

From: Nigel McGurk [<mailto:info@erimaxplanning.co.uk>]
Sent: 11 September 2018 14:35
To: Matthew Bills
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: South Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan - Examiner Appointment

Matthew

Taking into account NPIERS Guidance and further to reviewing all of the information provided, I was about to contact you to ask if you would, on the Examiner's behalf, please contact the Qualifying Body to ask whether they would like to respond to Harborough's comments made at Submission stage. This is not a requirement of the QB, but provides an opportunity for them to respond. If they would like to do so I would require the response within the next 10 working days.

Whilst I have not made the final decision, at this stage I am unlikely to be calling a public hearing.

Subject to confirmation of my decision re the hearing, I anticipate sending you my draft report within around one week of receipt of the QBs comments (or within 10 days of their confirmation that they will not be calling commenting).

Kind regards
Nigel

On 13 Sep 2018, at 14:38, Matthew Bills <M.Bills@harborough.gov.uk> wrote:

Nigel

The QB was grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Reg 16 reps from the LPA. The further comments by the QB are attached

There was one representation that had caused some concern re: paragraph 6.3 and the agreed position of the LPA and the QB after our joint meeting.

The LPA fully endorses the Qualifying Bodies clarification in the attached of the outcome of the meeting, and supports the use of the phrase 'the principle of development'.

The LPA had concerns that the use of the word 'agreed' in the submission version plan implied that a decision had been taken, when of course a planning decision, should an application be received, would need to be made by planning committee. The view of the LPA had perhaps been clumsily expressed.

I hope this helps clarify. I have copied in the QB for information.

Regards

Matthew

<p>Harborough District Council</p> <p>The Symington Building</p> <p>Market Harborough</p>	<p>5.1 - 1st paragraph</p> <p>6.2 – 3rd paragraph:</p> <p>6.3 – 2nd paragraph:</p> <p>6.3 – 3rd paragraph:</p> <p>6.4 – Methodology</p>	<p>Comments on South Kilworth NP – Examination version</p> <p>5.1 - 1st paragraph: Delete UK as NPPF sets out planning policies for England only.</p> <p>6.2 – 3rd paragraph: May be clearer to say:</p> <p>As a result the housing target for South Kilworth up to 2031 is 20 units. This is in addition to any housing developments with planning permission as at 31 March 2017.</p> <p>6.3 – 2nd paragraph: Did the sites go through some sort of assessment process which can be referred to? What were the ‘only sites that came forward’?</p> <p>‘Deemed unsuitable by Harborough District Council’ is misleading as I understand this was an informal discussion with a planning policy officer who gave initial feedback on the potential suitability of sites only.</p> <p>6.3 – 3rd paragraph: Officer views on the potential way forward were discussed rather than agreed. Replace ‘agreed’ with ‘discussed as a potential approach’.</p>	<p>Response from QB</p> <p>Happy for this amendment to be made.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>South Kilworth is unusual as there were very few sites that came forward following a ‘call for sites’. There were only 4 potential sites and two of these were not favoured by the District Council.</p> <p>The meeting referred to was not an ‘informal discussion with a Planning Officer’ but was a formally convened meeting between the Neighbourhood Plan Group and Harborough District Council who were represented by the Head of Planning, the Council’s Neighbourhood Planning</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Figure 7:</p> <p>Policy ENV 5:</p>	<p>6.4 – Methodology: In some cases clearly defined physical features have not been followed (i.e. along Walcote Road) and it would be helpful to have an explanation of why this has not been possible in some cases.</p> <p>Policy H5: include ‘and after criterion e).</p>	<p>Champion and Neighbourhood and Green Spaces Officer and a Planning Officer.</p> <p>The purpose of the meeting was to consider the housing target for the Parish and to discuss how the QB could meet the target given the paucity of development sites.</p> <p>Rather than say ‘agreed’, the QB would be content for the phrase ‘the principle of development’ to be used.</p> <p>Everyone left the meeting with a clear understanding that there was support for the approach that was being taken by the QB in delivering the housing target required of it by HDC.</p> <p>The NP updated the HDC Limits to Development which followed the same lines. The NP LtD has updated this by incorporating the allocations but has otherwise followed the same form.</p> <p>Agreed</p>
--	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Figure 7: Important Open Space. The amp shows 'Monte Bello frontage' as IOS but this is not referred to in Policy ENV 2.</p> <p>Policy ENV 5: The part of the policy relating to hedgerows should reflect the last sentence of the policy explanation (i.e. 'wherever practicable') and set out how any unavoidable loss of hedgerows should be mitigated (through planting of new trees, hedges and woodland)</p>	<p>This can be added in.</p> <p>This can be added in.</p>
	Policy ENV 6:	<p>Policy ENV 6: Second part of policy. 'Permitted development' is just that and the policy can't be enforced. Would be better in explanation or as a community action to encourage this approach.</p>	<p>The term 'permitted' can be removed from the policy so that it reads 'Development in the plan area will be expected to protect and enhance ...'</p>
	Policy ENV 9:	<p>Policy ENV 9: Not clear what this policy is trying to add to the emerging strategic Local Plan policy to which it refers.</p>	<p>The strategic Local Plan policy is yet to be tested through Examination and may vary prior to adoption.</p>
	Policy CF2	<p>Policy CF2: include 'and' after criterion c).</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
	Policy E2: Criterion b)	<p>Policy E2: Criterion b) – What does 'within or adjacent to South Kilworth Village mean'? There needs to be clarification</p>	<p>This means the LtD and can be amended to reflect this.</p>

	Policies E2 and E4:	as to whether this means Limits to Development or the wider built up area of the village. Policies E2 and E4: Include 'and' after criterion c).	Agreed.
--	---------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------