

The Kibworths' Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation Results

Approved 26th January 2017

GENERAL COMMENTS

No:	Plan section/ policy number	Comment	From	Response	Proposed Amendment
1.	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 07/11/2016. 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. Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land We have not checked the agricultural land classification of the proposed allocations, but we advise you ensure that any allocations on best and most versatile land are justified in line with para 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework. For clarification of any points in this letter, please contact me on 02080261940. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk. Yours faithfully Sean Mahoney Lead Adviser, Sustainable Development, East Midlands Area Team.</p>	Natural England - Sean Mahoney Lead Adviser, Sustainable Development, East Midlands Area Team	Noted	None

2.	General Comment	<p>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 Mineral Consultation Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals Local Plan and Mineral and Waste Safeguarding proposed in the new Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Plan. These proposed safeguarding areas and existing Mineral Consultation Areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect mineral resources or waste operations. 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>	LCC – Mineral and Waste Planning	Noted	None
3.	General Comment	<p>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</p>	LCC - Education	Noted	None

		yield a new school. 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.			
4.	General Comment	Suggest reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and look for developments to include bungalows etc of differing tenures. 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.	LCC Adult Social Care	Noted. The NP recognises the ageing population and addresses this in the housing mix policy H5.	None
5.	General Comment	Whilst we have no specific concerns or comments to make on the plan we would like to inform you that the Environment Agency is currently updating the computer models which are used to define the floodplain associated with the Main Rivers within the Plan area. The new data (flood levels and modelled extents) will be available for use from the beginning of January 2017. The Flood Map for Planning will be updated to reflect these changes at the end of January 2017.	Nick Wakefield Environment Agency	Noted. We will look out for the updated maps and amend the plan if they are available within the required timescale.	Update to environmental maps if available.
6.	General Comment	<u>Superfast Broadband</u> 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 superfast broadband (of at least 30Mbps) Developers should take active steps to incorporate superfast broadband at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure superfast broadband is available as soon as build	LCC	Agreed. Wording of Policy E3 to be amended as proposed.	Change policy E3 to 'Every individual dwelling in new housing developments should have a connection installed capable of supplying broadband operation at speeds of 30 megabytes per second (as at the date of publication) or better to reflect higher minimum speeds that may be recommended through the lifetime of the Plan'.

		<p>on the development is complete.</p> <p>Suggest including that broadband is a requirement for any new development and that developers are required to put in the infrastructure within smaller developments. By doing this it will ensure that housing is more desirable to buyers, leading to quicker sales. Along similar lines as Houghton-on-the-Hill's Draft Plan broadband policy. www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/uploads/draft-plan-9.pdf</p>			
7.	General Comment	<p>1st email: Councillor Holyoak suggested that I let you know my comment.</p> <p>I believe that my comments made to the consultation have been missed off the consultation document. My comment was with regards to the land offered for development at the end of St Wilfrids Close. My comment was against any development on this land as it was designated as important open space and beautiful paddock land in the heart of the village. I asked for the land to be protected.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could check those responses and add mine made at the time to the consultation plan. Please let me know if you need any further detail. Thank you for your help on this matter.</p> <p>2nd email: I am also concerned that I do believe that there were many more comments made about this land but the consultation results show only a few. I think the one that says Wilkins Close or road should be St Wilfrids Close as the description fits. There do seem to be a few typos.</p>	Resident	<p>Noted. The comment is now formally recorded through this consultation. All other consultation through the NP has been recorded faithfully from what was written at the events.</p> <p>The scoring shows that this site only scored 15 out of possible 32. The cut off to qualify for LGS is 24. Therefore this site was not designated in the KNP as LGS.</p> <p>The Environment Group didn't receive any previous comments directly for consideration, and it was their scoring following assessment of each site that determined the LGS designation.</p>	None

8.	General Comment	Harborough District Council officers also made comments prior to Regulation 14 consultation, which they have submitted again formally as part of the Regulation 14 consultation.	HDC Officers	Noted. The earlier comments have been taken into account.	None
9.	General Comment on Prematurity SEPARATE ATTACHMENT	Detailed submission by Manor Oak Homes in separate document dated 4 th January 2017 relating to Prematurity to the Harborough Local Plan (page 3-5) and a promotion of their proposals for land west of the Kibworths.	Geoff Armstrong – Manor Oak Homes	<p>The case is put forward in the attached letter that the NP fails to meet the basic conditions as it is being brought forward premature to the Local plan determination and that it does not take into account the emerging housing needs assessment (HEDNA).</p> <p>We disagree with this assessment.</p> <p>PPG 009 on Neighbourhood Planning specifically addresses the issue and states that NPs can come forward before an up to date Local Plan is in place. The NP has to be in general conformity with the existing strategic policies of the LPA.</p> <p>It is also necessary to take into account the most up to date information on housing needs, which the Kibworth NP does. If more up to date information comes to light in advance of submission this will also be taken into account. Kibworth has exceeded its housing requirement on the basis of the most up to date information, as it is required to do.</p>	None

10.	General Comment SEPARATE ATTACHMENT	Detailed submission including proposals on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance in relation to their proposed SDA. These have been incorporated into the table below where specific policies are referred to.	Stephen Mair from Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None
11.	General Comment	Neighbourhood Plan for The Kibworths Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Neighbourhood Plan. Your Neighbourhood Plan falls within the boundary of the Kibworth Beauchamp and the Kibworth Harcourt Conservation Areas and includes a number of designated heritage assets including The Old House and Garden Walls, Kibworth Harcourt Mill	Historic England – Clive Fletcher	Noted. The NP recognises the statutorily listed buildings in the Parish and the need to have regard to them in development.	None

		<p>and the Church of St Wilfrid. It will be important that the strategy you put together for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the importance of those historic assets. This will assist in ensuring they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure it is in line with national planning policy.</p> <p>The conservation officer at Harborough District Council is the best placed person to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan. They can help you to consider how the strategy might address the area's heritage assets. At this point we do not consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area.</p> <p>If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staff at Leicestershire County Council who look after the Historic Environment Record and give advice on archaeological matters. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk <http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk>). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society, local history groups, building preservation trusts, etc., in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Your local authority might also be able to provide you with general support in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan. National Planning Practice Guidance is clear that where it is relevant, Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide planning</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>decisions and to put broader strategic heritage policies from the local authority's local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions.</p> <p>Further information and guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans has been produced by Historic England. This signposts a number of other documents which your community might find useful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:- http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-yourneighbourhood/</p> <p>If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>			
12.	General Comment	<p>Thank you for consulting the Homes and Community Agency on Kibworths' Neighbourhood Plan. The Agency supports the delivery of housing to meet identified local needs and supports the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans where they are clear in promoting development. However as the Agency is not a landowner within the boundary of the Neighbourhood plan, we will not be submitting a formal response in this instance.</p>	Lindsey Richards at Homes and Communities Agency	Noted	None
13.	General Comment	<p>Numbering on contents page is different to plan body.</p>	Resident	Agreed.	Formatting/typos will be addressed.
14.	General Comment	<p>Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of Kibworth's Neighbourhood Plan which includes both Kibworth Beauchamp and Kibworth Harcourt Parish council areas</p>	Highways England – Scarlett Griffiths	Noted	None

