

SWINFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SUBMISSINON

NPAC RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S COMMENTS JANUARY 2018

NP ITEM	EXAMINER'S COMMENT	NPAC RESPONSE/ACTION
PAGE 23 Policy S1 Limits to Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to evidence support of Policy S1 without a prior understanding of Policies H2 & H3 Suggestion that policies should be brought together 	<p>We agree with the comments made by the Examiner.</p> <p>We propose moving the position of Policy S1 in the Plan and placing it after Policy H4 in the Housing Policy section of the Plan.</p>
PAGE 27 Policy H1 Building Design Principles (Query 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examiner is unclear why this Policy is restricted to residential developments Only the last bullet point need apply exclusively to housing 	<p>Policy H1 is a Housing Policy, as such, the content of the Policy has been written in relation to residential development.</p>
PAGE 27 Policy H1 Building Design Principles (Query 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy reads more as a checklist than a set of principles Core of the Policy seems to be that "proposals should clearly show how [their] general character, scale, mass, density and layout...[fit in with} the surrounding area [street scene, Conservation Area (where appropriate) and wider landscape]" 	<p>It appears that the Examiner is looking to replace the bullet point list with this general statement. In terms of being prescriptive, the justification comes from the NPPF. We consider that the Policy is fit for purpose in general terms and will contribute towards the delivery of high-quality and distinctive development in the Plan area. One of the 12 core planning principles in the NPPF (paragraph 17) is '(always seek) to secure high-quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings'. The approach adopted in the Policy has regard to the more detailed design elements of the NPPF. In particular, it plans positively for high-quality and inclusive design (paragraph 57), it has developed a robust and comprehensive policy (paragraph 59) and does so in a locally distinctive yet non-prescriptive way (paragraph 60). We note that if Policy H1 is amended it will impact on Policy ENV9.</p>
PAGE 35 Policy H3 Housing / Land Allocations (Query 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area 1 enlarges between Map 1 and Map 3 Research suggests it is not the SHLAA Site but the southerly extension that has planning permission for 9 dwellings Because there are no site outlines attached the Site Sustainability Analysis it is unclear 	<p>Map 3 shows the original SHLAA sites. Map 4 shows the revised SHLAA sites. The Berries development is referred to Area 1 on both maps, Map 3 showing the original SHLAA designation and Map 4 showing the extended SHLAA designation. The Site Sustainability Analysis was undertaken on the whole area (original site and extension). We could amend Map 4 to outline the original SHLAA site as Area 1a and the extension as Area</p>

	<p>whether the whole site or only part of the site was included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was part or all of Area 1 excluded from consideration in August 2016? 	<p>1b. We also note that the map titles for Map 3 and Map 4 need to be moved to be directly above the maps in the Plan.</p>
<p>PAGE 35 Policy H3 Housing / Land Allocations (Query 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the foot of page 34 it is asserted that the selected sites “are considered deliverable [and] achievable” Has there been some confirmation by the site owners that their sites are indeed “deliverable” within the terms now set out in the Plan? 	<p>Those owners of sites not designated in the original SHLAA Sites indicated to NPAC engagement/deliverability of the sites by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement of their personal consultant/land agent to define sites Volunteering their sites Their communication with Harborough District Council in their Regulation 16 Consultation comments <p>The reason given for the non-inclusion of the sites in the early SHLAA process was ‘bad feeling within the village over windfarm development’.</p>
<p>PAGE 35 Policy H3 Housing / Land Allocations (Query 3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy notes that developments should “maintain a similar density to adjacent existing dwellings” Two of the sites do not have obvious neighbouring comparators If the Plan’s encouragement for the provision of smaller dwellings is to be taken seriously, then adjacent comparators may be unhelpful if they are predominantly larger dwellings 	<p>If the Examiner is drawing attention here to the apparent contradiction between reflecting close-by densities and the need for smaller units then this is agreed. The reference to reflecting density levels of nearby dwellings could be lost. This has been discussed at length as the Plan progressed. Is the Examiner able to suggest a form of wording that will satisfy requirements?</p>
<p>PAGE 36 Policy H4 Windfall Sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The restriction within this Policy to sites of “1 to 3 dwellings” is not explained or justified Emerging Local Plan more generous Difficult to see what a relatively arbitrary restraint on the number of dwellings per site might achieve 	<p>Policy GD4 in the emerging Local Plan only applies to settlements rated below Selected Rural Villages. We chose the figure of 3 to reflect the size and character of the village and consider the number appropriate alongside the housing allocations provided. The Plan for Great Easton has a windfall allowance of up to 2. We recognise that if the Policy text is retained at “1 to 3 dwellings” the text will need to be enhanced.</p>
<p>PAGE 37 Policy H5 Housing Mix</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-amble to Policy and Policy wording differ Examiner requests clarification on the disparity on size of dwellings between the text and the Policy 	<p>We agree the text should match. Amend the preamble text and the Policy text to: ‘one, two and three-bedroom units and bungalows’.</p>

