

## HARBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

### MEDBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN DECISION STATEMENT

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an Independent Examination, Harborough District Council now confirms that the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2018
- 1.2 This decision statement can be viewed at:

#### **Harborough District Council Offices**

The Symington Building,  
Adam & Eve Street,  
Market Harborough  
Leicestershire  
LE16 7AG  
Open - Mon/Tues/Thu/Fri: 8.45am - 5pm. Wed: 9.30am - 5pm

#### **Market Harborough Library**

Leicestershire County Council  
The Symington Building  
Adam and Eve Street  
Market Harborough  
LE16 7LT

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

**Medbourne Shop and Post Office, 3 Hallaton Road, Medbourne LE16 8DR**  
**Medbourne Sports Club, 3 Spring Bank, Medbourne LE16 8EB**

#### 2. Background

- 2.1 In February 2015 Medbourne Parish Council, as the qualifying body, applied for Medbourne Parish to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area for the purpose of preparing a neighbourhood plan. The Neighbourhood Area application was approved by Harborough District Council (the Council) on 16<sup>th</sup> April 2015 in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012)
- 2.2 Following the submission of the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan to the Council, the Plan was publicised and representations were invited. The consultation period closed on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2018.
- 2.3 The Council, with the agreement of Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan Group, appointed an independent examiner, Mr Christopher Collison, to review whether the Plan met the Basic Conditions required by legislation and should proceed to referendum.

2.4 The Examiner's Report concludes that, subject to making the modifications proposed by the Examiner, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

### **3. Decision and Reasons**

3.1 At its meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2018 the Councils Executive agreed that all the Examiner's recommended modifications should be accepted as presented to the Executive Committee in the Examiners report, and that the amended Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a referendum (see Council resolution at Appendix 1).

3.2 The District Council has made the modifications proposed by the examiner, to secure that the draft plan meets the basic conditions. Appendix 2 sets out these modifications and the action to be taken in respect of each of them.

3.3 The Council agrees with the Examiner's recommendation that there is no reason to extend the Neighbourhood Plan area (Medbourne Parish) for the purpose of holding the referendum.

3.4 The Examiner has concluded that with the specified modifications the Plan meets the basic conditions and other relevant legal requirements. The Council concurs with this view the Plan complies with the provision made by or under sections 38A and 38B of the 2004 Act. Therefore to meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 a referendum which poses the question

**'Do you want Harborough District Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Medbourne to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?'**

will be held in the Parish of Medbourne.

3.5 The date on which the referendum will take place is agreed as **28 June 2018**

**Appendix 1: Council/Executive Resolution in respect of Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan 14<sup>th</sup> May 2018**

*MEDBOURNE Neighbourhood Plan Proposal Decision*

**RESOLVED that:**

- i) the Independent Examiner's recommended changes to the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan are accepted as set out in the schedule at Appendix A to the report, and the recommendation that the amended Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a referendum of voters within the Parish of Medbourne to establish whether the Plan should form part of the Development Plan for the Harborough District be noted.**
- ii) the holding of a referendum relating to the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan on the 28<sup>th</sup> June 2018 that will include all of the registered electors in the Medbourne Parish be approved.**

