

South Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan

Pre-submission consultation responses

No.	Chapter / Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
1			Stuart Patience Anglian Water	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the South Kilworth Draft Neighbourhood Plan consultation. The following comments are submitted on behalf of Anglian Water. It would appear that South Kilworth Parish is located outside of our area of responsibility. (We serve part of Harborough District but not South Kilworth Parish). Therefore we have no comments relating to the content of the Draft Plan.	Noted.	None.
2			Sean Mahoney Natural England	South Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Consultation Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 05/01/2018. 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.	Noted.	None.

				<p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. For clarification of any points in this letter, please contact me on 02080261940. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p>		
3			Edward Marshall Resident	<p>Firstly well done to Bob Morley and his Team for producing such a thorough Document; should be congratulated!</p> <p>Some thoughts:</p> <p>0. H6 The Timbered House is not mentioned under H 6 (but to be fair</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>The Timbered House is a statutorily Listed dwelling, so it is not needed to be identified separately.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

			<p>is mentioned in the Historical section)</p> <p>POLICY H6: BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES OF LOCAL HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL INTEREST - 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:</p> <p>Church Clock/War Memorial</p> <p>Observatory</p> <p>Welford Road Thatched Cottages</p> <p>Village Green</p> <p>0. The Malt Shovel</p> <p>7;5;2 and I support the important open spaces around the Timbered house (In W02)</p> <p>POLICY ENV 1: PROTECTION OF LOCAL GREEN SPACE</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

				<p>1. 6;6 I think a key issue is if we take on more houses without additional facilities we are doing the village no favours! (there is considerable concern to introduce 40 per cent social housing without these extra facilities and transport links; there is no evening or Sunday buses) which is pretty disastrous. Frankly we should be aiming for a housing population that can support these!</p> <p>2. 8;2 (we are lucky to have a School, a church and a Pub) but no village shop as such (or café) (though I suppose the Village hall is a substitute at times)</p> <p>3. 6:4 Limits of Development We seem a bit vague about the borders up to north kilworth and towards walcote (referred to as ribbon development)</p> <p>(these are quite substantial buildings (and presumably there is demand for these type of houses) and it seems strange not to give more thought to the situation.</p> <p>4. 7;6;1 Not a single picture of the windfarm or the very village green with the ugly telegraph pole on it; could not some of the windfarm</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. The level of affordable housing required is set by the District Council. It should be noted that affordable housing can be available for people in low-wage employment who may have their own transport.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Limits to Development have a clearly defined methodology that has been followed in drawing the red-line boundary.</p> <p>This is a matter for the Parish Council, not for the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------

				<p>money go to improving this eyesore? 5. 9;</p> <p>Definitely support at looking at helping cycle lanes / pathways / pavements (especially along the initial stage of the walcote road leaving the Village)</p> <p>6. 8:4 The School should be supported to expand its building</p> <p>7. 10;6 Tourism: perhaps we need a bed and breakfast?</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Parish could benefit from a B&B and would be supported if in line with other development plan policies. The section on business development, especially 10.2 encourages a wide range of development and establishes the criteria against which new business development will be considered.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
4			Hannah Lorna Bevins National Grid	<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. About National Grid</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</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>Specific Comments</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</p>		
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

				<p>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 pipeline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FM02 - Duddington to Churchover <p>From the consultation information provided, the above overheads powerline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.</p> <p><i>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure</i></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. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</p> <p>Key resources / contacts</p> <p>National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link:</p>		
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

				http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/		
5			Adrian Chadha Highways England	Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft pre-submission version of the South Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period 2017 to 2031. We note that the document is designed to guide and shape development in South Kilworth over the lifetime of the emerging Harborough Local Plan. Specifically, it sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications. Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the South Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan, Highways England's principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the M1 which routes 3	Noted.	None.

				<p>mile to the west of the Plan area and the A14 which routes 2 miles to the south.</p> <p>We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for South Kilworth is required to be in conformity with the emerging Harborough Local Plan and this is acknowledged within the document.</p> <p>We note that the South Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan has identified a housing allocation of 20 dwellings, including windfall developments but excluding recently approved developments totalling 27 dwellings. Given the limited amount of development proposed to come forward in this area, we consider that there will be no adverse impacts on the operation of the M1 and A14.</p> <p>We have no further comments to provide and trust that the above is useful in the progression of the South Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
6		H1	Matthew Bills Harborough District Council	In respect of H1 housing allocation; Abattoir site does have constraints (access/residential amenity/nature)	Noted. The site has been incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan in view of the stated	None.

		H2	<p>and seems to be a successful rural business, so how realistic?</p> <p>Also, policies for its relocation may be useful.</p> <p>Site opposite Leys Crescent- proposed to add 5 dwellings, this is a more realistic site to develop (esp as it already has outline pp), consider expanding site? (see map Fig x): text of policy needs to refer to Figure 2 Figure 2 should refer to figure 3.</p> <p>2nd part of policy is quite negative and perhaps unnecessary, as it duplicates explanatory text of section 6.4</p>	<p>aspirations of the land owners for converting the site into a residential development.</p> <p>Policy E2 was drafted with the relocation of the Abattoir in mind.</p> <p>The addition of a further 5 units is considered to be a suitable size for the development. The landowner is not supportive of further development here.</p> <p>References to figures 2 and 3 have been amended as proposed.</p> <p>This is needed to clarify and reinforce the role of the limits to development in relation to land within and outside of the boundary. The explanatory text is not part of the policy so reference to this in the policy itself is considered important.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Amendments made as indicated.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

		H3		Policy H3 – a minority of what, the total number of dwellings? appears to largely replicate PSLP H2? Therefore may be unnecessary.	Yes, the total number of dwellings. The policy will be amended to make this clear. As the PSLP is yet to be adopted the policy in the Neighbourhood Plan is needed.	Add in 'total number of dwellings to read 'Dwellings of 4 or more bedrooms will be expected to comprise a minority of the total number of new dwellings in any multi-house development'.
		H5		The limit of less than three units for windfall does not appear to be supported by evidence. It is worth noting that some examiners have amended these limits to windfall to be a less restrictive policy. As written the policy would allow only two-unit windfall developments. Is this what the Advisory group intended? Is a limit of "less than 3 dwellings" necessary as other criteria will be applied such as impact on character of area, highways, etc. This may restrict smaller dwellings coming forward.	Having reconsidered this issue, the limit for windfall development will be increased to three or less. It is considered that this level allows for appropriate development in addition to the allocated sites, whilst reflecting the character of the parish.	Policy criterion a) to be changed to say 'The development comprises 3 dwellings or fewer.
		Page 19		Section 6.4 para 2 – not sure this para is factually accurate or up to date (?). Limits to Development are referred to in the CS policy CS2a) / Appendix 3 as being a 'retained' policy i.e. Policy HS/8 from the Harborough District Local Plan (2001) in which Limits to	Noted. The narrative will be amended to reflect the form of words provided here.	Paragraph changed to say 'Limits to Development are referred to in the CS policy CS2a)/Appendix 3 as being a 'retained' policy, namely Policy HS/8 from the

				<p>Development for particular settlements were defined.</p> <p>The Proposed Submission LP (PSLP) (Sept. 2017) doesn't maintain the concept of limits to development i.e. a red line boundary on a map, instead it includes a criterion based policy GD2 (Settlement development) to guide development within and on the edge of settlements. Justification for the change from PSLP (i.e. inclusion of Lto D) should be made either in the text or as an appendix.</p> <p>Section 6.4 para 3 – LtoD in the NDP would update the LtoD currently used by HDC which are from retained HDLP (2001) Policy HS8 in respect of S Kilworth. However, in addition to saying it supersedes these, would it also be appropriate for it to say that it augments (or replaces?) PSLP Policy GD2 in respect of S Kilworth as there's no reference to LtoD in</p>	<p>It is well recognised and tested on numerous occasions through Examination (including several in the Harborough District) that Neighbourhood Plans are able to re-introduce Limits to Development where the Local Plan removed them. This is because the issue is recognised as being a matter of detail open to local decision rather than being a strategic policy.</p> <p>We do not think it is appropriate to refer to a policy in the PSLP that has yet to be tested through Inspection.</p>	<p>Harborough District Local Plan (2001) in which Limits to Development for particular settlements were defined'.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>the PSLP, only GD2? Presume the PSLP can be referred to (as submission is imminent / before they consult) even though it's not yet adopted.</p> <p>Section 6.4 para 5 – could be more positively worded? i.e. will ensure the most sustainable and suitable sites for South Kilworth are brought forward.</p> <p>H7 Design-there are 33 criteria listed which seems overly prescriptive and may be difficult to enforce-duplication of other guidance and NPPF.</p> <p>South Kilworth has a rich and diverse build environment.</p> <p>Dwelling heights should generally be restricted to one or two</p>	<p>We believe that the paragraph in the draft neighbourhood Plan is factually correct and reflects the circumstances that the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to address.</p> <p>These criteria have been supported through consultation. The policy requires them to be considered 'where appropriate ...' so is considered to be sufficiently flexible. However, the specific criteria will be moved to an appendix to make it more readable.</p> <p>Noted. We will change 'build' to 'built'.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Design criteria to be moved to the appendix.</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>Amendment made as proposed.</p>
		<p>6.9 Design</p> <p>Page 27 H7 point 10 & 14</p>			

