

# **HUSBANDS BOSWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2018-2031**

Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan Examination  
A Report to Harborough District Council

by Independent Examiner, Nigel McGurk BSc(Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

February 2020



**Contents**

**1, Summary**

**2, Introduction**

**3, Basic Conditions and Development Plan Status**

**4, Background Documents and the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area**

**5, Public Consultation**

**6, The Neighbourhood Plan: Introductory Section**

**7, The Neighbourhood Plan: Policies**

**8, The Neighbourhood Plan: Other Matters**

**9, Referendum**

## **1. Summary**

- 1 Subject to the recommendations within this Report, made in respect of enabling the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan to meet the basic conditions, I confirm that:
  - having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;
  - the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
  - the making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area);
  - the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, European Union (EU) obligations; and
  - the making of the neighbourhood plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
  
- 2 Taking the above into account, I find that the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions<sup>1</sup> and I recommend to Harborough District Council that, subject to modifications, it should proceed to Referendum.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is confirmed in Chapter 3 of this Report that the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

## **2. Introduction**

### **The Neighbourhood Plan**

- 3 This Report provides the findings of the examination into the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan (referred to as the Neighbourhood Plan) prepared by Husbands Bosworth Parish Council.
- 4 As above, the Report recommends that the Neighbourhood Plan should go forward to a Referendum. At Referendum, should more than 50% of votes be in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan, then the Plan would be formally *made* by Harborough District Council. The Neighbourhood Plan would then form part of the development plan and as such, it would be used to determine planning applications and guide planning decisions in the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area.
- 5 Neighbourhood planning provides communities with the power to establish their own policies to shape future development in and around where they live and work.  
  
*“Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood Plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development.”*  
(Paragraph 29, National Planning Policy Framework)
- 6 As confirmed in paragraph 3.2 of the Basic Conditions Statement, submitted alongside the Neighbourhood Plan, Husbands Bosworth Parish Council is the *Qualifying Body*, ultimately responsible for the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 7 The Introduction to the Basic Conditions Statement confirms that the Neighbourhood Plan relates only to the designated Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area. Paragraph 3.6 of the Basic Conditions Statement reconfirms this and the fact that there is no other neighbourhood plan in place in the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area.

- 8 The above meets with the aims and purposes of neighbourhood planning, as set out in the Localism Act (2011), the National Planning Policy Framework (2019<sup>2</sup>) and Planning Practice Guidance (2014).

#### Role of the Independent Examiner

- 9 I was appointed by Harborough District Council, with the consent of the Qualifying Body, to conduct the examination of the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan and to provide this Report.
- 10 As an Independent Neighbourhood Plan Examiner, I am independent of the Qualifying Body and the Local Authority. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Neighbourhood Plan and I possess appropriate qualifications and experience.
- 11 I am a chartered town planner and have eight years' direct experience as an Independent Examiner of Neighbourhood Plans and Orders. I also have thirty years' land, planning and development experience, gained across the public, private, partnership and community sectors.
- 12 As the Independent Examiner, I must make one of the following recommendations:
- that the Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it meets all legal requirements;
  - that the Neighbourhood Plan, as modified, should proceed to Referendum;
  - that the Neighbourhood Plan does not proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it does not meet the relevant legal requirements.

---

<sup>2</sup> A replacement National Planning Policy Framework was published in July 2018 and amended in 2019. Paragraph 214 of the replacement document establishes that the policies of the previous National Planning Policy Framework apply for the purpose of examining plans, where those plans are submitted on or before the 24<sup>th</sup> January 2019. The Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to Harborough District Council after this date and consequently, it is appropriate to examine the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan against the most recent version of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 13 If recommending that the Neighbourhood Plan should go forward to Referendum, I must then consider whether the Referendum Area should extend beyond the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area to which the Plan relates.
- 14 Where modifications are recommended, they are presented as bullet points and highlighted in **bold print**, with any proposed new wording in *italics*.

#### Neighbourhood Plan Period

- 15 A neighbourhood plan must specify the period during which it is to have effect.
- 16 There is a mistake in Paragraph 3.4 of the Basic Conditions Statement submitted alongside the Neighbourhood Plan, which refers to the plan period as being 2011-2031. However, the title page of the Neighbourhood Plan provides a clear reference to the plan period, 2018-2031.
- 17 Taking the above into account, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirement in respect of specifying the period during which it is to have effect.

Public Hearing

- 18 According to the legislation, it is a general rule that neighbourhood plan examinations should be held without a public hearing – by written representations only.
- 19 However, it is also the case that *when the Examiner considers it necessary* to ensure adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case, then a public hearing must be held.
- 20 Further to consideration of the information submitted, I determined not to hold a public hearing as part of the examination of the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan.
- 21 However, in order to clarify a number of points in respect of the examination, I wrote to the Qualifying Body and to Harborough District Council and this examination has taken the responses received into account.

### **3. Basic Conditions and Development Plan Status**

#### **Basic Conditions**

- 22 It is the role of the Independent Examiner to consider whether a neighbourhood plan meets the “*basic conditions*.” These were *set out in law*<sup>3</sup> following the Localism Act 2011. Effectively, the basic conditions provide the rock or foundation upon which neighbourhood plans are created. A neighbourhood plan meets the basic conditions if:
- having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;
  - the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
  - the making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area);
  - the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, European Union (EU) obligations; and
  - prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan.
- 23 Regulations 23 and 33 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) set out two additional basic conditions to those set out in primary legislation and referred to above. Of these, the following basic condition, brought into effect on 28<sup>th</sup> December 2018, applies to neighbourhood plans:
- the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

<sup>4</sup> *ibid* (same as above).