PAGE 38 Policy H6 Affordable Housing and Homes for Local People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text on pages 37 and 38 seems confused The term “affordable” is not shorthand for “rented”, it can be applied to both rented and owned dwellings 	We agree with the comments made by the Examiner. The purpose of the Policy is to reflect and reinforce Harborough District Council Policy. The wording of the Policy needs further clarification.
PAGE 39 Policy H7 Developer Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy states a commitment from the Parish Council about a financial matter Should be shown as a Community Action 	We agree with the comments made by the Examiner. Policy H7 should be converted into a Community Action.
PAGE 40 Policy ENV1 Local Green Spaces (Query1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPPF criteria for the designation of Local Green Spaces (LGS) Consideration of whether a space is “local in character and not an extensive tract of land” is omitted 	The Environmental Inventory has been devised to specifically determine the most locally important open spaces. It then highlights significant features of other land not proposed for designation as LGSs. The issue of ‘large tract of land’ is not something that was given a score (it is a potential red flag if too large) therefore all sites in the inventory were judged to be within the threshold (i.e. ‘bounded’ rather than large open tracts).
PAGE 40 Policy ENV1 Local Green Spaces (Query 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplication of protections (Stanford Estate Avenue, Quicks/Holmfield and the Parish Cemetery Supporting document on LGS does not include NPPF designation criteria 	The Local Green Space supporting document has been revised. The Parish Cemetery and the Stanford Estate Avenue have been removed because they do have other means of protection (for detail see inventory). The NPPF criteria have been referred to explicitly for each site to show how each site on the revised document meet those criteria. The NP will require revision to remove the two sites from the main text.
PAGE 46 Map 7 Sites Identified by Villagers as Valued and with Local Significance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doubtful that Map 7 has a place in a statutory planning document that might be effective to 2031 	Map 7 is the ‘Dots Map’ from the initial consultation. We agree that the map should be removed from the Plan and included as part of the evidence base.
PAGE 48 Policies ENV3 to ENV5 Maps 8 & 9 Important Woodland, Trees and Hedges; Biodiversity; Ridge and Furrow Fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paper and PDF versions of the Environmental Inventory do not identify the referenced sites with any colour coding The October 2016 inventory was colour coded for LGS and OS but not for Policies ENV3,4 & 5 Reasons for the identification of the particular sites now selected is not obvious 	<p>A non-PDF version of the amended Environmental Inventory will be provided. The Environmental Inventory colour codes have been amended as suggested. ‘Identified features’ refers to the features/criteria used in the inventory (wording could be amended/added).</p> <p>We believe that Policies ENV 3 & 4 should be retained as they refer to specific aspects of environmental significance. However, we agree that there could be a case for merging the three policies (ENV 2, 3, 4).</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can you ascertain where the line has been drawn between “the best” ridge and furrow and the rest? 	Regarding Ridge & Furrow, on visual inspection ‘the best’ are those fields where the ridge and furrow is most defined and/or where there are accessory features e.g. associated medieval trackways. Our proposal would be to re-instate a map, included previously, showing ALL Ridge & Furrow fields. The ‘best’ could be shown in brown with ‘the rest’ in greyscale.
PAGE 57 Policy ENV6 Locally Listed Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Listing of buildings not understood 	<p>We agree we have inadvertently named this section as Local Listing whereas we should have referred to them as ‘Local Heritage Assets’. Our intention has been to draw attention to the typical types, designs and groupings and to make the point that ‘this is how we see our village’, and that these are buildings, typical of those that parishioners said they wish to see reflected in any future developments in the parish. The list is not intended to add any new protections to these houses, most of which are already protected by virtue of their locations within the Conservation Area or are already Listed under National Planning Regulations.</p> <p>It would be possible to produce a map showing the boundaries to these groups of buildings if the Examiner feels that would add clarity.</p> <p>The NPAC has not wished to formalise these houses and their features into a formal Design Guide for the Parish.</p>
PAGE 59 Policy ENV7 Protection of Important Views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modification of views in the Policy 	The purpose of the Policy is to ensure that any development respects the views highlighted and doesn’t have a significant adverse impact on them. We agree that views 1 and 3 should be removed. View 2 is visible on Map 10 but in addition Map 12 could be revised to make view 2 clearer.
PAGE 60 Policy ENV8 Footpaths and Bridleways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what way do you envisage that statutory protections may be extended by this Policy? 	We are informed that the policy has passed examination in every other NP that our consultants (YourLocale) have been involved in. It highlights the issue and draws attention to it. We recognize that it doesn’t extend to national policy so could be deleted if that is what the Examiner is considering.
PAGE 62 Policy ENV9 Sustainable Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interprets the Policy as aiming to encourage the integration of design features addressing issues of sustainability into new buildings This has been addressed, more appropriately, within (renumbered) Policy H1? 	We agree but only if Policy H1 remains in its current form. In earlier in the comments the Examiner appeared to suggest Policy H1 should be replaced with a single sentence. We believe that Policy ENV9 has more emphasis on an environment context than on a housing context.

