

## Misterton with Walcote Neighbourhood Plan

### Summary of representations submitted by Harborough District Council to the independent examiner pursuant to Regulation 17 of Part 5 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

	Name	Policy /Page	Full Representation
1	Anglian Water, Thorpe Wood House, Thorpe Wood, Peterborough Cambridgeshire. PE3 6WT		Misterton with Walcote Parish is located outside of our area of responsibility. The views of Severn Trent who provide water and wastewater services should be sought on the neighbourhood plan.
2	Resident Lutterworth LE17 4HP	P30  p33 (map), p14 (map), p19-21	<p>On page 30 1026 is called Misterton Churchyard and Meadows as part of local Green Space. The area shown is two fields to the N of the churchyard, across one of which runs a footpath. While the footpath (across one field) passes through this 'space', both fields are organically farmed and in environmental programmes. Both these aspects of land use are not compatible with access by people and/or dogs going off the footpath and it is therefore important that the definition of Green Space is properly understood</p> <p>To the West of 1106 and to the South of 1105 is the small 'Bufton field' (approx 2ha). What was once its most Eastern corner is now the Walcote 'Bufton play area'. This well-defined area adjoining Walcote would be suitable for sympathetic residential development in line with the policies set out in pages 19-21 and in harmony with the surrounding land uses. Consideration should therefore be given to including this space within the Walcote Revised Limits to Development boundary</p>
3	Harborough District Council - Planning Policy	Page 7: 2nd para  Page 19: Policy HBE2	<p>Over the Local Plan period the SDA is to deliver 1,260 homes with the rest of the 2,750 to be delivered after 2031.</p> <p>Criterion j: Refers to 'land designated by LCC as a Country Park in the SDA'. Designated is probably not the appropriate word to use- 'proposed' or 'indicated'</p>

		<p>Criterion j.</p> <p>Page 21: Policy HBE4</p> <p>Page 22: Policy HBE5</p> <p>Page 24: Policy HBE 6</p> <p>Page 33: Policy ENV3</p> <p>Policy ENV 7</p> <p>Page 43: Policy CF1</p> <p>Page 43 Policy CFA2</p>	<p>Definition of small has the potential for not making best use of sites that become available.</p> <p>What is meant by small sites?</p> <p>How is the market housing going to be prioritised in perpetuity for people with a local connection?</p> <p>Criterion E: Should 'provision made for the upkeep' only refer to new grass areas – is it not open space more generally?</p> <p>Criterion F: 'New development should incorporate.....' rather than 'Applications'.</p> <p>Policy needs to refer to map of the sites and it would be helpful if the boundaries could be seen in greater detail than currently shown in Figure 7.</p> <p>Key should make it clear that the amber sites are designated in Local Plan.</p> <p>Second sentence of the policy is not clear. Significantly harm is not defined. Suggest development should respect these views and any proposals impacting on the views should demonstrate how this is achieved.</p> <p>Policy should be CFA1 (not CF1) to reflect subsequent policy numbering.</p> <p>Should be an 'and' after criterion c) to ensure proposals meet all criteria.</p>
	<b>Harborough District Council Conservation Officer</b>		<p>I would suggest that consideration be given to the importance of the group value of entries 19 (Misterton Hall) and 20 (The Old Rectory) in the list of non-designated heritage assets. Group value provides recognition of the entire group, rather than considering part of the group devoid of context. Both of these entries have stated group value as 'not applicable' yet comments in other areas indicate such value. For example, in the case of the Old Rectory whilst the Grade II* Church of St Leonard is noted in the 'historical association' and the 'designed landscape' sections there is no recognition of the group value between the Old Rectory and the Church of St Leonard.</p>
	<b>Harborough District Council S106 Officer</b>		<p><b>Misterton with Walcote Neighbourhood Plan Examination – Public Examination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of a section on developer contributions on page 51 is welcomed in principle.</li> <li>• It is appropriate that a Neighbourhood Plan recognises the importance of a policy/section about developer</li> </ul>

		<p>contributions and that new development can bring significant benefits for a local community, for example, new homes and jobs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S106 planning obligations have generally been used to secure infrastructure or funding from a developer to mitigate the negative impacts of a new development, towards local services and infrastructure and affordable housing where appropriate;</li> <li>• Planning obligations must meet the three tests as outlined in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended) – it is noted that the first paragraph of the developer contributions section includes a description of the three test;</li> <li>• The second paragraph of the developer contributions section might require an update as the CIL charge regime is no longer a new system as it was introduced by the Planning Act 2008 and it came into force on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2010. The CIL is a means for local authorities in England and Wales to help deliver infrastructure to support new development in their area.</li> <li>• To date, Harborough District Council has not introduced a CIL charge in the Borough. This however is being kept under review in conjunction with partner authorities across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area.</li> <li>• Recently, the Government published its White Paper <i>The Future of Planning</i> and Pillar 3 proposes changes to the planning obligations regime by the replacement of the S106 planning obligations and CIL with a combined Infrastructure Levy (IL);</li> <li>• <u>Please note the IL, is at this time is only a proposal, however if it was to be adopted and introduced a proportion of the IL would be similarly devolved to a Parish Council for neighbourhood priorities. If the proposed IL was introduced, the proportion would be set at 25%, in an area where there is a Neighbourhood Plan adopted.</u></li> <li>• It is important the Neighbourhood Plan policies including the references to planning obligations policies and the priority projects should be consistent with the Local Plan.</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>Highways England Stirling House Lakeside Court, Osier Drive Annesley NG15 0DS</b></p>	<p><b>Consultation on the Submission Version of the Misterton with Walcote Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Submission Version of the Misterton with Walcote Neighbourhood Plan which has been produced for public consultation and covers the Plan period 2019 to 2031. The document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications.</p> <p>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 Misterton with Walcote Parish Neighbourhood Plan, our principal interest is in safeguarding the M1 Motorway routeing adjacent to the plan area and the A5 Trunk Road and M6 Motorway routing approximately 3 miles away.</p> <p>We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning</p>

		<p>policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for Misterton with Walcote Parish is required to be in conformity with the adopted Harborough Local Plan (2011-2031) and this is acknowledged within the document.</p> <p>We understand that Misterton and Walcote are classified as “rural villages” within the Harborough Local Plan and as such there is no specific housing requirement for the Parish. This is reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan, which wishes to retain the former limits to development, allowing further development only where the proposal meets the criteria set out in the policy section on windfall sites and, outside those limits, where the terms of the rural exception policy can be met.</p> <p>We also note that, as mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan, a significant portion of the East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area (SDA) falls within the plan area. The impacts of this site on the nearby SRN are being assessed and managed through the development management process, as part of planning application ref. 19/00250/OUT. As mentioned during the pre-submission consultation, due to the small scale of the additional development growth being proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan, it is not considered that there will be further impacts on the operation of the SRN in the area.</p> <p>We therefore have no further comments to provide and trust the above is useful in the progression of the Misterton with Walcote Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
5	<p><b>Leicestershire County Council,</b>  <b>County Hall</b>  <b>Glenfield</b>  <b>Leicester</b>  <b>E:</b>  <a href="mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@leics.gov.uk">neighbourhoodplanning@leics.gov.uk</a></p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council is supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process and welcome being included in this consultation.</p> <p><b>Highways</b>  <b>Specific Comments</b></p> <p><b>General Comments</b>  The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth.</p> <p>Like very many local authorities, the County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding.</p> <p>To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems. Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be</p>

		<p>maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provided as a commuted sum.</p> <p>In regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped ie they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p> <p>The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third-party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third-party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk Management</b></p> <p>The County Council are fully aware of flooding that has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding, review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a statutory consultee on major planning applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure that the onsite drainage systems are designed in accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage solution.</p> <p>The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Require development to resolve existing flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

		<p>All development will be required to restrict the discharge and retain surface water on site in line with current government policies. This should be undertaken through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites when considering the housing density to ensure that the potential site will not limit the ability for good SuDS design to be carried out. Consideration should also be given to blue green corridors and how they could be used to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, including benefits to surrounding areas.</p> <p>Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.</p> <p>LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies. For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning Practice Guidance webpage. Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals. Risk of flooding from surface water map: <a href="https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map">https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</a> Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): <a href="https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/">https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</a></p> <p><b>Highway Development Management</b>  Accesses have been designed and submitted in support of the planning application. The planning application now benefits from a resolution to permit.</p> <p>Assessment of the impact of the SDA through the planning application process did not identify any need for off-site mitigation in these locations.</p> <p><b>Traffic and Signals</b>  Leicestershire County Council will continue to work with the local planning authority regarding development within the parish to support sustainable growth and seek mitigation where development impacts upon the highway network.</p> <p>Local roads outside of the strategic road network benefit from an area wide prohibition of goods vehicles greater than 7.5T GVW, a legally enforceable TRO restricts access to HGV's unless they have legitimate access needs, for example delivering goods to local premises.  Traffic calming features and other measures have previously been deployed in the local area; it is unlikely that further measures would be funded by the County Council; the full whole life costs of any additional measures would need to be funded by the Parish Council or third-party contributions in their entirety.</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council is committed to the promotion of sustainable transport and will work with local communities and</p>
--	--	---

		<p>other third parties to improve existing provision where opportunities arise. The parish must be fully aware of the costs associated with provision of new footpaths / cycleways as this would need to be fully funded by a third party and not LCC.</p> <p>LCC would have to establish if there is an actual speeding problem through speed survey data. The management of local speed limits would have to be assessed to ensure the correct limit is in place for that location. This assessment alongside liaison with Leicestershire Police would ensure that limit set would also have a high driver compliance level. The assessment would take into account the current driver compliance with the current speed limit, the class of road, the type of road, the physical environment (including direct frontages), the interaction between all road users and the accident record.</p> <p><b>Planning</b>  <b>Developer Contributions</b>  If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Adopted North Kilworth NP and the Adopted Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances of your community. This would in general be consistent with the relevant District Council's local plan or its policy on planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of new development and enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations, where applicable.  North Kilworth Adopted Plan  Great Glen Adopted Plan</p> <p><b>Mineral &amp; Waste Planning</b>  The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development.</p> <p>Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood.</p> <p>You should also be aware of Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan. These safeguarding areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect minerals resources or waste operations. There is one Sand and Gravel Mineral Consultation Area (MCA) located within your NDP area. The County Council can provide guidance on this if your neighbourhood plan is allocating development in these areas or if any proposed neighbourhood plan policies may impact on minerals and waste provision.</p> <p><b>Property Education</b>  Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two-mile (primary) and three-mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school.</p> <p>However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one. Strategic Property Services No comment at this time.</p> <p><b>Adult Social Care</b></p> <p>It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and that development seeks to include bungalows etc of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.</p> <p><b>Environment</b></p> <p><b>Specific Comments</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A well thought out, strong plan. No additional comments to make at this time.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>With regard to the environment and in line with Government advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of the natural environment including climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land.</p> <p><b>Climate Change</b></p> <p>The County Council through its Environment Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire's resilience to the existing and predicted changes in climate. Furthermore, LCC has declared a climate emergency along with most other UK councils. The County Council has committed to becoming carbon neutral as a council by 2030 and to working with others to keep global temperature rise to less than 1.5 degrees Celsius, which will mean in effect needing to achieve carbon neutrality for Leicestershire by 2050 or before. Planning is one of the key levers for enabling these commitments to be met and to meeting the legally binding target set by the government for the UK to be carbon neutral by 2050. Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and to increasing the county's resilience to climate change.</p> <p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p>The County Council would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account Natural England's Landscape character areas; Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy; the Local District/Borough Council landscape character assessments and the Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study for Leicester and Leicestershire (2017) which examines the sensitivity of the landscape, exploring the extent to which different areas can accommodate development without impacting on their key landscape qualities. We would recommend that Neighbourhood Plans should also consider the street scene and public realm within their communities, further advice can be found in the latest 'Streets for All East Midlands' Advisory Document (2006) published by English Heritage.</p>
--	--	---



		<p>LCC would encourage the development of local listings as per the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and LCC have some data on the social, cultural, archaeological and historic value of local features and buildings (<a href="https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record">https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record</a> )</p> <p><b>Biodiversity</b></p> <p>The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, providing net gain for biodiversity, and reducing pollution. Neighbourhood Plans should therefore seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver a strategic approach to protecting and improving the natural environment based on local evidence and priorities. Each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential development or management of open spaces on enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity, such as hedgerows and greenways. Also, habitat permeability for habitats and species which addresses encouragement of movement from one location to another such as the design of street lighting, roads, noise, obstructions in water, exposure of species to predation and arrangement of land-uses.</p> <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of protected and priority Biodiversity Action Plan species.</p> <p>These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent Habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme.</p> <p>Contact: <a href="mailto:planningecology@leics.gov.uk">planningecology@leics.gov.uk</a> , or phone 0116 305 4108</p> <p><b>Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Green infrastructure (GI) is a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities, (NPPF definition). As a network, GI includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/churchyards allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls.</p> <p>The NPPF places the duty on local authorities to plan positively for a strategic network of GI which can deliver a range of planning policies including: building a strong, competitive economy; creating a sense of place and promote good design; promoting healthier communities by providing greater opportunities for recreation and mental and physical health benefits; meeting the challenges of climate change and flood risk; increasing biodiversity and conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Looking at the existing provision of GI networks within a community can influence the plan for creating &amp;</p>
--	--	--

		<p>enhancing new networks and this assessment can then be used to inform CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedules, enabling communities to potentially benefit from this source of funding.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and in doing so they should ensure that their Neighbourhood Plan is reflective of the relevant Local Authority Green Infrastructure strategy. Through the Neighbourhood Plan and discussions with the Local Authority Planning teams and potential Developers communities are well placed to influence the delivery of local scale GI networks.</p> <p><b>Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land</b></p> <p>The NPPF encourages the effective use of brownfield land for development, provided that it is not of high environmental/ecological value. Neighbourhood planning groups should check with Defra if their neighbourhood planning area includes brownfield sites. Where information is lacking as to the ecological value of these sites then the Neighbourhood Plan could include policies that ensure such survey work should be carried out to assess the ecological value of a brownfield site before development decisions are taken.</p> <p>Soils are an essential finite resource on which important ecosystem services such as food production, are dependent on. They should be enhanced in value and protected from adverse effects of unacceptable levels of pollution. Within the governments “Safeguarding our Soils” strategy, Defra have produced a code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites which could be helpful to neighbourhood planning groups in preparing environmental policies.</p> <p>High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification.</p> <p><b>Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs)</b></p> <p>Information for Neighbourhood Planning groups regarding Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) can be found on the Neighbourhood Planning website (<a href="http://www.neighbourhoodplanning.org">www.neighbourhoodplanning.org</a>) and should be referred to. As taken from the website, a Neighbourhood Plan must meet certain basic conditions in order to be ‘made’. It must not breach and be otherwise compatible with EU obligations. One of these obligations is Directive 2001/42/EC ‘on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment’ (Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations, 2004, available online). This is often referred to as the SEA Directive. Not every Neighbourhood Plan needs a SEA, however, it is compulsory to provide when submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A statement of reasons as to why SEA was not required</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> An environmental report (a key output of the SEA process).</li> </ul> <p>As the UK prepares to leave the EU in 2020, Neighbourhood Planning groups should remain mindful of any future changes which may occur to the above guidance.</p>
--	--	---

		<p><b>Impact of Development on Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC)</b>  Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and Leicestershire County Council. The County's Waste Management team considers proposed developments on a case by case basis and when it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the local HWRC infrastructure then appropriate projects to increase the capacity to off-set the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire's Planning Obligations Policy and the relevant Legislation Regulations.</p> <p><b>Communities</b>  Consideration of community facilities is a positive facet of Neighbourhood Plans that reflects the importance of these facilities within communities and can proactively protect and develop facilities to meet the needs of people in local communities. Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Carry out and report on a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community.</li> <li>2. Set out policies that seek to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protect and retain these existing facilities, • support the independent development of new facilities, and, • identify and protect Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Identify and support potential community projects that could be progressed.</li> </ol> <p>You are encouraged to consider and respond to all aspects of community resources as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. Further information, guidance and examples of policies and supporting information is available at <a href="http://www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/useful-information">www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/useful-information</a>.</p> <p><b>Economic Development</b>  We would recommend including economic development aspirations with your Plan, outlining what the community currently values and whether they are open to new development of small businesses etc.</p> <p><b>Superfast Broadband</b>  High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a superfast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life. All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to ultrafast broadband (of at least 100Mbps). Developers should take active steps to incorporate adequate broadband provision at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure ultrafast broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete. Where practical, developers should consider engaging several telecoms providers to encourage competition and consumer choice.</p> <p><b>Equalities</b>  While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council's Equality Strategy 2016-2020 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work. A copy of the strategy can be view at: <a href="http://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality-strategy2016-2020.pdf">www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality-strategy2016-2020.pdf</a></p>
--	--	---

6	Resident Walcote Lutterworth LE17 4JR	Page 33  Policy ENV 3  POLICY ENV 4 NON- DESIGNA TED LOCAL HERITAG E ASSETS	<p>We need to protect the current Open Spaces, Sports and Recreation Sites within the village. Included are two areas that are key to the village which have not been identified in the plan. Both sites are within the village redline and which provide valuable wildlife and open space which should be protected.</p> <p>1104 Open space (paddock) between Chapel Lane and footpath Y98 should be extended down to the road at Brook Street. This open space / spinney provides valuable environmental habitats for wildlife within the village.</p> <p>There is no other wildlife site within the village redline boundary.</p> <p>The spinney opposite Hall Cottage, Brook Street if developed will have a detrimental impact on the nature of Hall Cottage, both from a parking and vehicle movement perspective and also visually on this historic part of the village. Cars park on the pavement and also can create issues for Emergency vehicles</p> <p>Comments submitted for pre-submission consultation – submitted again at Regulation 16</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="622 783 1413 1054"> <tr><td><b>Title</b></td><td>Mr</td></tr> <tr><td><b>First name</b></td><td>Adrian</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Last name</b></td><td>Lott</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Job title (if applicable)</b></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><b>Organisation (if applicable)</b></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><b>Representing (if applicable)</b></td><td>Adrian and Amanda Lott.</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Address</b></td><td>Walcote House, 38 Brook Street, <u>Walcote</u>.</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Post Code</b></td><td>LE17 4JR</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Telephone</b></td><td>07973677506</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Email</b></td><td>Adrian.cp.lott@gmail.com</td></tr> </table>	<b>Title</b>	Mr	<b>First name</b>	Adrian	<b>Last name</b>	Lott	<b>Job title (if applicable)</b>		<b>Organisation (if applicable)</b>		<b>Representing (if applicable)</b>	Adrian and Amanda Lott.	<b>Address</b>	Walcote House, 38 Brook Street, <u>Walcote</u> .	<b>Post Code</b>	LE17 4JR	<b>Telephone</b>	07973677506	<b>Email</b>	Adrian.cp.lott@gmail.com
<b>Title</b>	Mr																						
<b>First name</b>	Adrian																						
<b>Last name</b>	Lott																						
<b>Job title (if applicable)</b>																							
<b>Organisation (if applicable)</b>																							
<b>Representing (if applicable)</b>	Adrian and Amanda Lott.																						
<b>Address</b>	Walcote House, 38 Brook Street, <u>Walcote</u> .																						
<b>Post Code</b>	LE17 4JR																						
<b>Telephone</b>	07973677506																						
<b>Email</b>	Adrian.cp.lott@gmail.com																						

**SECTION 2: Representation**  
Where possible, please indicate to which part of the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan each comment relates.

Please provide your COMMENTS below and use an extra sheet if necessary.

Paragraph number & Page number in Plan:	Your comments:
Page 33	We need to protect the current Open Spaces, Sports and Recreation Sites within the village. Included are two areas that are key to the village which have not been identified in the plan. Both sites are within the village redline and which provide valuable wildlife and open space which should be protected.
Policy Reference Number: We would welcome your comments on the	We would welcome your comments on the policies:
POLICY ENV 3.	1104 Open space (paddock) between Chapel Lane and footpath Y98 should be extended down to the road at Brook Street. This open space / spinney provides valuable environmental habitats for wildlife within the village.  There is no other wildlife site within the village redline boundary.
POLICY ENV 4 NON-DESIGNATED LOCAL HERITAGE ASSETS	The spinney opposite Hall Cottage, Brook Street if developed will have a detrimental impact on the nature of Hall Cottage, both from a parking and vehicle movement perspective and also visually on this historic part of the village.
<b>General comments about the plan:</b>	
The plan is very comprehensive and well thought-out. However, there is a lack of sites within the village redline which have an environmental and wildlife habitat.  The "Spinney" down Brook Street has recently been increased in size which could lead to the potential for development. This would significantly increase traffic in the village and increase parking issues down Brook Street, which are already a significant concern both for the residents, but also for the emergency services and Seven Trent Water whom have to have 2hr access the Water Works.  Additional houses here would lead to a loss of wildlife habitat that the village does not have anywhere else within the village redline.	
Date:	11 <sup>th</sup> April 2020

If you would like to be kept updated on progress with the development of the Neighbourhood Plan please indicate here by deleting Yes or No as appropriate:

Yes



7	<b>Natural England Hornbeam House Crewe Business Park Electra Way Crewe Cheshire CW1 6GJ</b>		<b>Misterton with Walcote Neighbourhood Plan - Examination</b> Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 26 August 2020 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. 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. <b>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this neighbourhood plan examination.</b> For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.
8	<b>Environment Adviser NFU East Midlands Region Agriculture House North Gate Uppingham Rutland</b>	Policy HBE5 Page 22  Policy ENV6 Page 37.  Policy ENV 8 Page 40  Policy CFA2 Page 43  Policy BE4 Page 49  Policy BE5 Page 50	Does this policy allow for agricultural dwellings to be build in or around farmsteads to house agricultural workers and family members coming into the business? Please can it be more explicit on this.  Wildlife corridors and connectivity. How have these been developed and what evidence base was used? Have farmers and landowners been consulted on this policy as their co-operation will help make it a reality and is therefore important. Schemes currently being developed to provide payments for public goods (ELMS – Defra Environmental Land Management Scheme in development) may be relevant as they come on stream – 2024 onwards  The preamble for this policy talks about wind turbine and solar arrays appropriately scaled and sited will be considered. Should this be included in the wording of Policy ENV 8. Farming is well placed to host renewable energy projects and that is a fundamental part of how the industry will achieve net zero. A third of farm businesses in England are now involved in renewable energy and that is set to increase as we seek to combat and mitigate climate change.  Support for a farm shop in the village is welcomed and will support more local supply chains.  Farm diversification. This is welcomed as a very supportive policy.  This is welcomed. Good connectivity will be particularly important for farm businesses going forward as digital and big data handling grow
9	<b>Sport England Planning</b>		Sport England does not wish to make any detailed comments but would support the initiatives on cycling and policy ENV3

10	<b>Manager</b> <b>Severn Trent Water</b>	Policy HBE6	<p><b>Misterton with Walcote Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation</b></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation on the submission version of the Misterton with Walcote Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles within the neighbourhood plan, however there are a few amendments that we would recommend assisting with delivery of the plan's objectives and delivering wider benefits.</p> <p>Policy HBE 6: Design Standards</p> <p>Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within Policy HBE 6, but would recommend that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bullet point D also reference the need to follow the principles of the drainage hierarchy (planning practice Guidance paragraph 80) to ensure that surface water is managed and discharged in the most sustainable way.</li> <li>• Bullet point E, whilst supporting the protection of hedges and trees for biodiversity we would also highlight the importance of local watercourses for local ecology and biodiversity. Watercourses are also key features for managing surface water sustainably.</li> <li>• Bullet point F(5), we are supportive of the inclusion of a reference to water efficiency, but would note that without a standard the delivery of this objectives is likely to be missed. We would therefore recommend that the optional Water efficiency target from building regulations part M is provided to clarify expectations on the developer.</li> <li>• Bullet point F(6), we are supportive of the need for development to incorporate SuDS and that SuDS should be designed to incorporate biodiversity and amenity benefits along site water quantity and quality. However, SuDS should be designed such that they operate for the who life of the development, including the biodiversity benefits. It is therefore recommended that the reference to at least 10 years is removed. Whilst an alternative funding mechanism might be needed for the longer-term maintenance, the schedule should highlight the types of task and frequency needed to retain the benefits in perpetuity. Further guidance on why the issues raise above are important are provided below along with some example wording that we hope may assist you with the delivery of these recommendations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Water Efficiency Target</b></p> <p>Whilst the protection of sources of water is important it is also important that new development considered how water will be utilised within the home. By reducing the amount of water utilised development can reduce its impact on the sewerage network, reduce the quantity of water needing treatment for consumption and reduce the quantity of wastewater requiring treat. This will have positive impacts on the environment and result in more sustainable development that is more resilient to the impacts of climate change. Building regulations already highlight the need for water efficient design. To ensure that the design element is considered from the outset of design it is recommended that Policy RO4 specifies water efficiency. Some example wording is provided below to assist with implementation of our request.</p> <p>All development proposals should demonstrate that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day.</p> <p>The implementation of water re-use technology could also help to reduce the need for water, providing additional benefits to both water supply resilience and Sewerage resilience.</p> <p>All Development should demonstrate that unless not reasonably practicable the site designs have included water re-use measures.</p> <p><b>Drainage Hierarchy</b></p>
----	---	----------------	--



		<p>The management of surface water is a key element in delivering new development without increasing flood risk on or off site. Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80 provides a priority system that new development should follow to ensure that surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall. Severn Trent would recommend that this is highlighted within the design policy. Some example wording is provided below to assist in the interpretation of this request.</p> <p>All applications for new development shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, in such that a discharge to the public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80 (Reference ID: 7-080-20150323) states:  “Generally the aim should be to discharge surface water run off as high up the following hierarchy of drainage options as reasonably practicable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. into the ground (infiltration);</li> <li>2. to a surface water body;</li> <li>3. to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;</li> <li>4. to a combined sewer.”</li> </ol> <p><b>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)</b></p> <p>Whilst Severn Trent recognise that the Lead Local Flood Authority are the Statutory Consultee for surface water management, and would advise that they are consulted on any policy wording regarding SuDS of surface water management, We would advise that SuDS are included as a design requirement. It is recommended that SuDS are designed in accordance with industry best practice, currently CIRIA C753 The SuDS Manual, which advises that SuDS are designed to provide multiple benefits. We would therefore recommend that SuDs are covered in Policy RO4 including words to the effect of:  All major developments shall ensure that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off are put in place unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.</p> <p>All schemes for the inclusions of SuDS should demonstrate they have considered all four aspects of good SuDS design, Quantity, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity, and the SuDS and development will fit into the existing landscape. The completed SuDS schemes should be accompanied by a maintenance schedule detailing maintenance boundaries, responsible parties and arrangements to ensure that the SuDS are maintained in perpetuity.</p> <p>Where possible, all non-major development should look to incorporate these same SuDS principles into their designs. The supporting text for the policy should also include:  Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be designed in accordance with current industry best practice, The SuDS Manual, CIRIA (C753), to ensure that the systems deliver both the surface water quantity and the wider benefits, without significantly increasing costs. Good SuDS design can be key for creating a strong sense of place and pride in the community for where they live, work and visit, making the surface water management features as much a part of the development as the buildings and roads.</p> <p><b>Protection of Existing Watercourses</b></p> <p>Whilst Watercourses are outside of Severn Trent’s operational scope, however we understand the importance of these local assets in such that they convey water through the landscape safely, maintaining the flow of water away from building under normal flow conditions. A watercourse will contain an abstraction point, (this may not be close to the site location) so that it</p>
--	--	---

			<p>can be used by a utility provider to supply water for consumption following appropriate treatment. They are essential for enabling sustainable outfalls to be utilised reducing the need to accommodate surface water within the sewerage systems enhancing the resilience of the sewerage system to climate change. Watercourses are a vital natural resource for the environment, both flora and fauna, and should also be protected to ensure that existing habitats are not adversely effect. No development shall prevent the continuation of existing natural or manmade drainage features, where watercourses or dry ditches are present within a development site, these should be retained and where possible enhanced. Access to drainage features for maintenance should be retained and ownership of land clearly defined as part of the overall site maintenance plan.</p> <p>Prior to the alteration of any alignment an assessment will be required to ensure that all connections into the watercourse are retained and that exceedance flows are not then directed away from the watercourse channel towards properties.</p> <p>The supporting text for the policy should also include:</p> <p>The removal of watercourses and ditches from development sites, presents a risk for future growth and development in such that links to the natural water cycle can be removed resulting in a potential increase of on site and off site flood risk. The removal of these features would result in an increased need to connect surface water to the sewerage network, as identified above this is against the drainage hierarchy outline in the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Policy ENV 1: Protection of Local Green Space  Severn Trent understand the need for Local Green Space and the need for them to be protected, however local green spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes like flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation can result in additional benefits to the local green space in the form of biodiversity or amenity improvements. We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy ENV 1  <i>Development of flood resilience schemes within local green spaces will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the green space.</i></p> <p>Policy ENV 2: Protection of Site of Environmental Significance  Severn Trent understand the need for Site of Environmental Significance and the need for them to be protected, however Site of Environmental Significance can provide suitable locations for schemes like flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the environmental significance of the site. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation can result in additional benefits to the local green space in the form of enhanced biodiversity or amenity improvements. We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy ENV 2  <i>Development of flood resilience schemes within Site of Environmental Significance will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the environmental importance of the site.</i></p> <p>Policy ENV 3: Open Spaces, Sporting and Recreation sites  Severn Trent understand the need for Open Spaces, Sporting and Recreation sites and the need for them to be protected, however Open Spaces, Sporting and Recreation sites can provide suitable locations for schemes like flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation can result in additional benefits to the Open Spaces and Recreation sites in the form of biodiversity or amenity</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Policy ENV 6</p>	<p>improvements. We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy ENV 3 <i>Development of flood resilience schemes within Open Spaces, Sporting and Recreation sites will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the open space.</i></p> <p>Policy ENV 6: Biodiveristy, Woodland, Hedges and Habitat connectivity Severn Trent would highlight the importance of watercourse of habitat connectivity and sustainable space management. These features are vital assets for wildlife and ecology. We would therefore recommend that watercourses are also referenced within Policy ENV 6.</p> <p>For your information we have set out some general guidelines that may be useful to you.</p> <p><b>Position Statement</b> As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills.</p> <p><b>Sewage Strategy</b> Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works.</p> <p><b>Surface Water and Sewer Flooding</b> We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government’s Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer. We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers. To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. More details can be found on our website <a href="https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/">https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</a></p>
--	--	---------------------	---

		<p><b>Water Quality</b>  Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of good quality drinking water. We work closely with the Environment Agency and local farmers to ensure that water quality of supplies are not impacted by our or others operations. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit as prepared by the Environment Agency.</p> <p><b>Water Supply</b>  When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts.  We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands.</p> <p><b>Water Efficiency</b>  Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day. We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations.  We recommend that in all cases you consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres.</li> <li>• Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute.</li> <li>• Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres or less.</li> <li>• Water butts for external use in properties with gardens.</li> </ul> <p>To further encourage developers to act sustainably Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. More details can be found on our website  <a href="https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/">https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</a>  We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day.</p>
11.	<p><b>Marrons Planning On Behalf of Leicestershire County Council in its capacity as a Landowner.</b></p>	<p>1.1 These representations are made in respect of the Misterton with Walcote Parish Neighbourhood Plan Submission Draft (the Neighbourhood Plan) on behalf of Leicestershire County Council in relation to its interests in the Neighbourhood Plan area as landowner of the East of Lutterworth Strategic Development Area (SDA) and its wider land interests. In July 2020 Harborough District Council resolved to grant planning permission, subject the signing of a Section 106 agreement for the development of the East of Lutterworth SDA<sup>1</sup>.  <sup>1</sup> Ref 19/0250/OUT - Planning applications documents can be found here:  <a href="https://pa2.harborough.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=PMWU02HW06O00">https://pa2.harborough.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=PMWU02HW06O00</a></p> <p>1.2 The Neighbourhood Plan recognises the strategic importance of the East of Lutterworth SDA to the successful delivery of</p>

	<p><b>Contact: Marrons Planning, Bridgeway House, Bridgeway, Stratford upon Avon CV37 6YX</b></p>	<p><b>Policy HBE 2</b></p>	<p>the recently adopted Harborough Local Plan, 2011 – 2031 (the Local Plan). It is also recognised that the Neighbourhood Plan should be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure the integrity of the two settlements within the parish of Misterton and Walcote as separate identities and maintain effective visual separation from the SDA.</p> <p>1.3 <b>Policy HBE 2</b> of the Neighbourhood Plan is concerned with the SDA. The following comments are made in relation to the policy criteria:</p> <p>a) In relation to criterion a), Policy L1 of the Local Plan requires the SDA to provide for structural landscaping on the southern boundary; the provision of a community park and the protection of the setting of the listed church of St Leonard's at Misterton. It is not necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to repeat the requirements of the Local Plan. It should be noted that the submitted planning application provides for an area of separation between the proposed built development and Misterton, in accordance with L1, thereby protecting the setting and integrity of Misterton village.</p> <p>Highway criteria (b to f)</p> <p>The Transport Assessment submitted with the current planning application includes detailed mitigation measures that will be implemented as part of the development scheme fully addresses all highways issues to the satisfaction of Highways England and the Local Highway Authorities (as confirmed in their respective earlier consultation responses), including the need for a robust network of cycle and footpaths to provide connectivity between Lutterworth, the SDA and the wider area. In addition, the following comments are made to the following criteria:</p> <p>b) Policy L1 of the Local Plan requires access into the SDA from both the north and south of the A4304. The proposals in the submitted planning application have taken into account existing traffic travelling on the A4304, its projected increase during the development of the SDA and traffic from the SDA itself, to ensure that traffic in the area as a whole can be accommodated.</p> <p>c) Policy L1 sets out a series of highway mitigation measures required by HE and the LHA necessary for the SDA. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that mitigation is necessary where traffic to be generated by the development would otherwise result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.</p> <p>Environmental criteria (g to i)</p> <p>Local Plan policy L1 was developed in consultation with Historic England, Natural England and other stakeholders. The current planning application addresses environmental considerations in accordance with L1 through the proposed Parameters Plan and measures can be secured by appropriately worded conditions and section 106 obligations. The extent of appropriate buffering will be dealt with at the detailed application and/or condition discharge stage.</p> <p>Country Park</p> <p>j) Policy L1 requires a <i>community park</i> to be provided for within the SDA. The current planning application proposes the Swift Valley Community Park within the development boundary. However, it is considered inappropriate to extend the area of the</p>
--	---	--------------------------------	---