- 24 In examining the Plan, I am also required, as set out in sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act), to check whether the neighbourhood plan:
- has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body;
  - has been prepared for an area that has been properly designated for such plan preparation (under Section 61G of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended));
  - meets the requirements to i) specify the period to which it has effect; ii) not include provision about excluded development; and iii) not relate to more than one neighbourhood area and that:
  - its policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004.
- 25 An independent examiner must also consider whether a neighbourhood plan is compatible with the Convention rights.<sup>5</sup>
- 26 I note that, in line with legislative requirements, a Basic Conditions Statement was submitted alongside the Neighbourhood Plan. This sets out how, in the qualifying body's opinion, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Convention rights has the same meaning as in the Human Rights Act 1998.

### European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) Obligations

- 27 I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan has regard to fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the ECHR and complies with the Human Rights Act 1998 and there is no substantive evidence to the contrary.
- 28 In the above regard, I also note that information has been submitted to demonstrate that people were provided with a range of opportunities to engage with plan-making in different places and at different times. Various comments have been received in response to active community engagement during the plan-making process. The Consultation Statement submitted alongside the Neighbourhood Plan provides a summary of responses to comments and to resulting changes to the Neighbourhood Plan.

### European Union (EU) Obligations

- 29 In some limited circumstances, where a neighbourhood plan is likely to have significant environmental effects, it may require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. In this regard, national advice states:
- “Draft neighbourhood plan proposals should be assessed to determine whether the plan is likely to have significant environmental effects.”*  
(Planning Practice Guidance<sup>6</sup>)
- 30 This process is often referred to as “*screening*”<sup>7</sup>. If likely environmental effects are identified, an environmental report must be prepared.

---

<sup>6</sup> Planning Guidance, Paragraph 027, Ref: 11-027-20150209,.

<sup>7</sup> The requirements for a screening assessment are set out in in Regulation 9 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

- 31 Harborough District Council carried out a screening assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan, which reached the conclusion that:

*"...in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan does not require a full Strategic Environmental Assessment to be undertaken."*

- 32 The statutory bodies, Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency were all consulted on the screening assessment. All three of the bodies agreed with its conclusions.

- 33 In addition to SEA, a Habitats Regulations Assessment identifies whether a plan is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. This Assessment must determine whether significant effects on a European site can be ruled out on the basis of objective information<sup>8</sup>. If it is concluded that there is likely to be a significant effect on a European site, then an appropriate assessment of the implications of the plan for the site must be undertaken.

- 34 In this regard, Harborough District Council states:

*"Each policy of the Husbands Bosworth Plan has been individually assessed for its effects on Habitat Regulations (and other environmental effects)..."*

- 35 Further, Section 4.5 of the Basic Conditions Statement submitted alongside the Neighbourhood Plan notes that the Neighbourhood Area does not include and is not close to a European site and does not require a Habitats Regulations Assessment. The statutory bodies have been consulted and none disagree with this conclusion.

- 36 In addition to the above, national guidance establishes that the ultimate responsibility for determining whether a draft neighbourhood plan meets EU obligations lies with the local planning authority:

*"It is the responsibility of the local planning authority to ensure that all the regulations appropriate to the nature and scope of a neighbourhood plan proposal submitted to it have been met in order for the proposal to progress. The local planning authority must decide whether the draft neighbourhood plan is compatible with EU regulations (including obligations under the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive)"* (Planning Practice Guidance<sup>9</sup>).

---

<sup>8</sup> Planning Guidance Paragraph 047 Reference ID: 11-047-20150209.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid*, Paragraph 031 Reference ID: 11-031-20150209.

- 37 In carrying out the work that it has and in reaching the conclusions that it has, Harborough District Council has not raised any concerns in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan's compatibility with EU obligations.
- 38 I also note that, in April 2018, in the case *People Over Wind & Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta ("People over Wind")*, the Court of Justice of the European Union clarified that it is not appropriate to take account of mitigation measures when screening plans and projects for their effects on European protected habitats under the Habitats Directive. In practice this means if a likely significant effect is identified at the screening stage of a habitats assessment, an *Appropriate Assessment* of those effects must be undertaken.
- 39 In response to this judgement, the government made consequential changes to relevant regulations through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.
- 40 The changes to regulations allow neighbourhood plans and development orders in areas where there could be likely significant effects on a European protected site to be subject to an Appropriate Assessment to demonstrate how impacts will be mitigated, in the same way as would happen for a draft Local Plan or planning application. These changes came into force on 28<sup>th</sup> December 2018.
- 41 I am mindful that evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that Harborough District Council has taken all of the above into account.
- 42 Taking everything into consideration, I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with European obligations.

#### **4. Background Documents and the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area**

##### Background Documents

- 43 In undertaking this examination, I have considered various information in addition to the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan.
- 44 Information considered as part of this examination has included (but has not been limited to) the following main documents and information:
- National Planning Policy Framework (referred to in this Report as "*the Framework*") (2019)
  - Planning Practice Guidance (2014, as updated)
  - Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
  - The Localism Act (2011)
  - The Neighbourhood Plan Regulations (2012) (as amended)
  - Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 (referred to in this Report as the "*Local Plan*") (adopted April 2019)
  - Basic Conditions Statement
  - Consultation Statement
  - Representations received
  - Husbands Bosworth Strategic Environmental Assessment Determination
- 45 In addition, I spent an unaccompanied day visiting the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area.

Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area

- 46 The boundary of the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area is identified on a plan provided on page 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 47 The title of the plan refers to a pink shaded area and appears to suggest that the Neighbourhood Area is not within Harborough District. For clarity, I recommend
- **Page 5, change title of plan to “...shaded pink is *also* within...”**
- 48 Harborough District Council designated the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2017.
- 49 This satisfies a requirement in line with the purposes of preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan under section 61G (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

## 5. Public Consultation

### Introduction

- 50 As land use plans, the policies of neighbourhood plans form part of the basis for planning and development control decisions. Legislation requires the production of neighbourhood plans to be supported by public consultation.
- 51 Successful public consultation enables a neighbourhood plan to reflect the needs, views and priorities of the local community. It can create a sense of public ownership, help achieve consensus and provide the foundations for a 'Yes' vote at Referendum.

### Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

- 52 A Consultation Statement was submitted to Harborough District Council alongside the Neighbourhood Plan. The information within it sets out who was consulted and how, together with the outcome of the consultation, as required by the neighbourhood planning *regulations*<sup>10</sup>.
- 53 Taking the information provided into account, there is evidence to demonstrate that the Neighbourhood Plan comprises a "*shared vision*" for the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area, having regard to Paragraph 29 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("*the Framework*").
- 54 Further to a public meeting in January 2017 and a subsequent inaugural meeting in February 2017, it was determined to embark upon the creation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Husbands Bosworth Plan Advisory Committee (HBAC) was set up to undertake the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.

---

<sup>10</sup> Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

- 55 In October 2017, a flyer was distributed, inviting residents to join a "*Theme Group*." Three initial Groups (Housing; Environment and Heritage; and Community, Economy and Transport) were formed. A questionnaire was designed and distributed/collected during March 2018, with results helping to inform the plan-making process.
- 56 The draft Neighbourhood Plan was presented to the community and underwent consultation during March and April 2019. Representations received were considered and informed the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 57 As well as a dedicated page on the Husbands Bosworth Parish Council website, public consultation was supported by publicity via the village's community newsletter, "*The Bosworth Bugle*," by the distribution of leaflets and fliers, via public notices and banners, and through social media. Use was also made of local events, including the Bosworth Festival, Drop-In events and Village Conker Day
- 58 The Consultation Statement provides ample evidence to demonstrate that public consultation formed an important part of the plan-making process. Consultation was well-publicised and matters raised were duly considered.
- 59 Taking all of the above into account, I am satisfied that the consultation process was robust and that it complied with the neighbourhood planning regulations referred to above.



## **6. The Neighbourhood Plan – Introductory Section**

60 For precision, I recommend:

- **Page 4, last sentence, change to “...Plan into account. *The Neighbourhood Plan will provide our community with a real and lasting tool...*”**
- **Page 5, change second sentence to “*The NPPF sets out national planning policy and states that ‘Neighbourhood...*”**
- **Page 5, second para, change line four to “...in the *parish. The made POLICIES of the Neighbourhood Plan form part of the development plan. The Neighbourhood Plan also identifies...*”**

## **7. The Neighbourhood Plan – Neighbourhood Plan Policies**

### **Housing and the Built Environment**

#### **Policy H1: Settlement Boundary**

- 61 Local Plan Policy GD2 (*“Settlement development”*) establishes that the main focus of development in Harborough should be within the District's settlements. The Policy also goes on to provide for development on land adjoining settlements, subject to it meeting clearly specified requirements.
- 62 In addition to this, Local Plan Policies GD3 (*“Development in the countryside”*) and GD4 (*“Housing in the countryside”*) set out a supportive land use planning policy framework for appropriate development in the countryside.
- 63 These Policies specify the range of development appropriate to the countryside and are reflective of national policy which seeks to balance the need to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside (Chapter 15, *“Conserving and enhancing the natural environment”*) with the needs of supporting a prosperous rural economy (Chapter 6, *“Building a strong, competitive economy”*) and enhancing or maintaining the vitality of rural communities (*“Chapter 5, “Delivering a sufficient supply of homes”*).
- 64 Neighbourhood Plan Policy H1 establishes a settlement boundary, and to some extent, the aim of this is to focus development within Husbands Bosworth's built-up area. Whilst the Local Plan relies on its clear policy framework, rather than the use of settlement boundaries, to steer and management development in the above manner, the introduction of a settlement boundary at Husbands Bosworth does not, in itself, conflict with Harborough's adopted strategic policies.

- 65 However, as set out, the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to introduce a less flexible approach to development outside the settlement boundary than that required by national and local planning policy. Taken together, Policy H1 and its related information appear to seek to restrict development in the countryside to a far more limited range of uses than those supported by national policy and Local Plan Policies GD3 and GD4.
- 66 In addition to the above, the wording of Policy H1 would fail to provide for the more flexible approach to development set out in Policy GD2. Consequently, the Policy does not have regard to national policy and is not in general conformity with adopted strategic policies. This results in an approach that fails to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
- 67 The recommendations below seek to balance the need for the Policy to meet the basic conditions along with the local aspirations for the creation of a settlement boundary.
- 68 In making these recommendations, I note that the less flexible approach inherent in establishing a settlement boundary is exemplified by the fact that the boundary proposed in Figure 3a of the Neighbourhood Plan has already been overtaken by events. A recent planning permission adjoining the settlement means that it is sensible and appropriate to alter the proposed settlement boundary at this stage.
- 69 Part of the supporting text to Policy H1 appears focused upon limiting rural development to a level that does not have regard to national policy and that is not in general conformity with the Local Plan. It also includes statements unsupported by substantive evidence and part of the text reads as though it comprises a Policy requirement, which it does not. These are matters addressed in the recommendations below.
- 70 I recommend:
- **Change Policy H1 to “*The Settlement Boundary shown on Figure 3a provides a focus for development in the Neighbourhood Area. Within the settlement boundary, there will be a presumption in favour of development that respects local character and residential amenity.*” (delete rest of Policy)**
  - **Page 17, fourth para, change to “...recent approved planning applications, there is no requirement to allocate residential development land in the parish up to 2031.”**