PAGE 63 Policy ENV10 Rivers and Flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unreasonable for all development proposals, of whatever scale, to be obliged to carry out the sequential and other tests exclusively within Swinford 	The wording for this policy was recommended by Leicestershire County Council. The Policy can be amended without losing anything should the Examiner require.
PAGE 71 Policy T1 Traffic Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the issues raised in the Policy would seem to have been included under the umbrella provisions of Policy H7 (re-designated) Community Action would seem more appropriate 	The purpose of the Policy is to highlight the issues within the Plan. We agree that this Policy could be converted into a Community Action.
Page 74 Policy E1 Support for Existing Employment Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to gauge the impact of Policy E1 but arguably, employers may be deterred from locating in Swinford because they may not be facilitated to use their sites flexibly Environmental consequences of buildings left empty for at least 12 months Emerging Local Plan, in line with NPPF expectations, provides a positive encouragement to new employment opportunities as is the approach adopted for Policies E2 and E3 	The Policy has been designed to detail the circumstances in which employment sites would be released and therefore it provides more detail than the broad strategic policy in the emerging Local Plan. The emerging Local Plan is not yet adopted and the policy referred to may not be in the final version. Harborough District Council raised no concerns regarding the intent of policies E2 and E3 in the Plan when they undertook their review. We feel that in villages with limited employment opportunities, the existence of employment is of greater significance. We are open to reducing the 12-month period to a 6-month period in response to concerns raised.
Page 75 & 76 Policies E2 & E3 Support for New Employment Opportunities within the Village of Swinford and Re-use of Agricultural and Commercial Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parallel equivalent policies in the Core Strategy / Local Plan Potential for greater clarity if the local policies are briefer and combined or alternatively if the in-village and in-countryside aspects are separated more assiduously 	We are open to suggestions for making amendments as long as the individual Policies are not significantly diluted.
Page 77 Policy E4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Framework of national and local planning policies glossed over in arriving at this Policy; 	Emerging Local Plan Policy IN3 relates primarily to major developments. The purpose of Policy E4 is to seek to ensure that all development of new residential and commercial

Broadband Infrastructure	<p>limits to local discretion are not acknowledged</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since emerging Local Plan Policy IN3 is quite detailed in addressing the identified issues, perhaps Policy E4 would be better expressed as a non-land use Community Action to sustain pressure on the telecoms providers to extend/improve their network 	<p> dwellings have appropriate access and is a policy promoted by Leicestershire County Council in their Regulation 14 Consultation responses. We request that the Policy is retained.</p>
Page 78 Policy E5 Working from Home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitted development rights generally facilitate much home working. • From the way Policy is written the Examiner wonders whether there is experience in Swinford of home working being obstructed by the planning system and in what circumstances a light industrial use of part of a dwelling has been / might be sought • Further clarification requested 	<p>The Policy has been written in response to high and increasing levels of home working and a desire to support this process where planning applications are required (provision of separate access etc) and to set the conditions necessary to protect residential amenity.</p>