## Appendix 2: Schedule of Modifications Recommended in the Examiner's Report

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
1	H1	<b>Residential Site Allocations</b>	<p>Site 1. Station House Livery Yard – Buildings only Development will be supported subject to the following criteria:</p> <p>a) The development will provide for about 12 dwellings;</p> <p>c) A footpath, in keeping with the rural nature of the setting, is to be provided from the site entrance to Station House and around the perimeter to the new development providing safe pedestrian access from the site to the village amenities. This footpath should continue as a permissible footpath to Leviathan Wood;</p> <p>Site 4. Hallaton Road site. Development will be supported subject to the following criteria:</p> <p>a) The development will provide for about 12 dwellings;</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 1: In Policy H1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in Site 1 and Site 4 delete “about” and insert “a minimum of”</li> <li>• delete “This footpath should continue” and insert “The proposal must, subject to viability assessment, include a contribution to achieve the continuation of this footpath”</li> <li>• throughout the policy delete “houses” and insert “dwellings”</li> </ul>	To ensure conformity with the Basic Conditions
2	H2	<b>The Limits to Development</b>	<p>POLICY H2 – The Limits to Development - Development proposals in the Plan area will be supported within the Limits to Development as identified in Figure 3. Land outside the defined Limits to Development will be treated as open countryside, where development will be carefully controlled in line with local and national strategic planning policies.</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 2: In Policy H2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• delete “in line with local and national strategic planning policies”</li> <li>• delete “can include” and insert “includes”</li> <li>• delete “(in principle)”</li> <li>• after diversification insert “and other land-based rural businesses”</li> </ul>	Clarity and to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>Appropriate development in the countryside can include:</p> <p>a) For the purposes of agriculture – including (in principle) farm diversification;</p> <p>b) For the provision of affordable housing through a rural exception site, where local need has been identified;</p> <p>c) For the provision of a formal recreation or sport use;</p> <p>d) Development suitable to a countryside location.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• after “sport use” continue “or for rural tourism that respects the character of the countryside”</li> <li>• delete d)</li> <li>• add a final paragraph “New isolated homes in the countryside will not be supported except in the special circumstances described in paragraph 55 of the Framework.”</li> </ul>	
3	H3	Housing mix	<p><b>POLICY H3: HOUSING MIX</b> - New housing development proposals should provide a mixture of housing types specifically to meet the identified local needs in Medbourne.</p> <p>Applications for small family homes (2 or 3 bedrooms) or for older people (ground floor accommodation meeting accessible requirements in Building Regulations M2) will be supported where in accordance with other policies. Larger homes (4 or more bedrooms) can feature in the mix of housing but will be expected to provide a minority on any single site.</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 3:</b></p> <p><b>In Policy H3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• after “meet the” insert “latest assessment of”</li> <li>• after “bedrooms) or” insert “homes suitable” and delete “(ground floor accommodation meeting accessible requirements in Building Regulations M2)”</li> <li>• delete “where in accordance with other policies”</li> </ul>	Precision and to ensure the policy is practical for decision making purposes
4	H4	Windfall Development	<p><b>POLICY H4: WINDFALL DEVELOPMENT</b> - Development proposals for infill and redevelopment sites (four dwellings or fewer) will be supported where:</p> <p>a) The site is within the LTD boundary for Medbourne;</p> <p>b) The site retains existing important natural</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 4:</b></p> <p><b>In Policy H4 Delete “(four dwellings or fewer)” and insert “(individual dwellings or small groups of dwellings)”</b></p>	To ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			boundaries such as gardens, trees, hedges and streams; c) The site provides for a safe vehicular and pedestrian access to the site; d) The proposal avoids negative impact on the Conservation area and its setting; e) The site does not reduce garden space to an extent where it adversely impacts on the character of the area, or the amenity of neighbours.		
5	ENV1	Protection of Local Green Space	POLICY ENV 1: PROTECTION OF LOCAL GREEN SPACE – The sites listed below and shown on the accompanying plans (map Figure 5, detailed in the supporting information, Appendix 9), are designated as Local Green Space, where new development is ruled out other than in very special circumstances. a) ‘The Towpath’, south end greens and verges (inventory map reference 116a) b) Village Hall grounds (116b) c) Leviathan Wood (Medbourne part) (091)	<b>Recommended modification 5: In Policy ENV1 identify each Local Green Space on a map at a sufficient scale to identify the boundaries precisely</b>	
6	ENV2	Protection of Other Sites and Features of Environmental Significance	POLICY ENV 2: PROTECTION OF OTHER SITES AND FEATURES OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE – 11 further sites (Appendix 7 environmental inventory, and Figure 6 below) have been identified as being of at least local significance for biodiversity (species and habitats) and/or history. They are important in their own right and are locally valued.	<b>Recommended modification 6: Replace Policy ENV2 with “To be supported development proposals that affect the following sites: (list the sites with the map reference and identify the feature/s that explain their inclusion, for example, biodiversity) must: • in the case of heritage assets, demonstrate how they balance any</b>	To ensure precision and clarity