				<p>Point 14 – replacement of trees. Replacement of lost trees by the same species may not be appropriate – replacement of a lost tree by one of a suitable native species may be more suitable.</p> <p>Point 20 – may need to list where the older parts of the village are for clarity</p> <p>Point 20 – I can see why ‘red coloured bricks’ may not be suitable as drives can look like garage forecourts; however some red coloured or multi red brick pavers may be suitable.</p> <p>SuDS features could be incorporated into driveways with appropriate paving</p> <p>This is a very long policy. Consider how it will be used by decision makers – is it a practical policy. There are some subjective terms used in the criteria e.g. rustic and rural character,</p> <p>The provision of space and systems for battery storage may be considered too onerous on developers</p>	<p>The policy says the same or similar species, so this point is already made.</p> <p>Narrative to be changed to refer to all properties in the parish.</p> <p>The policy says ‘should be avoided’ rather than ‘must be avoided’ therefore it is considered that the policy should remain as it is.</p> <p>Policy Env 8 addresses SuDS in development.</p> <p>It is a long policy, but it is felt that the criteria are important and should be retained for application where relevant. To be placed in the appendix for ease of reference.</p> <p>Noted. Point 31 is one criterion for consideration, but it is related to points 25 and point 30. Local power</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Amendment to be made as stated.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Point 25 will be revised from: Roof designs that take into account the possible fitting of solar panels (in</p>
		H7				
		H7 point 31				

					<p>generation, power storage and electric car re-charging are increasingly becoming more important and is reflected in the draft NPPF. The policy is asking the developer to consider providing:</p> <p>a. Space (only) for equipment and systems for the later installation by the homeowner of battery storage and electric car re-charging points.</p> <p>b. Space for suitably aligned solar panels for the later installation by the homeowner of solar panels</p> <p>c. A suitable car parking layout that takes into account car re-charging points (to be installed by the homeowner).</p>	<p>direction and elevation) will be supported.;</p> <p>To: Roof designs where the developer takes into account the space required, direction and elevation for fitting by the homeowner of solar panels will be supported</p> <p>Point 30 will be revised from: For new houses, provision (space and systems) should be made for the later installation of a home electricity battery system for power storage;</p> <p>To: For new houses, the developer should provide appropriate space (only) for the later installation by the homeowner of a home electricity battery and systems for power storage;</p>
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Page 34 ENV1</p> <p>E1</p>		<p>(mapped above, Fig. 5 and detailed in the environmental inventory) should read (mapped below, Fig. 6 and detailed in the environmental inventory).</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Point 31 will be revised from: For new houses, provision (space and systems) should be made for the later installation of electricity car charging points close to where cars are parked. The number of charging points to be appropriate for the size of dwelling</p> <p>To: For new houses, the developer must consider the layout and proximity of where cars are parked so that the future homeowner is able to economically install electricity car charging points close to where cars are parked. The number of charging points to be appropriate for the size of dwelling</p> <p>Amendment to be made as suggested.</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

				<p>Policy E1 - goes beyond the intent of CS CS7d) and would offer some extra safeguarding over and above the Pre submission Local Plan (PSLP) (as BE3 doesn't cover existing employment areas/provision in locations below Rural Centres, and BE1(2) Rural Economic Development relates to sites rather than existing premises).</p> <p>However, it's not clear what type of commercial premises / sites the policy relates to - Is it those in B Class employment uses or other commercial uses as well? e.g. shops / services / eating & drinking establishments (A Class Uses), leisure facilities (D Class Uses), all of which provide employment opportunities. Further clarification would be helpful perhaps with reference to the Town & Country (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended, and given that changes of use between certain classes of use are allowed without planning</p>	<p>This is considered to be a matter of detail rather than a strategic element and therefore an appropriate policy for a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>CS policy CS7 a) supports employment development generally and the key driver here is the NPPF which supports sustainable economic growth and allows for the release of employment sites where no longer viable, as does policy E1.</p> <p>The policy is designed to relate to all employment use for which a planning permission is required. The policy will be amended to clarify this.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Policy to be amended to say 'Where planning permission is required, proposals that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, an existing employment use will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the site or building is not viable for employment uses, and has been marketed for at least a year'.</p>
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>permission (i.e. permitted development rights) it needs to be clear whether the intension is to remove these PD rights for premises? If so, the policy would likely need to identify specific premises or sites or to refer to premises / sites within a specified geographical area e.g. the Limits to Development as defined in policy H2, or South Kilworth Village as referred to in policy E2.</p> <p>Policy E1a) – it’s not clear what evidence the timescales included in the policy are based upon, but it may be preferable to align them to ‘at least 12mths’ as letting / sales outside of main commercial centres can take time.</p> <p>Policy E1b)- is it intended that “an equally suitable location” is within the parish of South Kilworth? This may not be realistic, given the limited choice of premises / land within the parish and so potentially unduly restrictive. Also Policy BE1(2) of the PSLP seeks to permit rural economic development on sites within or well related to SRV’s, subject to stated criterion and other general LP policies,</p>	<p>The timescales (amended following the response to the query posed above) have been accepted as appropriate by other Made Neighbourhood Plans and the timescales are therefore mirrored here.</p> <p>Yes, it is intended that the location remains within the Parish, and in the case of the Abattoir this is the stated intent of the business owners.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>‘Within the Parish’ added to the policy.</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

		E2		<p>although policy E2 of the NDP gives more flexibility (see comment below)</p> <p>Policy E2 – the policy appears more supportive when compared to the provisions of PSLP policy BE1(2) which permits new rural economic development within or well related to SRV's, subject to certain criterion and other general development policies. This is fine from an NPPF compliance perspective, but we could suggest that the two parts of the policy are reversed to bring forward the 2 criteria stated after "The following types of employment development will be supported:" which are geographic, and suggest that the wording of these criteria could more closely reflect BE1(2) of the PSLP which is supportive of all types of economic growth in sustainable rural locations. However, they're not seeking to be more restrictive than the PSLP so the choice on how flexible to be is there's.</p> <p>adds to the provision of the PSLP in terms of business and employment and recognises local circumstances. Relating E3 and E2 to each other ensures issues like</p>	<p>The policy will be restructured as proposed.</p> <p>Noted. The policy will only apply where</p>	<p>Policy reversed in order as suggested.</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	----	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

		E4		<p>impact on character, noise and traffic generation are covered. Some free-standing buildings will be subject to permitted development rights, so will not require planning permission</p> <p>Policy E4 – suggest deleting “and commercial” from the opening sentence of this policy as it concerns agricultural diversification, to avoid confusion / duplication with policy E1 which addresses the change of use of other commercial premises / land.</p>	<p>planning applications are submitted.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>‘...and commercial’ deleted from the policy.</p>
		E5		<p>Policy E5 – is positive, although it doesn’t appear to add anything specific to South Kilworth to the provisions of the PSLP (IN3). Community Actions CA-E1 and CA-E2 are positive, perhaps suggest that the Parish Council seek guidance / support from HDC Business Manager in this regard.</p>	<p>Noted – we think it is important to retain this policy in case the PSLP is amended at Inspection.</p> <p>The suggestion in relation to the Community Action is helpful.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
		Page 74 Community Actions				
7		H2	Ian Eperon Resident	<p>Policy H2 is extremely important, and I thoroughly approve of it in its present form. The essential features of the village from historical, landscape and countryside points of view are that it is a nucleated hill top village with views radiating in all directions. Extending areas in which</p>	<p>Thanks for this comment.</p>	<p>None.</p>

				<p>development is supported beyond these boundaries will affect the views outwards, compromising the village's sense of identity and character, and the setting of the village as seen from outside, which immediately reveals its historical context and that it exemplifies the character of the landscape area in which it is set.</p>		
		H4		<p>The emphasis in policy H4 on shared ownership and starter homes is appropriate for the overall character of the village.</p>	Noted.	None.
		ENV1		<p>Policy Env1 is extremely important, and I fully support it. These are all sites that emerge from a scoring system that was as rigorous, and objective as might be possible, and the sites all make very important contributions to the aesthetic and historical character of the village.</p>	Thank you for this helpful comment.	None.
		ENV3		<p>Env3 encapsulates much of what it means to live in a village with open views in many directions. These are both characteristic of the landscape character and yet are unusually clearly expressed in SK because of the relatively compact hill-top character of existing development.</p>	Thank you – this helps to explain the importance of this policy to the community.	None.

