
 - NPPF,
 - potential effects on Historic and/environmental consideration
 - Strategic Environmental Assessment
 - likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites within 50km (Ensors Pool approx. 30km away),
- and
- Conclusion relating to Habitat Regulations (HRA)

I look forward to hearing from you with regard to this.

Regards

Matthew

Attachments

[GGNDP determination – detail](#)

22 June 2017

Thanks Matthew

Your assessment combined with the report of the email from Natural England will be fine. I can see from the magic map that there are no Natura 2000 sites nearby.

28th June 2017

Dear Matthew and Lesley,

I am progressing with the above, but have come to several policies that I feel needs a bit more work to be acceptable. Policy GG13 “Other important Open Space” is at present too broad. Figure 5 includes potential LGS, Public Open Space, some ridge and furrow, sites of local ecological value and potentially sites designated for other reasons at well. This is just not clear enough as a policy, as required by the NPPF. Given the other policies listed and commented on below, does this policy do anything that is not included in policies GG14 – GG17?

As I read the policies, GG14 deals with ridge and furrow and has defined the areas affected in figure 6 and Appendix 11. GG15 deals with Public Open Space, but has not currently designated the sites effected by the policy adequately. A reference to figure 5 will not do, as this figure is showing too many other things, the policy should list the Public Open space affected. Policy GG16 Biodiversity also needs to make it clear where the ‘significant site(s) of (local) biodiversity value’ are, either within the policy or as a specific list in an appendix. Again that clarity will not be obtained from figure 5. I would advise not excluding sites of ecological value that have also been proposed for Local Green Space designation (part or all of a potential designation).

Oadby and Wigston BC have pointed out that site 19 on figure 5 is partly in their area, and your plan for figure 5 also appears to show the whole of site 37 Manor Park Wood although some of it is in the next parish – Burton Overy I believe? Can you confirm this is the case? The plan can only show that part of the site within the neighbourhood plan boundary, but this can be a recommendation in my report, it does not need amending at this point.

In order to get these policies clear and consistent enough for the purposes of meeting the Basic Conditions I will need the following please:

- A list of Public Open Spaces to be protected by policy GG15
- A list of sites of biodiversity value for Policy GG16
- A view on whether policy GG13 still has a role to play in designating land not covered by policies GG14 – GG17?

Examiner Enquiry Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan July
2017

I am happy to allow some time for this work, but will not be delivering a draft report by Friday consequently.

Please let me know how you want to proceed, and how much time you would like to do this work.

Best wishes
Liz
Examiner GGNP

29th June 2017 – from QB

Dear Liz and Matt

Many thanks for your email and we can partly respond to your queries.

We are taking a view still on whether GG13 still has a role to play and will respond as soon as possible on that.

We are also working still on a list of Public Open Spaces as per GG15.

With regard to the Oadby & Wigston BC boundary, it is correct that site 19 is partly in both areas as is site 37 Manor Park Wood, is part of Burton Overy.

I hope that this helps .

Regarding sites of biodiversity GG16- We believed that this was covered in the commentary of GG16 and as drawn in Fig 7 page 75 and also commented on in Policy GG16 and the only piece that is missing is the Community Wildspace which exists within the boundaries of the identified Wild life corridors. We will update this also as soon as possible.

We will further update you as soon as possible.

Kind regards

Lesley

29th June 2017 -

Thanks Lesley,

Please don't feel pressured, within reason I am happy to wait.

Figure 7 shows the proposed wildlife corridors, but does not indicate the sites of local ecological importance. I see from Community Action 2 that it is proposed to develop a list of sites of local biodiversity interest. it would be easier to justify mention of such sites in Policy GG16 if a start had been made at this point. The policy could then refer to updates rather than be referring to something that may never materialise. The sites do not necessarily need to be shown on a plan.

Best wishes
Liz
Examiner GGNP

6th July 2017

Good morning Liz

Please see attached the proposed changes as discussed by email last week.

The maps/plans to support this will take a little longer and we hope that this is in order.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me

Kind regards

Lesley

Attachment text

GG NP post-examination revisions.

POLICY GG13: OTHER IMPORTANT OPEN SPACE

The sites listed (Appendix 9) and mapped (figure 5 below, with a larger map as Appendix 10) have been identified as being of local significance for their environmental features (natural and/or historical). The sites are ecologically important in their own right, their historical features are extant and have visible expression, and they are locally valued.

Development proposals that affect any of these sites will be expected to seek to protect or enhance their identified features.

Change to:

POLICY GG13: OTHER IMPORTANT LOCAL SITES

The sites listed (Appendix 9) and mapped (figure 5 below, with a larger map as Appendix 10) have been identified as being of local significance for their environmental features (natural and/or historical). The sites are ecologically important in their own right, their historical features are extant and have visible expression, and they are locally valued.

Development proposals that affect any of these sites will be expected to seek to protect or enhance their identified features.

Replace Fig 5 with map showing 'other important local sites' only.

POLICY GG15: PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

The Parish Council will actively work with the District Council and other stakeholders to bring the ratio of 'area of public open space to population size' in Great Glen closer to recognised standards. Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, a public open space will not be supported, unless the public open space is replaced by an equivalent or better provision in an equally suitable location or it can be demonstrated to the Parish Council that the public open space or is no longer required by the community. Housing development proposals of five or more dwellings will be required to include adequate green space provision based on current district standards as an integral part of that development. Alternatively, if an existing open space is located within reasonable walking distance, then a commuted sum may be accepted for the enhancement of that area.