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			Development proposals that affect them will be expected to protect or enhance the identified features and be accompanied by an environmental survey whose recommendations are implemented.	<p><b>harm or loss with the significance of the feature/s, and the benefits of the proposal;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>• in the case of biodiversity assets, demonstrate how avoidance of harm, or mitigation, or compensation have been considered.”</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Identify each site on a map at a sufficient scale to identify the boundaries precisely.</b></p>	
7	ENV3	Other Important Open Spaces	<p>POLICY ENV 3: OTHER IMPORTANT OPEN SPACES – The protection and enhancement of the identified significant features of sites shown below, mapped in figure 7 above and detailed in the Environmental Inventory, Appendix 7, will be supported.</p> <p><b>Natural and semi-natural greenspaces:</b> The Hollow (098) Walk to The Hollow (099a)</p> <p><b>Amenity Greenspace</b> Springbank (156) (recommended as Local Green Space LGS/MED/8 by HDC 2015)</p> <p><b>Outdoor sports facilities:</b> Sports ground, tennis courts etc. (099) Bowling green (118)</p> <p><b>Provision for children and young people:</b> Play Area (100)</p> <p><b>Cemeteries and other burial grounds:</b> St Giles Churchyard (152)</p> <p><b>Green corridors or greenways:</b> East end of Rectory Lane (101)</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 7:</b> <b>Replace Policy ENV3 with “Development proposals that would lead to loss of, or harm to, the following important open spaces will not be supported except where sports or recreation facilities are being replaced by equivalent or better provision in a no less convenient location for users. Proposals to enhance the amenity of the open spaces will be supported: (list the important open spaces)”</b></p>	To ensure clarity

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
8	ENV4	Biodiversity and Wildlife Corridors	<p>POLICY ENV 4: BIODIVERSITY AND WILDLIFE CORRIDORS - Development proposals will be expected to safeguard locally significant habitats and species and, where possible, to create new habitats for wildlife</p> <p>Development proposals should not damage or adversely affect the wildlife corridors identified on the map, Figure 8.</p> <p>Permitted development in the Plan Area will be expected to protect and enhance wildlife corridors and other potential habitat links. It should not create barriers to the permeability of the landscape for wildlife in general, or fragment populations of species of conservation concern.</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 8:</b>  <b>Replace Policy ENV4 with “To be supported development proposals must safeguard locally significant habitats and species and demonstrate they take opportunities to create new habitats for wildlife. Proposals must demonstrate they will not harm the integrity and effectiveness of the wildlife corridors identified on Figure 8 and must not create barriers to the permeability of the landscape for wildlife in general, nor fragment populations of species of conservation concern.”</b></p>	
9	ENV5	Built Environment: Non-Designated Heritage Assets	<p>POLICY ENV 5: BUILT ENVIRONMENT: NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS – Development proposals that affect an identified non-designated building or structure of local historical or architectural interest or its setting will be expected to conserve or enhance the character, integrity and setting of that building or structure. The buildings of local interest currently identified are listed in the supporting information and are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mission Hall, Main Street</li> <li>2. Chapel School House, Main Street</li> <li>3. Reading Room, Main Street</li> <li>4. Cobblers Cottage, Old Green</li> </ol>	<p><b>Recommended modification 9:</b>  <b>In Policy ENV5 delete the second sentence with list of buildings and transfer those to a Community Action which states “The following buildings are identified as potential Non-Designated Heritage Assets”. The supporting text will require adjustment and the process for formal recognition by the District Council should be explained.</b></p>	<p>It is not appropriate to imply those assets identified will be recognised by the District Council as heritage assets. The status of the locally identified heritage assets should be clarified and the process to achieving their formal recognition should be</p>



Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			5. Brook Terrace, Drayton Road 6. Burnside, no. 8 Brook Terrace, Drayton Road 7. Village Stores and Post Office, 3 Springbank 8. Springbank 9. Old Forge Cottage, Main Street 10. Old Co-Op, 35 Main Street 11. Old Fernie Hunt Kennels, Manor Road 12. Row of 5 Cottages nos. 22- 30 Manor Road 13. Spring Cottage, No 18 and Nevill Cottage No 20 Manor Road 14. Old Fernie Hunt Stables, Ashley Road 15. Irish Bridge (Ford), Hallaton Road 16. Millennium plinth (towpath) 17. Mill Mound, Slawston Road 18. The Cottage, Rectory Lane 19. Plaque on Medieval Pack Horse Bridge, Hallaton Road 20. Brick Wall – Old Rectory, Rectory Lane and Main Street 21. Site of Roman Villa at Saddler’s Cottage, Waterfall Way		explained.
10	ENV6	Ridge and Furrow	<b>POLICY ENV 6: RIDGE AND FURROW</b> – The areas of ridge and furrow earthworks mapped above (Figure 10) are non-designated heritage assets. Any loss or damage arising from a development proposal (or a change of land use requiring planning permission) will need to be balanced against their significance as	<b>Recommended modification 10: Replace Policy ENV6 with “The areas of ridge and furrow earthworks identified on Figure 11 are identified as potential Non-Designated Heritage Assets”. The supporting text will require adjustment and the process for formal recognition by the District Council should be</b>	It is appropriate for a community to use the neighbourhood plan preparation process to identify buildings and structures of local interest and to