- Page 17, third line from bottom, change to “...housing mix *by supporting* a majority...”
- Page 17, last line, change to “...therefore *supports* a mixture of...”
- Page 18, second line, change to “...village *may* help to...”
- Page 18, delete second para (“Historically...policies.”)
- Page 18, delete third para and replace with “*The Neighbourhood Plan establishes a new Settlement Boundary. This provides a focus for development in the Neighbourhood Area. By promoting development within the Settlement Boundary, the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to support and enhance the vitality of Husbands Bosworth.*”

*Focusing development in this way is intended to support the existing services within the village.*

*Outside the settlement boundary, development is subject to national policy and the policies of the Harborough Local Plan (2011-2031). Together, these policies provide for appropriate forms of development at the edge of settlements and within the countryside beyond.”*

- Page 18/19, delete fourth and fifth paras (“The new...development.”)
- Page 19, retain “Methodology” and bullet points a) to d). Delete all other text
- Figure 3a, revise boundary to include permitted development site at Honeypot Farm<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> Reference: 18/00056/OUT.

**Policy H2: Residential Site Allocation**

71 National policy supports the delivery of a sufficient supply of homes. In this respect, it identifies:

*“the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes.”*  
(Paragraph 59, the Framework)

72 Whilst there is no requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate land for development, in the case of Husbands Bosworth, the Neighbourhood Plan states that it *“allocates a site for housing development in order to help address the housing imbalance”* identified.

73 In respect of the above, the Neighbourhood Plan identifies a requirement for more smaller homes.

74 Whilst it may appear a little odd that Policy H2 allocates a site with the purpose of providing more smaller homes, but does not include any requirement for such, I note that, to some extent, the ensuing Neighbourhood Plan Policy, Policy H3, attempts to promote a housing mix that alludes to the provision of smaller homes. Policy H3 is considered within this context later in this Report.

75 The residential allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan has emerged through an assessment process and I note earlier in this Report that the Neighbourhood Plan itself has been subject to robust public consultation.

76 Representations have included support for the allocation of additional land. However, as noted above, there is no requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate land.

77 No changes recommended.

**Policy H3: Housing Mix**

- 78 National policy supports the provision of a mix of housing to meet the needs of different groups within the community:

*"...including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities..."*

- 79 Local Plan Policy H5 ("*Housing density, mix and standards*") requires major housing development (10 or more houses) to provide a mix of house types informed by up to date evidence of housing need.

- 80 Policy H3, as set out, requires all proposals for housing to meet the current and future needs of the Parish. As such, the Policy would apply to the development of a single dwelling upwards. In the absence of any substantive evidence, it is not clear how for example, a single dwelling could meet the current and future needs of the Parish, who would judge this and on what basis. The Neighbourhood Plan is not clear in this respect.

- 81 Also, there is no information to demonstrate that the above requirement, as vague as it is, is deliverable and as such, this part of the Policy fails to have regard to Paragraph 16 of the Framework, which states that:

*"Plans should...be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable."*

- 82 Further to the above, the Policy goes on to "*particularly support*" the provision of small family homes and homes for older people, without any direction in respect of how "*particularly*" should be interpreted by a decision maker. The ambiguous nature of the Policy continues with reference to "*4+ bedroom dwellings may be allowed but will be expected to comprise a significant minority.*"

- 83 In the absence of any definition, the Policy fails to provide clarity, contrary to national planning guidance, which requires planning policies to be clear and unambiguous<sup>12</sup>:

*“A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared.”*

- 84 I note earlier in this Report that the purpose of the allocation in Policy H2 is to support the provision of smaller homes. Policy H2 does not include any reference to smaller homes. Taking this and all of the above into account, I recommend:

- **Change Policy H3 to “Major residential development (10 or more dwellings) must provide a mix of housing informed by up to date evidence of need (for example the Parish Housing Needs Report and the Leicester and Leicestershire HEDNA, as updated). The provision of smaller homes and homes suitable for older people will be supported. Major residential development should provide a greater proportion of 1 or 2 bedroom homes than 4+ bedroom homes.”**
- **Page 22, three lines up, change to “...smaller homes could enable...which would then provide opportunities to larger...”**

---

<sup>12</sup> Planning Guidance, Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-042-20140306.

**Policy H4: Affordable Housing Provision**

- 85 In general terms, Policy H4 supports the provision of affordable housing. Whilst Policy H4 and its supporting text contain far less detail and clarity than the Local Plan, the basic requirements of the Policy are in general conformity with Local Plan Policy H2 "*Affordable Housing.*"
- 86 As set out, Policy H4 slightly confuses its terminology – whilst having the same overarching intention as the Local Plan it sets out different wording to that used in Local Plan Policy H2 and this results in a different approach to development that is not supported by substantive evidence.
- 87 The Policy also goes on to include a vague reference to local connection and cascading requirements, without further explanation in the supporting text. This results in an imprecise and unclear approach, contrary to planning guidance and Paragraph 16 of the Framework, both referred to earlier in this Report.
- 88 In making the recommendations below, I am mindful that the Local Plan does provide clarity in respect of local connections as they relate to the provision of affordable housing.
- 89 I recommend:
- **Change Policy H4 to "*..tenure split of around 75% affordable or social rented and about 25% low cost home ownership. The affordable...same site.*" (delete last sentence)**
  - **Change last line of supporting text to "*...75% affordable or social rented and 25% low cost home ownership.*"**



**Policy H5: Accessible Housing**

90 Policy H5 seeks to impose Building Regulations. This lies outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan's land use planning Policies.

91 I recommend:

- **Delete Policy H5**
- **Delete supporting text associated with Policy H5**

**Policy H6: Windfall Sites**

- 92 Local Plan Policy GD2, referred to earlier in this Report, states that development within the built up area of Rural Centres including Husbands Bosworth will be permitted subject to it respecting the form and character of the settlement and retaining natural boundaries.
- 93 Policy H6 sets out guidance for windfall development within the settlement of Husbands Bosworth and does so in a manner that is, largely, in general conformity with the Local Plan.
- 94 However, in the absence of any substantive evidence to demonstrate that it would not, under any circumstances, be possible for a site comprising more than 5 dwellings to come forward as windfall development, it is not clear why the first part of the Policy seeks to impose such a limit. Such an approach could prevent the plan from contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and there is no evidence to the contrary.
- 95 Part a) of the Policy requires windfall development to “close” a gap in the continuity of existing frontage buildings. There is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that it is necessary to “close” a gap in order for development to respect the form and character of the settlement and retain natural boundaries. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it could well be, for example, that closing a gap would result in an inappropriate terracing effect, to the harm of local character.
- 96 Similarly, it is unclear why the Policy requires all windfall development to be “closely surrounded by existing buildings.” Whilst this is a vague phrase – ie, how close is close ? – I am also mindful that such a requirement could provide for a “cramming” effect, which would be contrary to the requirements of and fail to be in general conformity with, Local Plan Policy GD2.
- 97 The requirement for development to enhance local character is not supported by any evidence in respect of deliverability. Such an approach goes well beyond the requirements of national or local policy. There is no requirement, even in Conservation Areas, for development to enhance local character. Also in respect of part d), it is not clear, in the absence of any information, how it might be possible to both maintain and enhance at the same time.

- 98 As presented, it is not clear as to whether all of the criteria set out apply to development proposals, or whether one or any number apply. The recommendations below take Local Plan Policy GD2 into account in this regard.
- 99 The references to “*adversely impact*” and “*unacceptable loss*” in parts f) and g) of the Policy respectively, are not explained in the supporting text and appear ambiguous.
- 100 Part of the supporting text reads as though it comprises a Policy requirement, which it does not.
- 101 I recommend:
- **Change Policy H6 to: “*Well designed residential development on infill and redevelopment sites within the Settlement Boundary will be supported where such development: a) is within a gap within the built-up area; and b) respects local character; and c) retains existing natural boundaries, such as trees, hedges and streams; and d) respects residential amenity.*”**
  - **Delete second paragraph of supporting text (“As there...bedrooms.”)**

**Policy H7: Design**

102 National planning policy recognises that:

*“Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creating better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.”*

(Paragraph 124, the Framework)

103 Local Plan Strategy Policy GD8 (*“Good Design in Development”*) requires all development to ensure that a high quality sustainable built environment can be achieved.

104 Whilst in general terms, Policy H7 seeks to promote high quality design and ensure that development appears in keeping with its surroundings, as set out, the Policy is prescriptive and fails to provide for the flexibility required by national policy, which states that policies should ensure that developments are:

*“...sympathetic to local character and history...while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change...”*

(Paragraph 127, the Framework)

105 Further, as noted earlier in this Report, national policy requires plans to be deliverable and there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that all of the requirements of criteria a) to s) would be deliverable in respect of the development of residential extensions and new dwellings in the Neighbourhood Area.

106 I recommend:

- **Change Policy H7 to *“All new development in the Neighbourhood Area must be of high quality design. Development proposals should have regard to the design guidance criteria set out in the supporting text above.”* (delete rest of Policy)**
- **Pages 27/28, delete text under heading Context and Character and replace with *“The Parish Council has developed the local design guidance criteria below, which is intended to help inform the development of residential extensions and new homes:”* PROVIDE CRITERIA A) TO S) HERE**

- **Criteria k) change "6 foot" to "2 metres"**
- **Page 27, change third paragraph to "...of the parish. Developers *will be expected to demonstrate how...*"**

Environment

**Policy ENV1: Protection of Local Green Space**

107 Local communities can identify areas of green space of particular importance to them for special protection. Paragraph 99 of the Framework states that:

*“The designation of land as a Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them.”*

108 The Framework requires policies for the managing of development within a Local Green Space to be consistent with those for Green Belts (Paragraph 101, the Framework). A Local Green Space designation therefore provides for development management in a manner that is comparable to that for Green Belt land. Consequently, Local Green Space comprises a restrictive and significant policy designation.

109 Given the importance of the designation, it is appropriate that areas of Local Green Space are clearly identified in the Neighbourhood Plan itself. The Figures identifying each Local Green Space are small and provided on a poor quality map base. This makes the detailed identification of boundaries difficult and I make a recommendation in this regard, below.

110 The designation of land for Local Green Space must meet the tests set out in Paragraph 100 of the Framework.

111 These are that the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; that it is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and that it is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

112 Policy ENV1 designates two areas of Local Green Space. Supporting evidence is provided to demonstrate that each proposed Local Green Space meets the relevant national policy tests and is therefore appropriate for designation. I also note earlier in this Report that the Neighbourhood Plan has emerged through robust public consultation.

113 With respect to the management of development in areas of Local Green Space, national policy is clear in stating that this should be consistent with that for Green Belts. I recommend:

- **Change Policy ENV1 to “*The areas listed below and identified on Figure 5 and Table 2 are designated as Local Green Space, which will be protected in a manner consistent with the protection of land within the Green Belt.*”**

**Policy ENV2: Protection of Sites of Environmental Significance**

- 114 Paragraph 170 of the Framework requires planning policies to protect valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils.
- 115 Generally, Policy ENV2 affords protection to environmentally significant sites, having regard to national policy.
- 116 Policy ENV2 seeks to protect sites identified in Figures 6.1 and 6.2. These sites are numbered, but the numbering does not equate to any information in the Neighbourhood Plan. The sites identified include land on the edge of the settlement boundary, the precise boundaries of which are difficult to distinguish, due to the scale of the plans used.
- 117 The sites identified also include a number of public highways. The development of highways is the responsibility of the highways authority.
- 118 The Policy and supporting evidence does not distinguish between grades of significance and the second part of the Policy appears vague.
- 119 For clarity, I recommend:
- **Change Policy ENV2 to “...been identified as *being of significance* for their...Development proposals *affecting these sites should demonstrate that...that *location outweighs* the impact...”***
  - **Either provide a key showing the names relating to each number shown on the Figures, or delete each number from the Figures**
  - **Delete all annotations covering public highways**
  - **Provide a new Figure clearly showing the precise boundary of any site adjoining or in close proximity (circa 50 metres) of the Settlement Boundary**



**Policy ENV3: Ridge and Furrow**

- 120 Policy ENV3 seeks to afford protection to areas of Ridge and Furrow, which are locally recognised as important non-designated heritage assets, having regard to Paragraph 170 of the Framework.
- 121 As set out, the Policy lacks clarity. It refers to non-designated *local* heritage assets, as opposed to the more accepted term "*non-designated heritage assets*," as used in Chapter 16 of the Framework ("*Conserving and enhancing the historic environment*").
- 122 It also refers to the benefits of a proposal that results in harm or damage, without reference to the scope for a proposal that may not necessarily result in harm or damage.
- 123 I recommend:
- ***Change Policy ENV3 to "The areas of ridge and furrow earthworks mapped in Figure 7 are non-designated heritage assets. Any harm arising from a development proposal or a change of land use requiring planning permission should be balanced against their significance as heritage assets."***

**Policy ENV4: Local Landscape Character**

124 Local Plan Policy GD5 ("*Landscape character*") requires development to be sensitive to its landscape setting and landscape character area.

125 In general terms, Policy ENV4 seeks to protect landscape character and in this respect, it has regard to Local Plan Policy GD5.

126 However, as presented Policy ENV4 requires all development proposals to "*demonstrate*" that they respect local character. This fails to have regard to Paragraph 44 of the Framework, which states that requests for supporting evidence should be kept to the minimum needed to make decisions and be necessary and material to the application.

127 Rather than direct development, the Policy then seeks to impose a requirement upon the decision maker, in respect of how impacts on landscape should be assessed. It is not the role of the Neighbourhood Plan to impose requirements upon the Local Planning Authority.

128 In addition to the above, a number of the criteria set out in Policy ENV4 appear vague and imprecise. Without the support of detailed information, the words "*unacceptable...adversely affect...incongruous...disturb...excessive...impact on views*" appear vague and subjective, and fail to provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal, having regard to Paragraph 16 of the Framework.

129 I recommend:

- **Change Policy ENV4 to "*The area...Bosworth parish. Development must respect the distinctive...Area. Development should respect features of landscape importance, safeguard important views, skylines and landmarks and restore or provide equivalent mitigation for landscapes that would be harmed as a result of development.*"**

**Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Woodland, Hedges and Habitat Connectivity**

130 Chapter 15 of the Framework, "*Conserving and enhancing the natural environment,*" requires planning policies to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

*"...minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks..."*

(Paragraph 170, the Framework)

131 Policy ENV5 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity and has regard to national policy.

132 For clarity, I recommend:

- ***Change Policy ENV5 to "Development proposals should safeguard locally significant habitats and species and where possible, should secure net gains for biodiversity. The creation of new habitats for wildlife will be supported.***

***Development proposals that damage or result in the net loss of...possible.***

***Development must respect the wildlife corridor identified on Figure 10. Development affecting this corridor should secure net gains for biodiversity."***

**Policy ENV6: Protection of Important Views**

- 133 As noted earlier in this Report, the Local Plan requires development to safeguard important views (Policy GD5).
- 134 Policy ENV6 identifies important views and provides for their safeguarding, in general conformity with the Local Plan.
- 135 As set out, Policy ENV6 includes a reference to “*significantly harm*” without providing information in respect of how this might be measured. As such, the reference appears vague. The Policy also requires all development proposals to “*include the treatment of views.*” This is a vague requirement which, in addition, does not have regard to Paragraph 44 of the Framework in respect of information requirements.
- 136 Taking the above into account, I recommend:
- **Change Policy ENV6 to “...village. *Development must respect these views and proposals impacting on the views (also listed below) should demonstrate this is achieved. LIST VIEWS 1) TO 7) HERE*”**

**Policy ENV7: Biodiversity Protection in New Development**

137 As set out, Policy ENV7 seeks to place obligations on all forms of development, regardless of the relevant tests set out in Paragraph 56 of the Framework, which requires planning obligations to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

138 It is not clear, in the absence of any information, on what land use planning basis Policy ENV7 seeks to place controls over the use of lighting. For example, most forms of security lighting do not require planning permission. Also, the phrase "*Site and sports facility lighting*" is vague. Further, there is no indication of how light spillage onto the "*canal wildlife corridor*" might be controlled and there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that this part of the Policy is deliverable.

139 I recommend:

- **Change Policy ENV7 to "*The provision of the following will be supported: criteria a) and b) here.*"**
- **Last line of supporting text, change to "*...adversely affect this and is therefore best avoided.*"**

**Policy ENV8: Energy Generation and Conservation**

140 National policy supports the transition to a low carbon future and Paragraph 151 of the Framework states that plans should:

*"...help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat."*

141 Policy ENV8 is generally supportive of low carbon energy solutions, having regard to national policy.

142 The phrase "*environmentally sound*" is unsupported by relevant information and appears vague. The phrase "*does not detract from*" fails to provide for a balanced consideration of benefits and harm and thus places a hurdle in the way of the plan contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.

143 All planning proposals are considered on their merits and the Neighbourhood Plan cannot steer the Local Planning Authority to consider proposals "*favourably*."

144 The supporting text includes statements not supported by evidence.

145 I recommend:

- **Change Policy ENV8 to "*The development of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, and energy storage solutions will be supported, subject to demonstrating respect for local character, including the need to be compatible with the Laughton Hills Landscape Character Area, and demonstrating respect for residential amenity.*"**
- **Second paragraph of supporting text, delete last sentence ("*Any...landscape.*")**
- **Delete last sentence of supporting text ("*Similar...installations.*")**

Community Sustainability

**Policy CFA1: The Retention of Community Facilities and Amenities**

146 Chapter 8 of the Framework, "*Promoting healthy and safe communities,*" recognises the importance of social, recreational and cultural facilities. It states that:

*"...planning policies and decisions should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, public houses and places of worship)"* (Paragraph 92, the Framework)

147 Policy CFA1 seeks to protect community facilities, having regard to Paragraph 92 of the Framework, above.

148 In respect of the opening sentence of the Policy, it is not clear, in the absence of any explanation, what "*development leading to the loss*" might comprise and how a decision maker should interpret this. Also, no detailed information is provided in respect of the requirement for development proposals to take "*full*" account of the needs of people with disabilities and no evidence to demonstrate that this part of the Policy is deliverable.

149 The Policy includes a long list of a wide range of community facilities. Whilst there is little dispute that each of the facilities referred to are important to the community, some comprise private businesses, the loss of which cannot be prevented by the planning system.

150 The Policy includes vague references which detract from its clarity and precise nature.

151 For clarity, I recommend:

- **Change first sentence of Policy CFA1 to "*The loss of community facilities will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that:*"**
- **Change part b) to "*...by the community – such support includes fundraising...*"**

- Delete from end of part c) to end of list of facilities “which complies with...Welford Road allotments” (delete list of facilities)
- Second part of Policy, change a) to “*Respects local character, residential amenity and highway safety; and*”
- Delete part b) (“Will not...catered for;”)
- Change c) to “*Provides safe and convenient access for residents who wish to walk and cycle; and*”
- Change d) to “*Takes into account the needs of people with disabilities.*”



**Policy CFA2: Husbands Bosworth Primary School**

152 Paragraph 94 of the Framework requires a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of communities.

153 Policy CFA2 seeks to provide for the re-siting or extension of the primary school and has regard to this.

154 For clarity, I recommend:

- **Change title of Policy to “*Husbands Bosworth Primary School*” as the Policy does not propose a new school**
- **Change Policy CFA2 to “...it can be demonstrated that: *a) it can be safely accessed, provide for convenient waiting and parking areas and would not result in harm to highway safety; and b) it would not result in the loss of the overall provision of public open space; and c) it would respect local character and residential amenity.*”**

Transport and Roads

**Policy T1: Parking Development**

155 Amongst other things, the provision of safe and convenient parking helps to:

*“...create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles...”*  
(Paragraph 110, the Framework)

156 Policy T1 seeks to ensure that car parking provision is retained and has regard to national policy.

157 As set out, Policy T1's references to *“adversely affect...adverse impact...adequate”* appear subjective and vague and do not provide a decision maker with a clear indication of how to react to a development proposal, having regard to Paragraph 16 of the Framework.

158 The final sentence of the Policy is also imprecise and fails to provide for any degree of policy direction or certainty.

159 I recommend:

- **Change Policy T1 to *“Development proposals that result in the overall loss of public car parking provision in Husbands Bosworth will not be supported.”* (delete rest of Policy)**

**Policy T2: Electric Vehicles**

160 As noted earlier in this Report, national policy promotes a low carbon future. The Neighbourhood Plan considers that supporting the provision of electric vehicles can contribute to this.

161 Policy T2 is prescriptive in requiring 7kW cabling, but provides no evidence to demonstrate why this is the most appropriate way to provide for electric vehicle charging over the whole of the plan period. Technology moves on quickly and the recommendations below take account of the requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

162 The second part of Policy T2 comprises a statement and not a land use planning policy.

163 I recommend:

- **Change Policy T2 to “*New residential development (1 dwelling plus) should provide an electric vehicle charging point or provide the cabling that facilitates the future installation of such.*” (delete rest of Policy)**
- **Add new sentence to end of supporting text “*The Parish Council will seek to encourage the provision of communal electric vehicle charging points.*”**

**Policy T3: Traffic Management**

164 Policy T3 sets out a number of vague statements. There is no substantive evidence to support the contention that there is a *“need to minimise any increase in vehicular traffic.”* Indeed, the Neighbourhood Plan itself seeks to promote the increased use of electric vehicles and provide *“a minimum”* of two parking spaces for 1 bed flats and at least three spaces for larger dwellings.

165 Similarly, there is no evidence to support the contention that all development must be designed to minimise movement. Amongst other things, such an approach would run directly counter to Chapter 8 of the Framework, *“Promoting healthy and safe communities.”* Parts c) and d) of the Policy are not supported by evidence and are worded in ambiguously.