		<p>and covers the period 2011-2031. It is noted that the document provides a vision for the future of the Parish of Kibworth and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications. Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is the role of Highways England to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Kibworth Neighbourhood Plan, Highways England's principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the M1 which routes approximately 11 miles west of the Neighbourhood Plan area. Highways England understands that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for Kibworth is required to be in conformity with the emerging Harborough Local Plan and this is acknowledged as a requirement within the document. In relation to Kibworth's Neighbourhood Plan, Highways England's principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the M1 which routes approximately 11 miles west of the Neighbourhood Plan area. It is noted that until the Harborough Local plan is adopted the housing allocation for Kibworth's Neighbourhood Plan area will not be confirmed. However it is noted that due to the high number of dwellings which have already been constructed or received planning permission between 2011 and 2016 (566 dwellings in total) that it is likely that further housing development in the Parish will be restricted to small-scale windfall development. Highways England does not consider that this scale of</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		development will have any impact on the operation of the M1. Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363 Highways England has no further comments to provide and trusts that the above is useful in the progression of the Kibworth Neighbourhood Plan.			
15.	General Comment	<p>Here are my observations on the pre-submission version of the Kibworths' Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The KNPG is to be warmly congratulated on the hard work, skill and care put into the draft plan. I trust that all parishioners will recognise the value to the community, both for now and the future. 2. The plan, which is quite detailed, cries out for a 2-3 page summary, after the contents page. The introduction is important, but readers need an overview of the main policies and community actions to be elaborated later in the plan. 3. Further editorial work is essential to refine presentation. Examples are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1 Page breaks in the right places (several boxed statements are split between pages, and pages 49 and 50 do not exist). 3.2 Line spacing to be uniform throughout. 3.3 Punctuation checks. 3.4 Re-sizing of some larger photos, where that does not detract from the detail required, to give more evenness with images. 3.5 Captions to a few photos where the point or location of the image is unclear. 3.6 Re-ordering of material on pages 58-59 to represent 	Resident	<p>Thank you for this comment</p> <p>It has been agreed to add in a section at the end of the NP listing all the policies</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Extra section on policies to be included.</p> <p>Formatting/typos will be addressed</p>

		<p>a logical flow along streets (and why it is necessary to include 'Harborough' in all the addresses?).</p> <p>3.7 It was noted that appendix ENV1 was not included (this is not a criticism just an observation that it needs adding to the final version).</p> <p>3.8 Correction of any identifiable errors, such as page 93 para 6 line 6, Albert Street does not feed into the A6, and possibly page 96 para 9 line 1 'Chemist' should read 'pharmacist'.</p> <p>4. Readers will recognise that most policies are presented positively, along the lines 'Proposals will be supported if ...' But by the time the reader has reached the close and well written arguments in the 'Natural and Historical Environment' section, one is struck by the statement on page 88 para 1 lines 2-3 'The intention is not to prevent all development'. I can well imagine an independent inspector thinking at this point that the plan is indeed a wordy attempt to block development. Could this aspect of presentation be revisited?</p> <p>May I wish the KNPG well in finalising the plan which I shall be supporting?</p>		<p>Noted. The NP recognises the need to provide its minimum requirement in terms of development in the Parish, but is keen also to highlight and protect its important environmental features.</p> <p>Thank you for these helpful comments.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
16.	General Comment	<p>Dear Planning Group,</p> <p>Congratulations on a comprehensive and well researched document. It is apparent that a great deal of time and effort has gone into producing this plan and significant praise is due to all for their diligence and effort.</p> <p>Much work has been put in and sensible proposals and policies have been produced. Apart from a couple of</p>	Resident	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

		<p>minor grammatical points there is very little improvement that can be made. I was the Secretary of the Kibworth Parish Plan, published in 2004, and was a member of Kibworth Harcourt Parish Council, at the time when the village was fighting against the housing development then known as KB1. I therefore have some experience in these matters and feel qualified to comment on the situation. The factor which interests most people in the Neighbourhood Plan is the building of further houses in the Kibworths. In this context, the aims and policies outlined in the paper are very laudable, but there is one overriding factor that will negate these principles and that is greed - on the part of both the landowners and developers alike. Any refusal of planning permission will result in an appeal by the developers, which Harborough District Council cannot afford to challenge, due to the cost of losing the appeal.</p> <p>Thank you all for your fine efforts but I fear the future of the Kibworths doesn't look too rosy in the face of the continuing mania for house building.</p>			
17.	General Comment	<p>The Plan is set against a context of zero growth in Housing Numbers. As a result the plan is relatively silent on the infrastructure priorities that would be in the plan if sites were being identified for growth. In particular the provision of open space, linked footpaths, recreational space could do with development and ambition.</p>	Resident	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>Infrastructure issues are addressed in the section on the SDA (policy H11) but it is the case that without large scale development the opportunities for infrastructure improvements are limited. Nonetheless, an extra section pulling together all the infrastructure requirements will be added</p>	Infrastructure section to be added.
18.	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your email. The grammatical points I found are as follows:-</p> <p>Para 28 - para 2 -Sentences should not be commenced with a preposition. Thus, this paragraph should be only one sentence, not two with the second starting with "But".</p>	Resident	<p>Thank you – these typographical issues will be addressed in the final version of the NP</p>	Formatting/typos will be addressed

		<p>Para 5 "less semi-detached houses" should read "fewer semi-detached houses".</p> <p>Ditto para 8 - "less" should read "fewer".</p> <p>Page 84 - para 2, line 4 - Is "well treed" correct? Maybe, but I've never heard of "treed"!</p> <p>Page 86 - Objective A, line 2 - "if a roadside pavement was added" should read "were added".</p> <p>Pleased be assured of my support and admiration for the efforts of all the contributors and the only reason for my criticisms is that I am so pedantic!</p>		<p>This is a general word thrown around in the Landscaping sector. It means lots of trees.</p>	
19.	General Comment	<p>Hand written comment: congratulations on an excellent report – however – no account is taken of the effect of the existence of the A6 on the distribution of retail services in the area – not helped by the few shops of the K.H. estate in Leicester Road. From Kibworth Harcourt village it is impossible to buy a newspaper, a pint of milk or a loaf of bread without crossing the main road to shops almost a mile away. This has the effect of (a) increasing local traffic and (b) is a serious hardship to elderly or infirm individuals and those without transport or unable to drive.</p>	Resident	<p>Thank you for this comment. The NP seeks to protect the parade of shops on Leicester Road in Kibworth Harcourt from change of use and has resisted the call for a 'sequential test' to be applied to prevent retail development outside of the Primary Shopping Area in Kibworth Beauchamp which would have served to prevent retail development elsewhere in the Parish.</p>	None
20.	General Comment	<p>Dog excrement continues to plague us on the field and it is quite surprising, people clearly see that we and others are using the ground for recreational purposes but continue to be short sighted on this matter - it would be appreciated if more specific signage could be erected in the refurbished carpark and at all entrances to the field reminding people that it is an obligation to clean up</p>	Resident	<p>Thank you for these comments. They are primarily about enforcement issues and have been noted by the Parish Council.</p>	None

		<p>after their dogs have defecated.</p> <p>Long term of course the provision of some kind of field lighting with maybe a timer switch - code operated using prepaid methods to manage the cash could be of huge benefit especially in the winter months. This I am sure would benefit all users of the field who wish not to be limited by the reduced daylight hours. A Wish and a Suggestion more than anything for future consideration.</p> <p>Any word on the perimeter cycle/walk path - this would be a huge enhancement.</p>			
21.	General Comment	The plan recognises the impact of recent development on the Kibworths and seeks to control to the rate of expansion. We support this aim as surrounding villages like Burton Overy rely on the services available in Kibworth which are under tremendous pressure from the development which has already taken place.	Fran Brown BO Parish Council	Noted	None
22.	General Comment	Page 3 states this plan will determine planning policy for transport as well as other things but there is no reference to the wider policy context in which it sits.	LCC Highways	Noted. Reference to the Highways Authority having strategic responsibility will be made within the text.	Amendment as proposed to be made.

KIBWORTH HARCOURT AND KIBWORTH BEAUCHAMP

No:	Plan section/ policy number	Comment	From	Response	Proposed Amendment
23.	Kibworth Beauchamp Page 7 Section iv	Section iv is interesting, but confusing and hard to follow as it skips from one parish to the other and both do not appear to be covered equally. The information on statistics might be best brought out as an additional section. Whilst the two parishes are recognised, it may be appropriate to have a section on Kibworth as a settlement, as the two parishes are co-joined.	HDC Officers	Noted. The sections in question have been prepared by local residents to reflect local characteristics and the group wishes to keep the text broadly the same for this reason. It is considered that it introduces the Kibworths well.	None
24.	Kibworth Beauchamp Page 8	Resident should be changed to residence. "...carefully restored in the mid-twentieth century, was formerly the residence of the village doctor"	Stephen Butt, Clerk KB PC	Agreed	Amendment as proposed to be made.
25.	Kibworth Beauchamp Page 9	The bypass dates from 1810 not 1851.	Resident	Agreed	Amendment as proposed to be made.
26.	Kibworth Harcourt Page 21	<p>There is as small point on page 21... My own enquiries on the location of Harcourt's theatre, studying maps, visiting the premises and talks with the owner, led me to the conclusion that the theatre building no longer stands. The now demolished building that was most probably the theatre is shown on the attached OS 1904 map to which I've added the pointing arrow in blue. The site of that building is now a lawn etc, but it appears to have been rather larger than the remaining smallish garage and office.</p> <p>Are you really confident with your identification of the theatre location? Would it not be safer and more accurate to say something like 'The former village theatre was in the garden to the rear of the house'?</p>	Resident	Agree	Amendment as proposed to be made.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

No:	Plan section/ policy number	Comment	From	Response	Proposed Amendment
27.	Page 34 Policy SD1	In respect of Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development and Policy SD2: General Policy Principle, we strongly support the inclusion of these policies in the Kibworth Neighbourhood Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework. We are encouraged by the Council's desire to positively consider proposals that contribute to the sustainable development of the Kibworths.	Stephen Mair – Andrew on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None
28.	Page 35	It is helpful to see the limits to development drawn less tightly.	HDC Officers	Noted	None
29.	Page 35 Figure 2	<p><u>Limits to Development</u></p> <p>Manor Oak Homes' support the inclusion of planning permissions that already exist within the limits to development as identified on Figure 2 of the KNP. We note the inclusion of the consents at Wistow Road (Ref: 14/01641/OUT) and south and west of Priory Business Park (Ref: 16/00286/OUT) within the defined limits to development, but as the draft KNP was published prior to the approval of Manor Oak's application at Warwick Road (Ref: 15/01153/OUT) this has not been included. We request that the limits to development plan is updated to include this land.</p> <p>We would also recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan Group consider extending the current limits to development to include land to be allocated for residential use. It is clear from the discussion above that the Kibworths will be required to accommodate a significant level of residential development over the plan period, that we predict will be between 400-600 homes. As such, in order for the plan to meet the basic</p>	MOH	<p>Noted</p> <p>The LtD will be amended to show this recent approval.</p> <p>The NP is based on the current and most up to date indication of housing need and housing distribution and as such does not need to accommodate further growth. The NP will be reviewed as and when housing need increases.</p>	<p>Amendment as proposed to be made.</p> <p>None</p>

		conditions for Neighbourhood Plans and to be considered to represent a plan that will deliver sustainable development, it will be necessary for the plan to consider housing allocations outside of the settlement boundary. As will be discussed further below, Manor Oak Homes' land to the west of the Kibworths represents a uniquely sustainable option to accommodate this required level of growth in an area that is well connected to the centre of the village and is in the same area as the existing direction of growth.			
30.	Page 36 Policy SD3	We support policy SD3 which recognises development which has or is taking place but which seeks to limit further damaging development into the countryside.	Fran Brown BO Parish Council	Noted	None
31.	Page 36 Policy SD3	<p>We are concerned by the proposed inclusion of Policy SD3: Limits to Development in the Kibworth Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst we appreciate the desire of the Neighbourhood Plan to direct development towards the most appropriate locations within the Kibworths, we are concerned that the inclusion of this policy would be contrary to local planning policies contained with the Harborough District Council Core Strategy and the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy CS2 (a): Delivering New Housing of the HDC Core Strategy states: 'Limits to Development boundaries around settlements will be used to shape their future development as follows: - Housing development will not be permitted outside Limits to Development (either before or following their review) unless at any point there is less than a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and the proposal is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement concerned.'</p> <p>Policy SD3: Limits to Development is overly restrictive and contradicts the above policy contained in the adopted HDC Core Strategy. We would suggest greater flexibility in the Neighbourhood Plan policy to allow for</p>	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	<p>Noted</p> <p>Recent ministerial announcements have introduced the need to demonstrate a three year land supply in areas where there is a NP in place rather than a 5 year one, if certain conditions are met.</p> <p>The proposed LtD allow for the provision of the minimum housing requirement for the plan area, therefore it is not contradictory.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

		development outside of the Limits to Development, when there is less than a 5 years supply of deliverable housing land.			
32.	Page 36 Policy SD3	I suggest that you expand the area to the south of the village to ensure future development is as close to the centre of the village as possible. The current limits 'elongate' the village footprint. The limits should be expanded to include land to the south west and north east.	Resident	Not agreed. The LtD are drawn to allow for current housing need requirements. If further housing is required within the Plan period a review of the NPO will be undertaken.	None

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

No:	Plan section/ policy number	Comment	From	Response	Proposed Amendment
33.	Community Facilities – General Comment	<p>Consideration of community facilities in the draft Plan would be welcomed. We would suggest where possible to include a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. Consideration could also be given to policies that seek to protect and retain these existing facilities more generally, support the independent development of new facilities and relate to the protection of Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations.</p> <p>The identification of potential community projects that could be progressed would be a positive initiative.</p>	LCC	Noted – these are contained within the draft NP	None
34.	Page 37 to 40	In view of the Inspector’s decision re Manor Oak Homes’ recent application priority should be given to local children to obviate the need to “bus” pupils to schools elsewhere which are likely to be full to bursting anyway.	Resident	Noted – The NP contains policies supporting school expansion.	None
35.	Page 38 and 40 Policy CSA 1 and 2	I suggest you include provision to provide and improve vehicle access and parking for parents, including purpose built 'drop off' zones.	Resident	<p>Noted – the NP includes policies to ensure school expansion does not lead to worsening parking issues.</p> <p>Reference will be made to seeking to address car parking issues as identified.</p>	Community Action to be added.
36.	Page 38 Policy CSA 1	With regards to Policy CSA1: Pre-School Provision, we fully support the provision of additional pre-school places available to families within the Kibworths in line with Paragraph 17 and 72 of the NPPF and Policy CS1 of HDC’s Core Strategy.	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None

37.	Page 40 Policy CSA 2	Any additional capacity to the Kibworth schools will inevitably lead to more traffic at peak times as children are delivered to the schools. Saddington Parish already	Chris Carter, Chairman, Saddington	Noted. Policy CSA2 requires further development to mitigate traffic-related issues. The NP cannot influence matters beyond the boundaries of the Plan area.	None
-----	-------------------------	--	--	---	------

		suffers from through traffic, eg busses and cars, heading to/from Kibworth for the morning and afternoon school sessions. The roads in Saddington cannot easily handle busses and we would ask that you consider how to minimise traffic impact to Smeeton Westerby and Saddington as a result of expanded school capacity, or indeed how you could reduce the current school time traffic? Part of the problem is that the car parking along Fleckney Road/High Street, Kibworth, is so bad that it is very difficult to use that road to get to the centre of Kibworth and hence some traffic will choose to go all the way round through Saddington and Smeeton to get to Kibworth.	Parish Meeting		
38.	Page 40 Policy CSA2	This policy discusses expanding the local school however there is no mention of how this is to be funded, or the cost of providing a bus to get children to alternative schools if the local school is full.	LCC Highways	Noted. The policy in question specifies the conditions that need to be applied to make school expansion possible. Any costing issues would be accounted for within specific planning applications.	None
39.	Page 40 Policy CSA 2	We fully support the expansion and/or provision of a new school within the Parish that is advocated by Policy CSA2: Schools, in line with Paragraphs 17 and 72 of the NPPF and Policy CS1 of HDC's Core Strategy. The proposed SDA scheme has allocated land for the provision of a new 2-form primary school in a manner that complies with the criteria outlined in this policy of the Neighbourhood Plan. The provision of a new school could be brought forward as part P/300/K8 – Kibworth North East Strategic Development Area 8 of a SDA proposal, however, it is unlikely that piecemeal development would achieve this same result.	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None
40.	Page 41 Policy CSA 3	We support the provision of a multi-functional amenities centre as supported by Policy CSA3: Clubs and Groups in line with Paragraph 70 of the NPPF, Policy CS1 of the HDC Core Strategy and Policy HC2 of the emerging HDC Local Plan. We would reiterate our above concerns regarding the use of Limits to	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester	Noted. Propose changing reference to 'sports facilities' to 'multi-functional facilities' in Policy SD3 to allow more flexibility.	Amendment as proposed to be made.

		Development in relation to this policy; we would argue that the land requirements for a facility of this nature are unlikely to be catered for within the village confines. The proposed SDA scheme would provide a multi-functional local centre which would meet these needs in a manner suitable for the requirements outlined in this policy.	Diocesan Board of Finance	The policy allows for the development of such a facility outside of the Ltd.	None
41.	Page 42 Policy CSA 4	With regards to Policy CSA4: Sporting Facilities and Community Action CSA2: Sporting Facilities we fully support the provision of new and/or improved sporting facilities in line with Paragraph 73 of the NPPF and Policy CS8 of the HDC Core Strategy. Once more, we would reiterate our concerns about the use of Limits to Development and the impact it would have on the delivery of new homes and community facilities and services. The proposed SDA masterplan allocates land for open space which could provide sports pitches, whilst the Section 106 agreement that would be sought as part of the development could contribute to funding additional facilities such as tennis courts or changing rooms. Furthermore, we would encourage the removal of the code CSA2 from the community action policy in order to assist with the functionality of the plan as a whole.	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted in relation to the SDA and Ltd. The Community Action CSA2 merely acknowledges the support for further sporting provision within the Parish.	None None
42.	Page 45 Policy CSA 5	Doctor Surgery - Saddington Parish welcomes the fact that the NP recognises that surrounding villages, such as Saddington, rely upon Kibworth for the provision of a doctor's service, and accordingly Saddington hopes that the proposed additional houses to be built at Kibworth will not preclude this on-going provision due to lack of capacity.	Chris Carter, Chairman, Saddington Parish Meeting	Noted	None
43.	Page 45 Policy CSA 5	In respect of Policy CSA5: Health and Wellbeing, discussions have taken place between the Agent and the Local Health Partnership/Trust regarding the potential for the proposed SDA scheme to provide a new medical facility or to extend the existing facilities within the	Stephen Mair - Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College	Noted	None

		Kibworths.	and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance		
44.	Page 46 Policy CSA 6	CSA6 acceptable	District Cllr. Chris Holyoak	Noted	None
45.	Page 46 Policy CSA 6	We support the proposals outlined in Policy CSA6: Parks and Green Spaces and Community Action CSA3: Parks and Green Spaces in line with Paragraphs 73 and 74 of the NPPF and Policy CS8 of the HDC Core Strategy. The proposed SDA development would provide 84 hectares of public open space which will include green landscaped 'spines' running through from Kibworth Harcourt to the open countryside.	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None
46.	Page 47 Policy CSA 7	CSA7 acceptable	District Cllr. Chris Holyoak	Noted	None
47.	Page 47 Policy CSA 7	We fully support the retention, provision and enhancement of community services and facilities as identified by Policy CSA7: Important Community Facilities. The proposed SDA scheme masterplan includes the provision of numerous additional community facilities, including a new multi-functions local centre and a new two-form primary school. Future development in the Kibworths would assist in the delivery of new community facilities and services.	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None
48.	Page 48	St Wilfrid's Church Halls should surely read St Wilfrid's Church & Hall.	Resident	Agreed	Amendment as proposed to be made.
49.	Page 49 and 50	These pages are missing.	Resident	Noted	Amendment as proposed to be made.
50.	Page 51 Policy CSA 7	Suggestion: consolidate community facilities where possible to ensure that they are viable and sustainable in modern facilities.	Resident	Noted. This will form part of a solution to be determined according to need at the time.	None

HOUSING

No:	Plan section/ policy number	Comment	From	Response	Proposed Amendment
51.	Page 53 Housing Section	This starts to say how LCC describe the A6 as problematic and approaching severe but doesn't give a context for this – We are therefore not sure where this came from.	LCC Highways	Noted – source to be referenced in the text.	Amendment as proposed to be made.
52.	General Comment Housing Section	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 Draft North Kilworth NP and the draft 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. www.northkilworth.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/nk-draft-low-resolution-1.pdf www.greatglen.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/uploads/175670305aeaf48650823074.pdf	LCC Planning	Noted. Specific infrastructure requirements are listed in the section on the SDA and in policy H11. A separate section on infrastructure will be added.	Section on infrastructure requirements to be added.
53.	Page 54 Policy H1	It is stated in Policy H1 that the Kibworths have exceeded its housing requirement over the plan period, and as a result, further housing development in the Parish will be restricted to windfall development in line with Policy H2. 3.2 The housing requirements across	David Wilson Homes	Noted	None

		<p>Harborough District will be tested as part of the emerging Local Plan. The proposed requirement for Kibworth has not yet been confirmed, and once it has, will also need to be tested by a Planning Inspector. It is one of the basic conditions that a Neighbourhood Plan should be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan. As such, David Wilson Homes agrees with the flexibility incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan, which confirms that the Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed if there is an increase in housing need across the District or if there is a failure to deliver the commitments already identified.</p>			
54.	Page 54 Policy H1	<p>H1: is this meant to incorporate overall housing numbers? If so if reading it in regard to H2, my understanding is that currently windfall sites of 5 dwellings or less on non SHLAA sites cannot be counted in provision figures.</p>	District Cllr. Chris Holyoak	<p>Noted. The policy reflects the numbers already completed or committed and windfall development contributes to that total.</p>	None
55.	Page 54 Policy H1	<p>In respect of Policy H1: Housing Provision, we strongly disagree with the approach to the delivery of new homes. We suggest that the current wording does not reflect the positive approach to supporting sustainable development identified in Policy SD1, and that it would be more appropriate to pursue a criteria-based policy. In taking this approach, it would P/300/K8 – Kibworth North East Strategic Development Area 9 provide a positive approach towards sustainable development whilst appreciating the significant levels of development that has already been committed within the Kibworths. 4.13. Furthermore, we would advise the Neighbourhood Plan Group that the residential requirements for Kibworth currently proposed for inclusion in the</p>	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	<p>Noted. Kibworth has witnessed significant development since 2011 and has exceeded its minimum requirements for new development. It has therefore met the requirement for demonstrating a positive approach to sustainable development.</p>	None

		<p>emerging Harborough District Council Local Plan, and as such provide the basis for the above policy, are not based on the most up-to-date information and therefore are subject to revision. Paragraph 158 of the NPPF states that 'each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental prospects of the area'. The Councils of Leicester and Leicestershire are currently working on producing the Housing and Employment Development Needs Assessment [HEDNA] report and this is anticipated to be published in January 2017. The updated Objectively Assessed Housing Needs [OAHN] contained within this document are likely to have a significant impact on the residential requirements for the District, and therefore is likely to have an impact on the amount of residential development proposed for the Kibworths. Consequently, we would recommend that adoption of the Plan or further consultation should be undertaken after the release of the HEDNA report so as to ensure that the plan is not immediately out of date therefore passes the test of soundness.</p> <p>It is important to note that any housing requirements identified by HDC is to be considered a minimum, and this should be reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, it may be beneficial for the Neighbourhood Plan Group to identify a potential reserve housing site which would come forward if future circumstances dictate that more residential development is required in the Kibworths. In doing so, this would provide the plan with flexibility, but would also ensure that the local community retains control over where future development is located.</p>		<p>We recognise that the numbers may change, and have built in a review to accommodate this. The NP is based on the most up to date housing figures available.</p> <p>KNPG considered the inclusion of a reserve site but decided against this as the housing numbers it has absorbed since 2011 significantly exceed the minimum requirement. Should housing need increase beyond the number of homes delivered then the NP will be subject to a formal review, and potential sites considered at that time.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
56.	Page 54	Since developers have successfully exploited the policy	Resident	Agreed. The housing approvals since the draft NP was written will be added in.	Amendment to numbers as proposed to be made.

	Policy H1	<p>vacuum and lack of 5 year supply to force more new houses on Kibworth that ever planned or considered sustainable in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan I find it necessary that we now use this fact in the plan and point out just how much we have already exceeded our minimum targets. While the plan was emerging it was the 56 dwelling site off Wistow Road that made up a lot of the houses that exceeded the targets. However this site is now being dwarfed by the appeal and subsequent permission for 110 houses off Warwick Road. We should therefore, in my opinion, amend the document to reflect this fact.</p> <p>My suggestion is to amend this:</p> <p><i>In view of the high number of commitments and completions between April 2011 and March 2016 (566), the minimum target has already been significantly exceeded. Should there be a failure to deliver the commitments already identified, or if there is an increase in housing need across the District, then the Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed.</i></p> <p>To:</p> <p><i>In view of the high number of commitments and completions between April 2011 and March 2016 (add actual, updated number which is at least 110 higher than the previous one), the minimum target has already been fulfilled and significantly exceeded. Should there be a failure to deliver the commitments already identified, or if there is an increase in housing need across the District, then the Neighbourhood Plan already contains an over provision of x dwellings which enables it to absorb a potential increase without further amendments.</i></p>			
--	-----------	--	--	--	--

		<p>I further suggest to remove this sentence: <i>Until this time, it will add a layer of protection against inappropriate development in the Plan area.</i></p>		Not agreed – this is a statement of fact.	None
57.	Page 54 Policy H1	<p>Amend the last sentence of H1 because the fact that the target has already been exceeded significantly means we can accommodate more houses than required - we do not need to explicitly account for increases as we have effectively already accounted for them at this stage. Failure to amend it means we risk having a significant overallocation now AND open ourselves up to even more houses is increases are proposed across the district. If such increases are indeed happening then we must be able to set the overallocation we have now off against any new targets, otherwise we effectively pay twice and have more houses built now only for this to be increase again if targets change.</p> <p>So I propose to amend</p> <p><i>Therefore until such a time as there is an increase in housing need across the Harborough District or unless there is a failure to deliver the existing commitments, further housing development in the Parish will be restricted to Windfall development in line with Policy H2.</i></p> <p>to</p> <p><i>Unless there is a failure to deliver the existing commitments, further housing development in the Parish will be restricted to Windfall development in line with Policy H2.</i></p>	Resident	Noted – however the removal of a policy on windfall development would make the NP too restrictive. Policy H2 contains a range of safeguards to minimise the impact of windfall development.	None
58.	Page 54/55 Policy H1/H2	<p>Policies H1 & H2 are supported as Kibworth has exceeded its housing requirement during the plan period and has already spread too far into the</p>	Fran Brown BO Parish Council	Noted	None

		countryside. The extent and rate of the current development is changing the character of Kibworth and making access to services and the road network increasingly difficult not just to Kibworth residents but also to surrounding communities.			
59.	Page 55 Policy H2	<u>Windfall Development</u> Manor Oak Homes support the inclusion in the draft KNP of Policy H2 – Windfall Sites which supports development proposals for infill and redevelopment sites, but is concerned that the definition of a windfall site is too restrictive. The policy states that windfall developments are small scale and the supporting text states that windfall sites are sites with a capacity of up to 5 dwellings. It is considered that this threshold is unduly restrictive and precludes unallocated sites from coming forwards within the limits to development that can be shown to sustainably accommodate more than 5 dwellings. The inclusion of a threshold is therefore felt to be unnecessary and could potentially prevent the sustainable development of the Kibworths.	MOH	Noted. KNPG considers that the threshold of 5 dwellings is appropriate given the space within the LtD and the amount of new houses delivered over recent years.	None
60.	Page 56 Policy H3	H3 does the 40% affordable include “starter” homes, viability would be in question otherwise.	District Cllr. Chris Holyoak	Yes it does.	None
61.	Page 56 Policy H3	Affordable Housing needs more car parking spaces provision to avoid conflict between co-owners and tenants. The ASSOCIATIONS need to select tenants more carefully from the DISTRICT before looking outside to prevent undesirables causing trouble.	Resident	Noted. The NP includes a policy on local residents having a priority.	None
62.	Page 56 Policy H3	<u>Affordable Housing</u> Draft KNP Policy H3 states that development proposals for new housing where there is a net gain of ten or more dwellings should provide at least 40% affordable housing in accordance with district wide planning policies. Harborough District Council published its recommended approach to affordable housing in a report to the Local Planning Executive Advisory Panel on	MOH	Agreed	Replace existing policy with ‘Affordable housing should be provided in accordance with district wide planning policies, currently 40%’.

		<p>22nd August 2016. This report includes the following draft policy: “Subject to scheme specific viability assessments, qualifying development will be required to provide: a) a minimum of 20% Starter Homes (except for those types of residential schemes excepted by national regulations), and b) 20% Other Affordable Housing (to comprise an equal balance of Shared Ownership and Affordable Rented Housing) unless an alternative tenure mix is justified by evidence of local housing need, registered provider views or scheme specific viability assessment”.</p> <p>This policy indicates the preferred policy approach for the emerging Local Plan, but it is still subject to further assessment and potential amendments. In this context, it is recommended that draft Policy H3 be amended to simply state that “Affordable housing should be provided in accordance with district wide planning policies”. This approach will avoid any conflict with emerging Local Plan policies that are still being developed.</p>			
63.	Page 56 Policy H3	Suggestion to include a criteria that states 'to take up an offer of permanent employment of 16 or more hours per week'.	Resident	Noted. This is not an acceptable criterion for the allocation of affordable housing.	None
64.	Page 56	Point 2 sentence in brackets, the word 'be' is missing.	Resident	Thank you. Agreed.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
65.	Page 57 Policy H4	H4 is aspirational, to comply with the HDC emerging local plan, such sites would be for a minimum of 250 dwellings.	District Cllr. Chris Holyoak	Noted. The policy supports new build and encourages its inclusion in any new development	None
66.	Page 57 Policy H5	The need for smaller properties for over 55's should be situated where car use is not needed if at all possible.	Resident	Noted.	None
67.	Page 57 Policy H5	H5 agree.	District Cllr. Chris Holyoak	Noted	None
68.	Page 57 Policy H5	With regards to Policy H5: Housing Mix, we fully support the provision of a wide range of housing types and sizes in line with Paragraph 47 and 50	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on	Noted	None