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			heritage assets.	<b>explained.</b>	include policies to require particular consideration of assets that have been formally recognised by the District Council in the determination of planning applications. It is not appropriate to imply those assets identified will be recognised by the District Council as heritage assets. The status of the locally identified heritage assets should be clarified and the process to achieving their formal recognition should be explained.
11	ENV7	Protection of Important Views	POLICY ENV 7: PROTECTION OF IMPORTANT VIEWS - Views into and out of the village (Fig. 12) are important to the setting and character of the village. Development will be expected to respect and where possible enhance views and should include the treatment of views in any	<b>Recommended modification 11: In Policy ENV7 replace the second sentence before “and should” with “To be supported development proposals must not significantly harm these views where seen from publicly accessible locations”</b>	clarity

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			design statement.		
12	ENV8	Renewable Energy Generation Infrastructure	<p>POLICY ENV 8: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION INFRASTRUCTURE - Renewable energy generation infrastructure will be supported. Proposals must demonstrate that they will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on:</p> <p>a) the health, wellbeing or amenities of residents and visitors (including, amongst other things, noise, visual impact, reflections, glare, shadow flicker, water pollution, smell, air quality, gaseous or particulate emissions)</p> <p>b) the character of the surrounding landscape and, in particular, views from any valued and accessible viewpoint; biodiversity and designated and non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>And also, that it:</p> <p>a) represents small-scale, local resident, business, amenity or community-initiated, solar and wind generation infrastructure of an appropriate scale for the size, character and level of other facilities, the built environment and services in the village.</p> <p>b) is supported by appropriate and relevant assessments and documentation in respect of, amongst other things, transport, heritage, archaeology, landscape visual impact, environmental impact, flood impact, ecological mitigation, arboriculture (impact and method) and tree reference and</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 12:</b></p> <p><b>In Policy ENV8</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• after “supported” replace “. Proposals must” with “where proposals”</li> <li>• in the first section a) delete “(including amongst other things,” and insert “with respect to” and delete the close of bracket</li> <li>• delete “, in particular, views from any valued and accessible viewpoint;”</li> <li>• delete “and designated and non-designated heritage assets”</li> <li>• in the second section b) delete “amongst other things”</li> </ul>	Clarity and to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			protection.		
13	ENV10	Rivers and Flooding	<p>POLICY ENV 10: RIVERS AND FLOODING – Development proposals of appropriate scale and where relevant will be required to demonstrate that:</p> <p>a) Its location takes geology, flood risk and natural drainage into account, including undertaking a hydrogeology study whose findings must be complied with in respect of design, groundworks and construction;</p> <p>b) Its design includes, as appropriate, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), surface water management measures and permeable surfaces; and</p> <p>c) It does not increase the risk of flooding downstream.</p>	<b>Recommended modification 13: Delete Policy ENV10</b>	The policy does not add any level of detail or local approach to that set out in national and strategic policy. The terms “of appropriate scale”, “where relevant” and “as appropriate” are imprecise such that the policy fails to provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency as required by paragraph 17 of the Framework.
14	CF1	Retention of Community Facilities and Amenities	<p>POLICY CF1: RETENTION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND AMENITIES</p> <p>- Development leading to the loss of an existing community facility or amenity listed</p>	<b>Recommended modification 14: In Policy CF1 delete “an existing community facility or amenity listed above” and insert “any of the following community facilities or amenities:</b>	This list of facilities and amenities to which the policy applies should be included in the

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			above will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that any of the below apply: a) There is no longer any need or demand for the existing community facility or amenity; b) The existing community facility or amenity is no longer economically viable; c) The proposal makes alternative provision for the relocation of the existing community facility to an equally or more appropriate and accessible location within the Parish which complies with the other general policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.	<b>village stores and post office; Medbourne village hall; the Nevill Arms; St Giles Church and Burial Ground; Recreation Activity facilities; and The Hollow”</b>	policy wording. To ensure that the policy provides a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency as required by paragraph 17 of the Framework.
15	CF3	Pedestrian Pavements and Footpaths	POLICY CF3: PEDESTRIAN PAVEMENTS & FOOTPATHS – Developments that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, the existing network of pedestrian pavements, footpaths and bridleways will not be supported. The maintenance, upgrading and extension of the pedestrian footpath network in the Parish will be supported including the specific planning improvements set out above.	<b>Recommended modification 15: In Policy CF3</b> • delete “in the Parish” • delete “including specific planning improvements set out above” and insert a list of the schemes concerned • delete “the existing network of pedestrian pavements” and insert “footways”	precision
16	TR1	Transport, Roads and Parking	POLICY TR1: TRANSPORT, ROADS AND PARKING - With particular regard to the rural highway network of the Parish and the need to minimise any increase in vehicular traffic, development, where appropriate, should:	<b>Recommended modification 16: Replace Policy TR1 with “Proposals for improvement of the active travel network, or for a car park convenient for village centre users, will be supported. Proposals that reduce</b>	Precision and to ensure that the policy provides a practical framework within which decisions on