166 I recommend:

- **Change title of Policy from T1 to *“T3: Traffic Management”***
- **Change Policy T3 to: *“Development must provide for safe and secure access and must not result in harm to highway safety. Improvements to public rights of way will be supported.”***

Economy

**Policy EC1: Support for Existing Employment Opportunities**

- 167 Paragraph 83 of the Framework seeks to secure a prosperous rural economy and in seeking to protect existing employment land and buildings, Policy EC1 has regard to this.
- 168 As set out, the Policy is not clear in respect of how the commercial viability of sites might be determined and this is a factor addressed in the recommendations below.
- 169 No information is provided in respect of the difference between “*a strong presumption*” and a presumption and this part of the Policy is unclear.
- 170 The Neighbourhood Plan cannot permit development. The Local Planning Authority with decision making powers is Harborough District Council.
- 171 I recommend:
- ***Change Policy EC1 to “There will be a presumption against...will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that: a) the commercial premises or land has not been in active use for at least 12 months; and b) the commercial premises or land has no potential for reoccupation or redevelopment for employment use as demonstrated through a valuation including evidence of a marketing campaign.”***

**Policy EC2: Support for New Employment Opportunities**

172 Paragraph 83 of the Framework supports:

*"...the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas...the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses; sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside."*

173 Policy EC2 sets out a somewhat confused interpretation of national policy but in general terms, appears to support sustainable economic development.

174 The Policy seeks to introduce an unexplained "*exceptional circumstances*" category. It fails to provide for the balanced consideration of planning proposals through seeking to prevent any development that "*adversely affects*" various things. Parts of the Policy are repetitive and include vague references, including to increased noise and unacceptable traffic movement.

175 No indication is provided of how the prioritisation of brownfield land might work in practice. No evidence has been provided in respect of the availability of brownfield land, nor is any information provided in respect of how a development proposal on greenfield land might be considered. The Policy fails to provide a decision maker with clarity.

176 No indication is provided of why development must be "*well integrated into and complement existing businesses.*" In the absence of evidence to the contrary such a requirement appears outside the realms of land use planning and could severely harm the competitiveness of a business.

177 It is not clear why, or on what basis Policy EC2 seeks to promote new-build employment development on the edge of the village, outside the Settlement Boundary. Such an approach is confusing and unclear as it conflicts with the stated purpose of the Settlement Boundary, as well as with the first part of Policy EC2 itself.

178 I recommend:

- **Change Policy EC2 to "*New employment development should: a) Fall...countryside location; and b) respect local character, residential amenity and highway safety.*" (delete rest of Policy)**

**Policy EC3: Working from Home**

179 Policy EC3 supports home working and in this respect, has regard to the national policy aim of supporting a prosperous rural community.

180 As presented, the Policy is vague in a number of respects, including what a “*small-scale freestanding building*” comprises; what “*unacceptable traffic movements*” and “*appropriate parking provision*” are; what a “*significant and adverse impact*” might be; and why development is only required to respect the host property and not neighbouring buildings.

181 The supporting text refers to Policy E3.

182 I recommend:

- **Change Policy EC3 to “*Proposals that provide for home office or light industrial use will be supported, subject to respecting local character, residential amenity and highway safety.*”**
- **Delete second paragraph of supporting text and replace with “*Policy EC3 seeks to support the creation of a prosperous rural community by supporting new enterprises, including home run businesses.*”**
- **Change third paragraph to “Policy EC3...”**

**Policy EC4: Farm Diversification**

*(NB, referred to in Submission version as "Policy E4")*

183 As noted above, national policy affords specific support to farm diversification and Policy EC4 has regard to this.

184 For clarity, I recommend:

- **Change title of Policy to "EC4: Farm Diversification"**
- **Change Policy EC4 to "...rural location; and a) ...; and b) ...; and c) *The development respects any archaeological...; and d) *The proposal does not harm highway safety; and e) *The proposal respects residential amenity and does not increase flood risk on site or elsewhere.*****



**Policy EC5: Broadband and Mobile Phone Provision**

(NB, referred to in Submission version as "Policy E4")

185 Chapter 10 of the Framework, "*Supporting high quality communications,*" recognises that:

*"...high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being."*

(Paragraph 112, the Framework)

186 Policy EC5 supports the provision of communications infrastructure and in this way, has regard to national policy.

187 Technology changes and given the plan period, it is important that Policy EC5 provides for this, thus enabling the Policy to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

188 Communications infrastructure serves everyone, not just businesses and properties and subject to being sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate, needs to be located to meet needs.

189 The final part of Policy EC5 is not supported by any evidence in respect of deliverability and places a requirement on all forms of development without regard to Paragraph 56 of the Framework.

190 I recommend:

- **Change title of Policy to "*EC5: Farm Diversification*"**
- **Change Policy EC5 to "*...broadband service and improve the communications network, including mobile telecommunications, will be supported. This may...which should be sympathetically designed to integrate into the landscape.*" (Delete rest of Policy)**

## **8. The Neighbourhood Plan: Other Matters**

191 The recommendations made in this Report will also have a subsequent impact on Contents, including Policy, Figure and page numbering.

192 I recommend:

- **Update the Contents and where necessary, Policy, Figure and page numbering, to take into account the recommendations contained in this Report**

## 9. Referendum

193 I recommend to Harborough District Council that, subject to the recommended modifications, **the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a Referendum.**

### Referendum Area

- 194 I am required to consider whether the Referendum Area should be extended beyond the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area.
- 195 I consider the Neighbourhood Area to be appropriate and there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that this is not the case.
- 196 Consequently, I recommend that the Plan should proceed to a Referendum based on the Husbands Bosworth Neighbourhood Area approved by Harborough District Council on the 25<sup>th</sup> April 2017.

**Nigel McGurk, February 2020**  
**Erimax – Land, Planning and Communities**