		of the NPPF, Policy CS3 of the HDC Core Strategy and Policy H5 of the emerging Local Plan. The proposed SDA scheme would provide a range of housing types and sizes, including bungalows, starter homes and family homes ranging in size from 2 to 5 bedrooms	behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance		
69.	Page 57 Policy H5	Suggestion: promote the inclusion of 1 bedroom accommodation for younger single people and for those affected by relationship breakdowns	Resident	Thank you. The NP supports smaller houses as part of its housing mix.	None
70.	Page 57 Policy H5	The Plan assumes a presumption against 4 bed plus housing size – it is not clear how this is evidenced based as this has been where the demand has been.	Resident	Noted. The housing need report is a part of the evidence base to the NP.	None
71.	Page 58	St Wilfred should read St Wilfrid.	Resident	Noted	Amendment to be made as proposed.
72.	Page 59 Policy H6	H6 is a given.	District Cllr. Chris Holyoak	Noted	None
73.	Page 63 and 64	These sections provide a general design guide but not specific so very open to interpretation, no mention of LCC design guide. Infrastructure delivered as part of new development will need to comply with LCCs design guide.	LCC Highways	Noted. The references in the text to LCCs design guide will be referenced.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
74.	Page 65 Policy H7	There may be issues relating to the standards. The policy may be clearer if it requires that the national space standards included in building regulations Part M are adhered to. If necessary a proportion of homes could be built to the higher standard for adaptable homes found in Building Regs part M2. Design principles would be better in an appendix.	HDC Officers	These design standards will reference the need to achieve 15% of the higher standard as proposed. The detailed space standards will be removed to the appendices.	Amendments as proposed to be made.
75.	Page 65 Policy H7	We fully support the design principles advocated by Policy H7: Building Design Principles of the Pre-Submission Kibworth Neighbourhood Plan. We believe that good planning and good design are inseparable. We fully support the requirement for residential schemes to meet the highest design standards and respect the residential amenity of existing neighbours in line with Paragraphs 17, 56 and 58 of the NPPF, Policy	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted.	None.

		<p>CS11 of the HDC Core Strategy and Policy GD8 of the emerging Local Plan. Furthermore, we support the requirement of development schemes to enhance biodiversity and retain and enhance hedges and trees in line with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF. We also support the encouragement for the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems given by this policy in line with Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy. The proposed SDA scheme has been designed with significant consideration given to all of the criteria contained within this policy of the Neighbourhood Plan, the scheme would provide new residential development of the highest building design standards inspired P/300/K8 – Kibworth North East Strategic Development Area 10 by its location adjacent to the historic centre of Kibworth Harcourt and the open countryside.</p> <p>The proposed development would retain significant amounts of mature hedgerows and trees that are an intrinsic element of the site’s rural landscape, and would provide new planting of native species to enhance the site’s boundaries.</p> <p>Furthermore, the scheme would be designed to utilise SUDS including drainage ponds and permeable surfaces as part of the surface water management scheme.</p>			
76.	Page 65 Policy H7	<p>Anglian Water welcomes the reference made to the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) as part of new development. We support the use of SUDs to reduce risk of surface water and sewer flooding.</p>	Anglian Water	Noted	None.
77.	Page 65 Policy H7	<p>Point g, lines 3 and 4 at the end of point g please add the following after the word scheme: “for example provision for swifts, hirundines, house sparrows, other birds, bats and hedgehogs”. The property design is critical and must consider wildlife as a priority. Thank</p>	Resident	Agreed	Amendment to be made as proposed.

		you!			
78.	Page 67 Policy H8	H8 whilst in total agreement, I fear LHA 6c's and emerging 7c's guidance is all that will be achieved. Agree with all subsequent policies.	District Cllr. Chris Holyoak	Noted	None
79.	Page 67 Policy H8	The parking space requirements of 4 parking spaces for this size of house will make the viability of development sites prohibitive, thereby often necessitating a reduction in the affordable housing percentage or S106 contributions. It would also lead to higher house prices in what is already a high priced locality. These could be the unintended consequence of the policy whose emphasis is to reduce on-street parking.	Noted.	Noted – but this has been prioritised in the NP as an important consideration before development is supported.	None
80.	Page 67 Policy H8	It is clear from the Kibworth Meadows estate that insufficient provision has been made for on and off street parking. Off street parking should be increased and favour parallel rather than tandem spaces.	Resident	Noted	None
81.	Page 67 Policy H8	<u>Car Parking</u> Draft Policy H8 includes the KNP's proposed approach to residential car parking provision. It states that "At least two off-street car parking spaces are to be provided within the curtilage for each new dwelling developed within the Kibworths. Four such spaces should be provided for four-bedroom dwellings or larger". This policy is considered to be overly restrictive and does not allow for the wide-range of property types that could be developed in the Kibworths. For example, under this policy, a 1st floor 1 bedroom flat would need to provide 2 on-plot spaces. Not only is it not possible for a 1st floor flat to have on-plot parking spaces, but it is highly unlikely that a 1 bedroom flat would need 2 parking spaces. The district council currently uses parking guidance contained in the Leicestershire Highways 6Cs Design Guide and it is recommended that these standards are used in the KNP. If, however, it is felt that further guidance is needed, we recommend that this	MOH	Noted. The 6c's guide referred to includes the requirement for properties with three or fewer bedrooms to provide 2 car parking spaces. It also references a different requirement for flatted development and the policy will be amended to reflect this, by allowing communal parking adjacent to the development if it achieves the same parking standard.	Amendment to be made as proposed.

		policy is revised to provide a more nuanced approach. For example: "Parking spaces are to be provided where possible off-street and within the curtilage of the property. Where this is not possible, off-street parking courts will be considered appropriate".			
82.	Page 67 Policy H7	<u>Car Parking</u> – limited waiting time should be brought in for High Street, Station Street and part of New Road down to the railway bridge to prevent long-stay parking. If not shoppers will avoid the village in preference to Oadby and Market Harborough. This may be effective without prohibitive expense of enforcement by Wardens.	Resident	Thank you. Community Action T1 addresses issues related to enforcement. Reference to waiting restrictions will be added in.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
83.	Page 68 Policy H9	Developments should include hard landscaped areas within the curtilage of dwellings to store the appropriate number of wheeled bins to reduce the numbers left on street and in shared parking areas	Resident	Noted. Policy H9 on refuse storage addresses this issue.	None
84.	Page 69 Policy H11	NE Kibworth SDA - Saddington Parish would be very concerned about the building of 1200 new homes to the north of Kibworth, and while we understand that greater forces may decide its future, Saddington Parish would prefer if the SDA plan did not proceed at all.	Chris Carter, Chairman, Saddington Parish Meeting.	Noted. The decision on whether the SDA goes ahead is beyond the scope of the NP.	None
85.	Page 69	Housing: Beauchamp is unable practically to take more houses apart from infill so the Plan is correct to state that if HDC SDA provides for more development in future NW of Harcourt a relief road must be built FIRST. If there is to be more development along Fleckney Road the roadways will have to be substantially improved first.	Resident	Noted	None
86.	Page 69 Policy H11	We fully support the inclusion of the Kibworth SDA as Policy H11: North East Kibworth SDA in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. If approved, the bypass, proposed as part of the development, would greatly assist in reducing the amount traffic travelling through the Kibworths on the A6. In respect of construction, we	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester	Noted	None

		<p>propose that it is reasonable to expect the bypass construction to take place on a phased approach in line with the build out rates of the whole scheme.</p> <p>Furthermore, we support the protection of wildlife and biodiversity in line Paragraph 109 of the NPPF and Policy CS8 of the HDC Core Strategy. Initial investigations by our ecology consultants EDP have found: 'The preliminary ecological investigations completed to date have not identified any 'in principle' constraints on ecological grounds such as statutory and non-statutory designations 'The initial Extended Phase 1 Ecological Assessment has confirmed that the habitats present within the site are of low intrinsic value, therefore providing significant opportunities for biodiversity enhancement'.</p> <p>Furthermore, we fully support the requirement outlined in this policy to protect the landscape and historic assets of Kibworth Harcourt in line with Paragraph 128 and 129 of the NPPF and Policy CS11 of the HDC Core Strategy. Initial investigations into the site have concluded 'whilst there are designated heritage assets within the site, these are not sufficient in number or in extent to constraint he development potential of the site as a whole. Sensitive master planning could respect and protect their setting and heritage value'. The proposed SDA scheme has been designed to include significant areas of open space and retain large proportions of mature landscaping that exists on the site; these features will be enhanced as part of the proposals in order to retain the landscape character. The initial investigations have identified heritage assets on the site and this has been incorporated into the masterplan in order to enhance its long term survival.</p>	Diocesan Board of Finance		
--	--	---	---------------------------	--	--

		<p>The proposed SDA development has also been designed to incorporate a green buffer, in accordance to criterion D of Policy H11. As outlined above, the scheme has been sensitively designed to incorporate large areas of open space and the building designs will be inspired by the adjacent residential uses.</p> <p>We fully support the requirement of this policy for the SDA scheme to provide a mix of housing types and sizes in line with Paragraphs 47 and 50 of the NPPF, Policy CS3 of the HDC Core Strategy and Policy G5 of the emerging Local Plan. The proposed SDA scheme would P/300/K8 – Kibworth North East Strategic Development Area 11 provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes, including bungalows, starter homes and family homes ranging in size from 2 to 5 bedrooms. The building designs would be local vernacular but provide a distinct identity for the various neighbourhoods designed into the proposal.</p>			
87.	Page 69 Policy H11	<p>It is unlikely that a relief road would be provided before any housing, so this may be considered too onerous.</p> <p>The green buffer between the new development and Kibworth Harcourt may lead to a separate community, which would be detrimental to the sense of place in Kibworth, this may be perhaps worded better.</p>	HDC Officers	<p>Noted. This is an important issue for the Kibworths in view of the pressure on the infrastructure locally, so it remains a condition that the community wishes to see. It is known that such a condition has been secured elsewhere and LCC has confirmed the problematic nature of the existing road network without the additional 1,500 + homes proposed.</p> <p>Change description from 'green buffer' to 'area of open green space'.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amendment to be made as proposed.</p>

ENVIRONMENT

No:	Plan section/ policy number	Comment	From	Response	Proposed Amendment
88.	General Comment on Environment Section	I have decided to comment on that part of the plan that I had involvement in working on. Hedgerows are a prominent feature of the present Kibworth landscape. It is a pity that the content of this section of the plan seems to contradict itself to a considerable degree so far as their future importance to our environment is concerned.	Resident	Noted. The issues raised are addressed within the specific section.	None

89.	General Comment on Environment Section	<p><u>Environmental Inventory</u></p> <p>The environmental inventory section of the draft KNP states that it is based on fieldwork conducted by “a group of local residents some of whom were environmental and landscape professionals”. In the absence of further information on the qualifications of these professionals it is not clear how robust this assessment can be considered to be, not least due to the wide range of disciplines that have been covered including arboriculture, ecology, heritage and landscape and visual impact. It would appear from a search of the KNP website that the information contained in the draft KNP and a simple Environmental Inventory list form the totality of the evidence base on these subjects.</p> <p>If further evidence prepared by qualified professionals is available, we would suggest that this should be published on your website as a matter of priority. Alternatively, if these reports and/or the relevant detailed assessments are missing, we would recommend that they be conducted as soon as possible to ensure the emerging KNP is based on robust evidence. This is particular important in the context of the predicted need for housing allocations to come forward in the KNP as the location for new housing will need to be based on a thorough assessment of the constraints and opportunities of potential locations.</p> <p>In particular, considering the large areas of the parish covered it is recommended that robust evidence is published of the assessment undertaken of Important Views and Ridge and Furrow.</p>	MOH	<p>Noted.</p> <p>There is no requirement for the assessments to have been undertaken by professionally qualified people as inferred. However the Environment Group was made up of local residents who have a very keen interest in the environment. The group also benefited from having some members who have expertise in Landscape Architecture, countryside management, green infrastructure and environmental protection/risk assessment.</p> <p>The process followed in determining the most special local sites is as thorough and robust as in any NP undertaken, and involves an inventory of all local open spaces. The approach has been through Independent Examination elsewhere (See Thurcaston and Cropston NP). The field notes and site summaries will be added to the appendices as further evidence.</p>	None
-----	--	---	-----	---	------

90.	Page 71	Introduction Page71: "Compared with neighbouring parishes...there are few species rich hedges...". How do we know?	Resident	<p>This section of the chapter paints a general picture of the landscape and is not intended to be a definitive statement of content.</p> <p>The comparison is made with reference to neighbouring parishes of Great Glen and Burton Overy.</p>	None
-----	---------	--	----------	---	------

91.	Page 72	Consultation information would be better included in an appendix (section 10).	HDC Officers	Noted. The information provided here is not extensive and is used to specifically reinforce the issue under consideration.	None
92.	Page 72	Fig 4 shows the desire to retain significant trees and hedgerows at 4 th in priority list.	Resident	Noted.	None
93.	Page 75 Policy ENV 1	<p>Anglian Water owns part of the area designated as local green space at Church Road (area 096). The area of land in our ownership includes an existing balancing pond. There also existing surface water and combined sewers which cross the land designated as local open space including the land in Anglian Water's ownership. .These assets are critical to enable us to carry out Anglian Water's duty as statutory undertaker.</p> <p>It is noted that it stated that development in the designated local open spaces as identified in Figure 7 will not be allowed except in very special circumstances.</p> <p>Therefore we would suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan should explain in what circumstances development within designated local open space would be acceptable. As part of which reference should be included to utility infrastructure provided by Anglian Water.</p>	Anglian Water	Noted. Amend text to include the sentence including safeguarding the utility infrastructure provided by Anglian Water'.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
94.	Page 75 Policy ENV 1 SEPARATE ATTACHMENT	<p>Objection to the land owned by the Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance (allotment site) being designated Local Green Space as part of site 096. Full details given in attachment.</p> <p>Also noted re: Policy ENV 2 that 096 is not listed in the Schedule but is shown on Appendix 8 – this is also objected to.</p>	Leicester Diocesan Board Of Finance – agent being Rupert Harrison of Andrew Granger	<p>Noted.</p> <p>096 is north of the railway lines, it affords access to the village from the east, is a vibrant wildlife habitat for especially birds, also a well-used area by dog owners. 096 will be removed from Fig 8. 096 is correctly designated in ENV 1, LGS, so Fig 7 is correct.</p>	None

95.	Page 75 Policy ENV 1	In respect of Policy ENV1: Protection of Local Green Spaces we strongly disagree with the proposed designation of part of our site as Local Green	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on	Noted	
-----	-------------------------	---	--	-------	--

	<p>Space. Local Green Space is a highly restrictive and significant policy designation that has been given equivalent status to Green Belt designation. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF is unambiguous in stating the Local Green Space designation is not appropriate for most green areas or open space, and as such it is considered entirely logical and reasonable that the allocation of any land in this manner should be underpinned by compelling evidence demonstrating its appropriateness.</p> <p>4.23. The specific evidence about why the Local Green Spaces have been chosen for designation in this Neighbourhood Plan is limited to a few short sentences in the environmental inventory submitted as an appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, we consider that this does not constitute the robust and compelling evidence that is required by Paragraph 77 of the NPPF.</p> <p>4.24. Furthermore, the Planning Practice Guidance is clear that the designation of any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, local and neighbourhood plans are required to identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified local needs; the allocation of Local Green Space is not to be used in a manner that undermines this central aim of plan-making. The proposed allocation of Local Green Space on the site would do just that.</p> <p>4.25. As has already been noted in relation to Policy H1, the amount of housing that might be required to be accommodated within the Kibworths as part of the emerging HDC Local Plan has not been fully established or scrutinised in relation</p>	<p>behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance</p>	<p>The fields listed in ENV1 are the most important fields to the villagers in the Kibworths.</p> <p>From a development perspective, there are a total of 19 fields in ENV 1 and 2 therefore in excess of 100 fields remain for development. Also, several of these 19 fields may have hurdles for planning consent as evident the field description, for example “storm water retention basin” (031) and (096) “woodland, allotments and pond plus Anglian Water balancing pond”.</p> <p>We will strengthen the start of the environmental section with reference to the process followed and scoring system.</p> <p>This criterion is met – sufficient development land is in the NP</p> <p>Disagree with this conclusion.</p> <p>Review to be instigated if housing need increases.</p>	<p>Narrative to be added in to the environmental chapter of the NP</p>
--	---	---	--	--