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>a) Be designed to minimise additional traffic generation and movement;</p> <p>b) Provide for the improvement of and, where appropriate, the creation of pedestrian footpaths and cycle-ways to connect the development to village facilities in line with Policy CF3;</p> <p>c) Incorporate sufficient off-road parking; and</p> <p>d) Not remove or compromise the use of any existing off-road parking areas.</p> <p>The provision of a car park within walking distance of the village centre will be supported.</p>	<p><b>availability of off-road vehicle parking facilities or which generate additional on-road vehicle parking will not be supported.”</b></p>	<p>planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency as required by paragraph 17 of the Framework. Reference to another policy is unnecessary</p>
17	E1	Support for Existing Employment Opportunities	<p><b>POLICY E1: SUPPORT FOR EXISTING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES –</b></p> <p>Where planning permission is required there will be a presumption against the loss of commercial premises or land (B-class) which provides employment or future potential employment opportunities. Applications for a change of use to an activity that does not provide employment opportunities will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a) The commercial premises or land in question has not been in active use for at least 12months;</p> <p>b) The commercial premises or land in question has no potential for either reoccupation or redevelopment for employment-generating uses and as</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 17:</b></p> <p><b>In Policy E1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>replace the text before the colon with “Development proposals that will result in the loss of employment land or premises will only be supported where”</b></li> <li>• <b>after “12 months;” insert “and”</b></li> </ul>	<p>The term “presumption against” does not provide a basis for the determination of planning applications. The policy uses the term “permitted”. It is not appropriate for a policy to indicate that proposals will be permitted or not permitted as all planning applications</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			demonstrated through the results both of a full valuation report and a marketing campaign lasting for a continuous period of at least six months.		
18	E2	Support for New Employment Opportunities	<p>POLICY E2: SUPPORT FOR NEW EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES – In supporting additional employment opportunities, new development should:</p> <p>a) Fall within the boundary of planned limits of development for the village of Medbourne unless it relates to small scale leisure or tourism activities, or other forms of commercial/employment-related development appropriate to a countryside location;</p> <p>b) Where possible be sited in existing buildings or on areas of previously developed land. Live/work units are supported;</p> <p>c) Be of a size and scale not adversely affecting the character, infrastructure and environment of the village itself and the neighbourhood plan area, including the countryside;</p> <p>d) Not involve the loss of residential dwellings;</p> <p>e) Not increase noise levels or light pollution or introduce any pollution to an extent that they would unacceptably disturb occupants of nearby residential property;</p> <p>f) Not result in unacceptable levels of traffic movements that generate increased levels</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 18: Replace Policy E2 with “To be supported new employment development proposals (including live/work units) must:</b></p> <p><b>a) Be located within the limits to development identified in Figure 3, unless it relates to development and diversification of agricultural and other land based rural businesses or sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside;</b></p> <p><b>b) Not adversely affect residential amenity or the character of the surrounding area; and</b></p> <p><b>c) Not result in on-street parking of vehicles.”</b></p>	<p>The terms “in supporting” and “should” do not provide a basis for the determination of planning applications. The term “where possible” is imprecise. The restriction on loss of residential dwellings and the requirement to be sited in existing buildings or on areas of previously developed land is not adequately explained. The terms “unacceptably disturb”; “unacceptable levels”; “harmful disturbance”; “not adversely affecting the character,</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			<p>of noise, fumes, smell or other harmful disturbance to residential properties including the need for additional parking which cannot be catered for within the curtilage of the property;</p> <p>g) Contribute to the character and vitality of the local area;</p> <p>h) Be well integrated into and complement existing businesses.</p>		<p>infrastructure and environment of the village itself”; “contribute to the character and vitality of the local area” and “be well integrated into and complement existing businesses” are imprecise.</p>
19	E3	Re-use of Agricultural and Commercial Buildings	<p>POLICY E3: Re-use of Agricultural and Commercial Buildings - The re-use, conversion and adaptation of farm buildings for small businesses, recreation, or tourism purposes will be supported where:</p> <p>a. The use proposed is appropriate to the rural location and will not have an adverse impact on any archaeological, architectural, historic or environmental features;</p> <p>b. The conversion/adaptation works respect the local character of the surrounding area;</p> <p>c. The building is structurally sound and capable of conversion without substantial reconstruction;</p> <p>d. The development will not have an adverse impact on any archaeological, architectural, historic or environmental features;</p> <p>e. The local road system is capable of accommodating the traffic generated by the</p>	<p><b>Recommended modification 19: In Policy E3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• delete conditions a), d), e) and f) and insert an additional condition “the proposal will not result in on-street car parking”</li> <li>• in b) delete “respect” and insert “do not adversely affect”</li> </ul>	<p>The term “appropriate to the rural location” is imprecise. The requirements of condition b) and d) do not have sufficient regard for national policy with respect to the balanced approach to harm to heritage assets. The requirement to restrict floorspace increase to 30% is not explained. The Framework states development should only be</p>



Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
			proposed new use and adequate parking can be accommodated within the site; f. The floor space is not increased by more than 30%.		prevented or refused where the cumulative impacts of development are severe.
20	E4	Visitor Economy	<p>POLICY E4: VISITOR ECONOMY - The enhancement of local tourism and the visitor economy will be supported within the Limits of Development. Tourism developments outside the Limits of Development will be supported if in accordance with relevant District and national planning policies. It is a requirement that such developments:</p> <p>a) Are of character and scale appropriate to the Parish and do not have a detrimental effect on the distinct character of residential settlements and the countryside.</p> <p>b) Do not adversely impact utility infrastructure, particularly local road networks, water supply and sewerage;</p> <p>c) Benefits the local community, through for instance, provision of local employment opportunities and improvements to local service provision; and</p> <p>d) Where feasible, the development involves the re-use of existing buildings or is part of farm diversification.</p> <p>The loss of tourism and leisure facilities will not be supported unless they are no longer viable or alternative provision is made available.</p>	<b>Recommended modification 20:</b> <b>In Policy E4 replace the text before “The loss” with “Tourism and visitor economy development proposals will be supported where they do not have adverse residential or visual amenity impacts.”</b>	Requirements a), b), and d) are imprecise and the terms “where feasible” in provision d) and “unless they are no longer viable” in the final provision are also imprecise. The requirement in part d) is confusing and unnecessary given the provisions of Policy E1
21	E5	Communicatio	POLICY E5: COMMUNICATIONS	<b>Recommended modification 21:</b>	The term “where

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
		ns Infrastructure	<p>INFRASTRUCTURE - Proposals to provide increased access to a super-fast broadband service and improve the mobile telecommunication network that will serve businesses and other properties within the parish will be supported.</p> <p>Where possible this should be by underground cable, but where above ground network installations are unavoidable they must be sympathetically located and designed to integrate into the landscape and not be located in or near to open landscapes.</p> <p>All new developments 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><b>In Policy E5 replace the second paragraph with “Proposals for above ground communications cabling will only be supported where it is demonstrated underground installation is not possible and installation will not have a detrimental visual impact on the landscape.”</b></p>	<p>possible” does not provide a basis for decision making on development proposals and the term “sympathetically located” is imprecise.</p>
22		Minor Corrections to the Neighbourhood Plan		<p><b>Recommended modification 22: Modification of general text will be necessary to achieve consistency with the modified policies, and to correct identified errors including those arising from updates.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In policy CF2 delete “Additional” and insert “additional”.</li> <li>• The dual use of the reference letters “U” and “V” in Appendix 7 should be</li> </ul>	<p>A number of consequential modifications to the general text, and in particular the justification of policies sections, of the Neighbourhood Plan will be necessary as a result of</p>

Modification No.	Policy No.	Policy Title	Submission Draft Policy Text	Suggested Revised Policy Text	Reason
				corrected.	recommended modifications relating to policies. The Examiner is able to recommend modification of the Neighbourhood Plan in order to correct errors. The Examiner recommends the minor change only in so far as it is to correct an error or where it is necessary so that the Neighbourhood Plan provides a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability