

# INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE MISTERTON WITH WALCOTE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

INDEPENDENT EXAMINER:  
Christopher Collison BA(Hons) MBA MRTPI MIED MCMi IHBC

To Harborough District Council and Misterton with Walcote Parish Council

By email to Matthew Bills, Neighbourhood and Green Spaces Officer, Harborough District Council and Cathy Walsh, Clerk, Misterton with Walcote Parish Council

Dated 19 January 2021  
Response dated 21 Jan 2021

Dear Cathy and Matthew

## **Misterton with Walcote Neighbourhood Development Plan Independent Examination - Examiner Letter Seeking Clarification of Matters**

Further to my initial letter of 21 December 2020 I am writing to seek clarification of the following matters:

Combined response from Harborough District Council (DC) and Misterton with Walcote Parish Council (PC) shown in red below

### **Policy HBE2**

1. In Part f) is it intended that “with” should be “within”? **The PC and DC agree.**
2. In what way does Part i) serve a clear purpose by providing an additional level of detail or distinct local approach to that set out in part u of Strategic Policy L1? **Part (i) of the MWWNDP states**

*i) Development avoids harm to St Leonard’s Church Misterton, a grade 2\* listed building, respects its setting and maintains the important vista between St Leonard’s Misterton and St Mary’s Lutterworth, as required by LP Policy U;*

Local Plan Policy L1 part (u) states:

*u. protection and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings, including the grade II\* listed Church of St Leonard at Misterton and grade I listed Church of St Mary, Lutterworth and non-designated heritage assets. The master plan will be informed by a heritage impact assessment, which must form the basis for approaches to design, scale and layout of development. Green space, such as a community park, should be provided in the southern part of the site together with height restrictions on buildings in the southern part of the site, in order to protect the setting of the Church of St Leonard. The proposed*

*new access road should be routed to have regard to any undesignated archaeology and minimise its impact on all heritage assets, particularly the inter-visibility between the Church of St Leonard and the Church of St Mary*

It is the District Councils view that additional detail has not been included in the NDP policy HBE2 (i), which was communicated in June 2019 as part of the comments to a draft document (attached) which stated:

*HBE2: Lutterworth SDA – some of this is already covered by LP policy L1 and careful consideration is needed to not restrict the development of the SDA. There are policies that consider for example connectivity to the surrounding countryside etc. that the NDP may be well set to include. The QB may wish to review and take out duplicated criteria for ease of implementation. Where the criteria are a duplication of the Local Plan it is suggested that the NDP criteria is not required.*

DC agree that the duplicated criteria is removed from the policy as it does not add additional detail to the policy. The PC agrees that the duplicated criteria can be removed.

## **Policy HBE6**

3. In Part E is it intended that “new grass areas” should be “new green open spaces”? The DC and PC suggest considering ‘new green spaces’ as an alternative..

## **Policy ENV6**

4. How were the wildlife corridors and their boundaries on Figure 10 identified? Wildlife corridors were created to link sites of known ecological importance (SSSI and identified Priority Habitats) and to join these to locations where BAP species had been observed. Using water courses, hedgerows and lines of dense vegetation the corridors could provide routes allowing vulnerable species to spread more widely through the plan area. Figure 10 has not identified specific boundaries to these corridors, instead gradually shading the routes away from the central feature as the edges of the corridors are likely to be porous. Some species will prefer the protection of the central part of the feature, whilst others will use the edges and the adjacent farmland to travel. However, the Parish Council does acknowledge that the shading as seen on figure 10 may be a little wide and could be drawn more tightly to the physical features with no loss of value.

## Policy ENV7

5. Please confirm each of the identified views are seen from publicly accessible locations. **All the views can be seen from public highways: views 5, 6, 7 & 8 from roads; views 1, 2, 3, 4 & 8 from public footpaths or bridleways.**

I request any response to these requests for clarification is agreed as a joint response of the Parish and District Councils wherever possible. This request for clarification and any response should be published on the District Council website.

In order to maintain the momentum of the Independent Examination I would be grateful if any reply could be sent to me by 12.00 Noon on Monday 25 January 2021. An earlier reply would be appreciated.

As the Independent Examination progresses, I may seek clarification with respect to other matters. For the avoidance of doubt recommendations of modification of the Neighbourhood Plan that may be contained in my report of Independent Examination will not be limited to those matters in respect of which I have requested clarification.

I should be grateful if the District Council and the Parish Council could acknowledge receipt of this email.

Best regards

Chris Collison  
Independent Examiner  
Planning and Management Ltd  
[collisonchris@aol.com](mailto:collisonchris@aol.com)