				<p>These policies rightly emphasize the historical roots of the village. A sense of connection to past generations who lived in a site is often considered to be very important, and it is in the countryside that the results of everyday working life in the pre-industrial past can be seen most clearly.</p>	<p>We agree with this sentiment and the importance of the interconnectivity between the environment and the historical heritage of the Parish.</p>	<p>None.</p>
		ENV6		<p>Env6 is especially significant in the context of a local reservoir that has been shown to attract an exceptional number of species of birds and is fed by corridors providing cover alongside the streams.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
		ENV7		<p>Ridge and furrow is the product of up to around 800 years of cultivation. It is the most tangible evidence of the ways of life of previous generations living in this village; they preceded the use of gravestones and most have left no other marks. R & F is also important for grazing land: it increases the surface area of the land, provides damp hollows in conditions of drought and in wet weather provides strips of drier land on the ridges. This diversifies the grass species in the fields and</p>	<p>We agree! Ridge and Furrow is a diminishing resource. The policy was developed through detailed work of the environment theme group and supported through subsequent community consultation.</p>	<p>None.</p>

		ENV9		thus increases the resilience of the grazing (c.f. climate change). Solar energy is in many respects the renewable energy resource that is most compatible with sites in the countryside, but the sites do have to be selected carefully.	Noted. The purpose of this policy is to support renewable energy as long as it is appropriate for the community.	None.
		CF2		CF2 clause (a) makes an important point about traffic and disturbance. It is important that any developments should be appropriate in scale to the village and be justified primarily in terms of demonstrable local need One of the major issues in terms of village development and integrity is that there is relatively little employment within walking distance or inside the village. Such premises as do provide employment should if at all possible be kept in use, as implied by the policy.	Agreed – this policy will help to make sure that new or improved community facilities are appropriately located and do not cause unintended consequences in terms of disruption locally or disturbance to residential amenity.	None.
		Community Actions CA ENV1,2 &3		CA-Env1 & 2 are especially interesting. A programme of tree-planting and habitat diversification in and around the village would add greatly to the visual appearance of some areas and is,	Noted.	None.

		General Comments		<p>of course, environmentally valuable in its own right.</p> <p>Although I admit to having contributed to aspects of this, the whole is much greater than the parts and it is a valuable and important contribution to the future of the village.</p>	Noted, and thank you for your contributions.	None.
8			Caolan Gaffney Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 10/01/2018. 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>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made. Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that</p>	Noted	None.

				<p>should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</p> <p>We have not checked the agricultural land classification of the proposed allocations, but we advise you ensure that any allocations on best and most versatile land are justified in line with para 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>		
9			<p>Elizabeth Bramwell Resident</p>	<p>With the lack of available land for future development should consideration be given to extending the limits to development.</p> <p>Ridge & furrow might be of historical interest but it serves no useful purpose and should not be used to limit the uses to which ridge & furrow fields might be put to.</p>	<p>Thank you for your contributions.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is required to make provision for a minimum number of new houses across the Plan period in order to contribute a fair share to the total needed across Harborough District. The Neighbourhood Plan achieves this through the re-drawing of the Limits to Development and in so doing strikes a balance between helping to meet its proportionate share of new housing whilst helping to safeguard the characteristics of the Parish so valued by the</p>	<p>None.</p>

					<p>local community. An increase in housing need will lead to a review of the Neighbourhood plan and a potential re-drawing of the Limits to Development.</p> <p>The policy to protect Ridge and Furrow is included to recognise its historical importance as you mention, whilst the Neighbourhood Plan identifies more appropriate and locally suitable sites for residential development, thereby helping to meet its housing requirement whilst also protecting its heritage assets which, once gone, will be gone forever.</p>	
10		8.3.1.56	Bob Wylie Resident	<p>This states that “the present village green is very small and its layout exacerbates traffic problems”. What is the justification that “its layout exacerbates traffic problems”? I live in Church Lane and have a good appreciation of the traffic situation on the Green and on the Walcote Road. The roads across it provide access to Church Lane, Walnut Tree Cottages, Walnut Tree House,</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. The description of what was intended could be improved to state the intention to retain the existing village green but to secure an additional one.</p>	<p>Narrative to change to say ‘Consultation has shown that many would welcome a better green space/village garden area in the village. The present village green is very small and the road layout makes its use as a community outdoor area</p>

			<p>Jasmine House and the Slaughterhouse. The layout of the village green does not cause access problems to any of these. The size and volume of vehicles visiting the slaughterhouse and shop can cause congestion but this is caused by the lack of sufficient space within the curtilage of the business rather than the layout of the village green. I would ask you to remove the statement "...its layout exacerbates traffic problems." or justify this further in the document. Can you give me an idea of how many people have made this comment as I can find no references within the key documents.</p> <p>COMMUNITY ACTION CA-CF5 on Page 73 COMMUNITY ACTION CA-CF5: COMMUNAL GREEN SPACE/VILLAGE GREEN/PARK - The Parish Council will explore and support the development of a new communal green space / village green /pocket park at the heart of South Kilworth village and tidy up the present one. (see 8.2.1) Does the action on the Parish Council involve any specific tasks? The Parish Council are not aware of any. If this relates to general maintenance does it belong in this</p>		<p>impractical. The creation of a new community space in South Kilworth in addition to the village green would be supported, particularly in the area around the village hall'.</p> <p>The Community Action is to be amended as indicated.</p> <p>Community Action CA-CF5 to be changed to say ' COMMUNALGREEN SPACE/PARK - The Parish Council will explore and support the development of a new communal green space at the heart of South Kilworth village whilst continuing to maintain and improve the existing village green'.</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

				document? There are no other references to the ongoing maintenance tasks of the Parish Council in this document. Excellent document – just a couple of detail points about the village green.	Thank you. This comment is appreciated.	None
11			Lucy Eperon Resident	I thoroughly approve of this plan. It has been drawn up with good consultation and research and reflects the views of the occupants of the village, whilst adhering to the constraints of the recent policies.	Many thanks for taking the trouble to read the draft Plan and to make this helpful comment.	None.
12		H3	Tina Morley Resident	Where is evidence for need for houses for disabled –too vague.	Thank you for these comments. The population is ageing, and this is likely to need accommodation that is more suited to the needs of an older and less mobile demography. This policy helps to balance the housing stock that is currently skewed in favour of large houses. Policy to be changed to reference 'mobility impaired' rather than 'disabled'. The environmental inventory represents a	Policy changed as indicated. None.

		Page 36		Do not think we need to keep allotment site it could be moved	set of scores leading to a ranking of importance that was put together based on significant fieldwork over an extended period which produced recognition of the sites identified.	
		H4		Do not think this village needs Social or Intermediate housing due to the problems they bring to an area AND the fact that we don't have the infrastructure to support them e.g. a regular bus service to link to jobs and facilities	<p>There is a national need for more affordable housing which is reflected locally and reinforced by HDC and NPPF policies in support of the provision of affordable housing and is therefore a strategic issue that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot influence without strong justification – and the evidence of the current availability of affordable housing in the Parish demonstrates that it is below the District average so if anything there is an argument for MORE affordable housing not less.</p> <p>It is not clear what evidence there is to support the statement that people in need of</p>	None.

		H6 & Fig6		# Disagree that we should keep the village green - it needs to be relocated and be space we can be proud of - better to sort out the traffic issues this present non-significant piece of land causes	social or intermediate housing bring problems to an area, but many people in such forms of housing are in low-paid employment but cannot access the local housing market without support. Noted. The list was put together through consultation with the community and represents the majority view. Narrative to be changed as indicated to reinforce this point.	Narrative to change to say 'Consultation has shown that many would welcome a better green space/village garden area in the village. The present village green is very small and the road layout makes its use as a community outdoor area impractical. The creation of a new community space in South Kilworth in addition to the village green would be supported, particularly in the area around the village hall'.
		Env7		Disagree we need to keep the small amount of ridge and furrow	The view of the majority of those consulted was that ridge and furrow is	None.

		General Comments		<p>left – we are a farming community and need to improve conditions for farmers making it easier for them to use the land.</p> <p>Overall I am in agreement with all the policy statements listed in the plan - as long as the above are considered. I have a concern that the plan is a long document and in order to encourage people to read it there should be an executive summary – focusing in on the planning issues</p>	<p>important and needs protection.</p> <p>Thank you for these comments. We will introduce a short executive summary at the start of the NP as requested.</p>	<p>Brief executive summary to be added to the NP.</p>
13		<p>Pages 17 & 18</p> <p>Pages 19-21</p>	<p>Ann Jones Resident</p>	<p>I would suggest that the proposed allocation titled “Abbatoir Site” should be considered as part of a larger allocation in relation to the additional land available to the west. The land identified on Plan 1 attached outlined in red is available and part of that land with reference to the area coloured green (on Plan 1 attached) being approximately 0.85 acres would make a logical extension to the “Abbatoir Site” taking into account its close relationship with the land to the east and the topography of the land in question.</p> <p>I would suggest that the Limits to Development displayed in Figure 3. could be extended to include the land identified coloured green on Plan 1 attached to allow for</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>This site was considered as a potential development site but the local planning authority was unsupportive (meeting with HDC Planners on 27.06.17), and in order for any site to be considered for inclusion within the Neighbourhood Plan it needs to be both developable and deliverable.</p> <p>If housing need increases during the Plan period, or there is a problem</p>	<p>None.</p>

		Pages 34 & 35		<p>potential future residential development in connection with the potential “Abbattoir Site”.</p> <p>I believe that in relation to Figure 6. Local Green Space in South Kilworth, that area NO1 is incorrectly referenced as it is referred to in the list on page 34 as (NO2, lower)</p> <p>I as owner of this area would consider proposals for part of this area to be used in conjunction with the primary school as part of wider development proposals in relation to the area coloured green on Plan 1 attached Plan 1.pdf , in relation to proposed policies ENV1 and ENV2.</p>	<p>delivering sites allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan, there will be a review undertaken and further development sites considered at that time.</p> <p>Thank you for spotting this. We will rename NO2 to become NO1</p> <p>Noted. At the moment there is no access onto the land and it cannot therefore be considered either developable or deliverable, so cannot feature in the NP as an allocation. We will reconsider this position at the first review of the NP.</p>	<p>Amendment to be made as proposed.</p> <p>None.</p>
		8.1	Rachel Chamberlain Headmistress South Kilworth Primary School	<p>It refers to a Junior school- this would suggest that pupils were aged 7-11 years old who attended it. The correct term is a Primary school as the age range of the pupils is currently from 4-11years old.</p> <p>“Consultation is underway for it (South Kilworth School) to become part of a group with school foundation status so increasing the</p>	<p>Thank you for drawing our attention to this.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>‘Junior School’ to be changed to ‘Primary School’</p> <p>Amendment to be made as proposed.</p>
		8.2.4 Page 55				

		8.2.4 page 58	<p>autonomy of the school." This is not really true and is contradicted in section 8.4.</p> <p>It would be better if it stated that South Kilworth Primary School became part of the Diocese of Leicester Academy Trust (DLAT) In April 2017. This does increase the autonomy of the school from its previous position as being a Local Authority School.</p> <p>Refers to St Nicholas as one of the few schools without a hall. It should say that South Kilworth Primary School is one of the few schools without a hall.</p> <p>I am pleased that the writers of the plan have supported proposals for the expansion of the primary school and the building of a meeting room/hall to enhance our facilities. We are hoping to hear by April 2018 as to whether it has been successful.</p> <p>I support your concern over parking and traffic issues during peak times at school, and I hope that we can work with the parish council to provide some solutions. As only about 40% of the current pupils live in the village, parking is likely to remain an issue for the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Amendment made as proposed.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>school and village. In order to maintain the viability of the school it is essential that we continue to attract pupils from out of catchment, so a parking and traffic solution is essential. When I initially discussed this plan with Tina, she mentioned about the possibility of parish land on the verges opposite the school being used for parking. It would be great if we could work together to see whether this would provide a solution to the traffic problem.</p> <p>Thank you for the considerable time and effort that you have taken to complete this document and gather the views of so many stakeholders. I hope that you are not offended by my comments regarding content.</p> <p>Please do contact me on the number below, if you wish to discuss any of my comments further. Regards,</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p>	<p>None.</p>
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------