		<p><b>Policy HBE 3</b></p> <p><b>Policy HBE 6</b></p> <p><b>Policy ENV 1</b></p> <p><b>Policy</b></p>	<p>country park beyond the limits of the SDA due to the potential damage to valuable ecological assets and disturbance to farm stock that could occur as a consequence of giving full public access beyond the SDA. It is not a proposal that can be implemented by the SDA in and of itself due to the issue of third party land ownerships nor is it necessary for the SDA. It is recognised that affording some protection to the land to the east of the SDA boundary would fulfil a number of important functions by protecting potentially important ecological, heritage and landscape features in addition to providing a greater area of separation between the SDA and neighbouring communities. Yet, the benefit to be derived from such an area of landscape and biodiversity importance has been compromised by the exclusion, within the current version of the plan, of those areas of land in private ownership. Access is already available for much of the area by both public rights of way and permissive routes, which should be maintained, although wider access has the potential to undermine the integrity of valuable ecological assets which may be sensitive to disturbance. To reiterate the wider area of land proposed in the earlier draft would best fulfil the need to provide separation between Walcote and development to the north west and achieve the objective of protecting the landscape and ecological assets, however, as the land is held in several ownerships, with a significant proportion active farms, it would be unrealistic to seek to give wider public access than already exists. Furthermore, maintaining viable agricultural units is an effective method of ensuring the existing landscape is retained.</p> <p>Land to the South of the A4304</p> <p>l) The mitigation measures required have been addressed within the current planning application and will be secured by appropriately worded conditions. This will be addressed further during the detailed design stage for this parcel of land.</p> <p>1.4 <b>Policy HBE 3</b> limits the number of 4 or more bedroom properties to no more than 50% in 'multi-house development'. Firstly, it is recommended that clarification is provided in relation to multi-house development (Policy HBE 4 considers 4 units 'small'). For instance a relatively small site will develop differently to a larger site. Furthermore, considerations such as viability, layout and design and environmental factors should be taken into account.</p> <p>1.5 <b>Policy HBE 6</b> states that all development should be designed to category M4(2) Category 2 of the building regulations. This is not in accordance with the development plan. Local Plan policy H5, criterion 3, requires only 4% of all development over 100 dwellings to accord with this higher accessibility standard. This requirement is based on evidence of likely need, that was justified at the Local Plan examination. The Neighbourhood Plan has not demonstrated why all properties should be M4 (2) Category 2, nor has it undertaken any assessment on the likely effect of such measures on the viability of development in accordance with national policy. It is noted that in the Neighbourhood Plan consultation statement that the plan has been changed to say 'should' rather than must, and that it is a requirement rather than an aspiration. In future, there is no certainty that this will remain clear to the decision maker if the wording remains as drafted.</p> <p>1.6 <b>Policy ENV 1</b> identifies two areas of substantial areas of Local Green Space (LGS). Whilst this is supported, the Neighbourhood Plan should be mindful of the NPPF which states that LGS should be discreet areas of specific local importance rather than extensive tracts of land.</p> <p>1.7 <b>Policy ENV 2</b> is supported, this accords with the Local Plan and the LCC's existing land management practices.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p><b>ENV 2</b></p> <p><b>Policy ENV 4</b></p> <p><b>Policy ENV 6</b></p> <p><b>Policy ENV 7</b></p> <p><b>Policy ENV 8</b></p> <p><b>Policy TR 1</b></p> <p><b>Policy TR 2</b></p> <p><b>Policies BE 1 – BE 5</b></p>	<p>1.8 <b>Policy ENV 4</b> is supported. It should be noted that measures for to the protection of Park Lodge, Misterton will be secured through the proposed layout for the SDA and the proposed planning conditions and delivered as part of the overall SDA scheme.</p> <p>1.9 <b>Policy ENV 6</b> is supported. In respect of the County Council's landholdings measures for the protection and enhancement of important ecological assets, green and wildlife corridors have been developed in consultation with Natural England, the Environment Agency and other stakeholders and will be implemented as part of the SDA scheme. However, the wildlife corridors in Figure 10, go beyond the extent of the habitats themselves. Whilst appropriate buffering to protect ecological features is accepted the extent of a buffer beyond the habitat will vary depending upon the development proposal. Figure 10 should be amended and/or the policy updated accordingly.</p> <p>1.10 <b>Policy ENV 7</b> - the designation and future protection of important views needs to take account of the likely changes to the landscape and built form of neighbouring settlements having regard to the policies of the Local Plan. The current planning application proposes the development of the area immediately north of the A4304, adjacent to the M1 for office uses, with height limits and structural planting to protect the setting of Misterton. Elsewhere the application proposes landscape mitigation which align with views 3, 4 and 8 in Figure 11.</p> <p>1.11 <b>Policy ENV 8</b> - whilst the proposal that energy generation be encouraged is supported the policy should not constrain the scale of commercial generation of renewable energy should the opportunity exist, subject to the benefits of such a scheme outweighing any potential harm as detailed in the policy.</p> <p>Transport and Road Safety Policies</p> <p>1.12 <b>Policy TR 1</b>, criterion c) requires existing off-road parking areas to be maintained or replaced with a suitable alternative. In certain circumstances, it may not be necessary to replace off-road parking areas if they are required for development, having regard to their use and the availability of other parking areas in the vicinity.</p> <p>1.13 <b>Policy TR 2</b>, notes that electric vehicle charging will only be expected where <i>feasible</i>. The example in the explanation relates to off-road parking. For communal development such as apartments, where off-road parking will be provided, management and feasibility issues may still arise as they have elsewhere. Furthermore, there may be other reasons why charging points are not feasible or practicable which could helpfully be included in the explanation, such as network capacity, environmental considerations or viability.</p> <p>Business and Employment policies</p> <p>1.14 <b>Policies BE 1 – BE 5</b> are all supported. In particular, <b>Policy BE 4</b> which provides the opportunity to create a second income stream for individual farming businesses and provides further employment opportunities for local people. For <b>Policy BE 3</b>, it may be helpful to clarify, in the preceding explanation that the policy applies only where the proposed development results in a mixed use and requiring planning permission rather than it being ancillary to the predominant use.</p>
--	--	--	---

--	--	--	--