Change to:

POLICY GG15: PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, a public open space (OSSR - see list below and map xx) will not be supported, unless the public open space is replaced by an equivalent or better provision in an equally suitable location or it can be demonstrated to the Parish Council that the public open space or is no longer required by the community:

Bridgewater Drive amenity green space x2;

Great Glen Recreation Ground;

Great Glen play area;

St Cuthbert's Church Great Glen x 2;

Cromwell Road play area;

Memorial Green;

St Cuthbert's C of E School playing field.

Housing development proposals of five or more dwellings will be required to include adequate

open space provision based on current district standards as an integral part of that development. Alternatively, if an existing open space is located within reasonable walking distance, then a commuted sum may be accepted for the enhancement of that area.

Introduce Community Action:

Community Action: The Parish Council will actively work with the District Council and other stakeholders to bring the ratio of 'area of public open space to population size' in Great Glen closer to recognised standards.

The Parish Council will also work with Harborough DC to designate:

Stretton Glen public open space;

Stretton Glen play area;

Burton Brook Community WildSpace.

Introduce map of OSSR sites

POLICY GG16: BIODIVERSITY

a) Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or have a substantial adverse effect on, a significant site of biodiversity value will be expected to apply the sequential test of avoid, mitigate and compensate.

b) Development proposals will be required, where feasible and as part of Planning Conditions, to contribute to the protection and enhancement of the biodiversity of the Parish, through for example the incorporation of native plants or the creation of new habitats in the scheme design; and

c) The Plan will designate two wildlife corridors as shown (map below and Appendix 13) (1) through the built-up area along the River Sence; (2) connecting the Stoneygate School grounds with the River Sence at its confluence with Burton Brook. Development proposals which impact on these sites will be resisted.

Change to: Say in text above policy: 'Policy GG16 a) and b) is not site-specific will apply on submission of a planning application'. (The policy does not identify biodiversity sites but requires development proposals to take biodiversity into account)

POLICY GG16: BIODIVERSITY

a) Development proposals will be expected to protect local habitats and species and where possible and viable, to create new habitats for wildlife;

b) The Plan will designate two wildlife corridors as shown (map below and Appendix 13) (1) through the built-up area along the River Sence; (2) connecting the Stoneygate School grounds with the River Sence at its confluence with Burton Brook. Development proposals which impact on these sites will be resisted.

10 July 2017

Dear Matthew and Lesley,

Attached is a draft of my examination report. At this stage I do not intend to alter any of the recommendations, but the report does need proofing and local information and facts checking. Your assistance with this is appreciated; I cannot properly proof the report I am just too familiar with it.

Let me know of any errors you find, and I will correct and issue a final report. Please send me anything by the end of Wednesday, 12th July.

Examiner Enquiry Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan July
2017

A few issues are highlighted yellow for in the text and reproduced below – can you please confirm or alter them:

- Reg 14 consultation ran from ran from the 18th December 2015 until the 29th January 2016?
- The Core Strategy is comprised of policies all of which the LPA considers strategic?
- In 2005 the Village Design Statement for Great Glen was approved for development control purposes by Harborough DC?
- Please confirm the boundary of the designated neighbourhood area for the GGNP is the parish boundary.

Many thanks,

Liz

Examiner GGNP

12th July 2017

Hi Matthew,

Before I formally issue a final report, can you just confirm that the amended sentence from 4.12 of my report correctly identifies the status of the Great Glen VDS at present?

“In 2005 a comprehensive and well-researched Village Design Statement for Great Glen was approved for development control purposes by Harborough DC. Although it was not saved after adoption of the Core Strategy in 2011, a paper to the Executive in December of that year confirmed its status as a material consideration.”

Ms L Beth BA

Response

Yes, correct

LP Intro includes:

1.7.4 In addition, a number of other SPDs and Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes have been adopted by the Council, the majority of which are linked to policies in the previous Local Plan (2001). However, some of the detailed design principles contained within the documents are still relevant and valuable in giving guidance to applicants and in the determination of planning applications. As a result, the Council's Executive resolved on 19 December 2011 that existing guidance, where still relevant, should continue to be used as a material consideration in determining planning applications.

Tess Nelson MRTPI

12th July 2017

Liz

Please find the proof reading issues picked up in the report.

I have left two further comments highlighted in red for your consideration.

One is concerning the designation of Local Green Space in the Local Plan. While we are designating some LGS in the Local Plan we do not intend to designate that already designated in Neighbourhood Plans. The sentence may therefore be redundant.

Examiner Enquiry Great Glen Neighbourhood Plan July
2017

The other is something suggested by our DM colleagues around the more than 1000m2 floor area for consideration of Affordable Housing contributions.

I hope this helps, and we look forward to receiving the final report in due course.

Regards

Matthew

12th July 2017

Thanks for this Matthew.

In my report, where the LGS designations in the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans are concerned (para 4.28), my use of the word 'recommend' here is giving the wrong impression. It is not my role to formally recommend changes to the Local Plan, so I have altered my text to avoid this impression.

I understand where the DM request is coming from, but I agree with you that District Council policy will apply - as indeed Policy GG5 requires. My role being limited to Basic Condition issues only, adding this to the neighbourhood plan policy would be outside my remit in these circumstances.

Many thanks for the assistance you and Lesley have given me during this examination, good luck going forward!

A final version is attached.