		to the imminent publication of the HENDA report. The designation of Local Green Space could therefore undermine the aims of the Local Plan by reducing the capacity to accommodate development in a SDA at the Kibworths. Consequently, any allocation of the site would pre-determine and undermine any decision about the location of strategic residential development in Harborough District without any clear evidence for doing so. This is despite Neighbourhood Plans having a very clear mandate about their required compliance with National and Local Planning Policies.			
96.	Page 75 Policy ENV 1	We fully support the objectives of Community Action ENV1 – Trees, Woodland Conservation and Habitat Creation in line with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF and Policy CS8 of the HDC Core Strategy. We would encourage the removal of the code ENV1 to assist with the functionality of the plan; the best course of action may be to incorporate Community Action ENV1 as part of Policy ENV3. As stated above, the proposed SDA scheme would provide a significant amount of planting and landscaping as well as the provision of public open spaces, which would make an important contribution to the Kibworths green infrastructure.	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None

97.	Page 75 Policy ENV 1 SEPARATE ATTACHMENT	<p>Detailed objection by DWH as to why 030 should not be a LGS.</p> <p><i>...In summary, David Wilson Homes objects to the designation of site 030 as a Local Green Space, on the basis that it does not have regard to NPPF paragraph 77 nor should it be regarded as contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. The Neighbourhood Plan thus fails to meet the basic conditions and should not be proceed to referendum or be made in its current form. The LGS designation of site 030 should be deleted.</i></p>	David Wilson Homes	<p>Noted</p> <p>We have done an environmental inventory assessment and the site scored a value of 24 out of 32 and as such it is recommended it remains designated as a LGS.</p> <p>Field 030 has even greater significance as LGS, being the “final frontier” for locally displaced wildlife following adjacent development. Observation of this field saw BAP bird species in large numbers feeding and many butterflies.</p> <p>The judgement that designating this land LGS will prevent sustainable development in the Kibworths is rejected.</p>	None
-----	---	--	--------------------	--	------

98.	Page 75 Policy ENV 1 SEPARATE ATTACHMENT	Detailed objection by DWH as to why 034 should not be a LGS. <i>...In summary, David Wilson Homes objects to the designation of site 034 as a Local Green Space, on the basis that it does not have regard to NPPF paragraph 77 nor should it be regarded as contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. The Neighbourhood Plan thus fails to meet the basic conditions and should not proceed to referendum or be made in its current form. The LGS designation of site 034 should be deleted.</i>	David Wilson Homes	Noted. We have done an environmental inventory assessment and the site scored a value of 24 out of 32 and as such it is recommended it remains designated as a LGS. Please see our notes in number 95 which have some relevance here also.	None
99.	Page 75 Policy ENV1	See correspondence of 18/11/16: The Kibworth Neighbourhood Plan allocation at Station Road is not consistent with the boundary for the site shown within Harborough Council's Local Green Space submissions report, which similarly identifies the land at Station Road as being a Local Green Space. Harborough Council's allocation excludes Network Rail's land. It is Network Rail's view that for consistency and to ensure that the future needs of the railway can be protected network rail land should not form part of the allocation in the neighbourhood plan. Please note that were the area of railway land to remain in the plan the requirement of the emerging policy ENV1 of the neighbourhood plan for there to be 'very special circumstances' to justify development in Local Green Spaces would not be relevant to railway related development. It is advised in the National Planning	Diane Cragg at Network Rail	Noted. The Environment Group didn't intend to designate the area as LGS to include Network Rail land. The map will be modified to reflect this. Noted – the extent of development activity would be determined through specific planning applications.	None

		<p>Practice Guidance (NPPG) that the consideration of development in Local Green spaces should be 'consistent with that in respect of Green Belt' (paragraph 020 ref ID 37-020-20140306). Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 'Protecting Green Belt Land' says at paragraph 90 that 'local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location' would not be inappropriate development. Section 9 advises that development that is not inappropriate does not need to show very special circumstances. If the land is retained within the boundary of the Local Green Space this NPPF policy position should be acknowledge in the wording of ENV1.</p> <p>Please also note that any recreation or other use on the allocation next to the railway should ensure that there is no trespass on to railway land and that all existing boundaries are maintained and protected. Planting of certain tree species are also restricted and any proposed works whether development or improvements to the local green space next to the boundary should be subject to consultation with Network Rail.</p> <p>General Comments relating to the Kibworth Neighbourhood Plan Consultation</p> <p>Network Rail does not have any significant comment to make about the details of the neighbourhood plan. It is noted that reference to future electrification of the railway line is acknowledged within the plan (views of</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>local residents in Section (iv)) and the impact this may have on the surrounding infrastructure.</p> <p>It may be beneficial to note within the neighbourhood plan the use of travel plans as a way of prioritising sustainable travel alternatives (as set out in section 4 of the NPPF), however it is accepted that in this relatively rural location travel plans will have a limited benefit.</p>			
100.	Page 75 Policy ENV 1	<p>I note that “Kibworth Harcourt fishponds (071)” are listed and understand these come under the ownership of Manor Farmhouse, Main Street Kibworth Harcourt? Ref Kibworth Harcourt fishponds (071), the protection of local green spaces only relates to the ponds themselves, not the surrounding grasslands / field.</p> <p>Should the area around the ponds be included I would object to the inclusion of the surrounding grasslands / field.</p> <p>Also, as the current owner, or any subsequent owner does this mean we are responsible for the upkeep and /or maintenance of the fishponds?</p> <p>As the fishponds have been listed as “features of natural and historical environment significance” I have a concern that whereas the majority of Kibworth residents where currently unaware of these, me included, it does highlight them and maybe as a result people try to gain access to view. If in the unlikely event this occurs do I have redress to them being highlighted as a result of this plan, i.e. potential safety issues etc.? Do I have to consider additional personal liability insurance, warning signage – buoyancy aids etc.?</p>	Resident	<p>Thank you for this contribution.</p> <p>The proposed LGS designation will be restricted to the fishponds themselves.</p> <p>There is no additional obligation placed on owners for the designation of a LGS, and it is considered highly unlikely that such a designation would result in increased demand for access.</p>	Amendment to be made as proposed.

		<p>General comments about the plan:</p> <p>Generally I agree with the objectives of the plan. I recognise the balance between retaining the important historical aspects of Kibworth to the needs for sensible, additional new housing. I suppose none of us ideally want any new housing right on our own footsteps.</p> <p>Inevitable new housing will appear and we all have a responsibility to ensure this is balanced and enhances, adds to Kibworth overall.</p>			
101.	<p>Page 76 Policy ENV 2 SEPARATE ATTACHMENT</p>	<p>Detailed representations from DWH on 035</p> <p><i>...As with Policy ENV1, it is David Wilson Homes' position that the ENV2 designation would result in the Neighbourhood Plan failing to meet a number of the basic conditions which are required for the Neighbourhood Plan to be able to proceed to referendum. In its present form, the inclusion of Policy ENV2 is unclear and has the potential to conflict with national policy and the aim of achieving sustainable development. The David Wilson Homes East Midlands Land off Smeeton Road, Kibworth Representations to The Kibworths' Neighbourhood Plan 900118.391.JA January 2017 14 Policy and its necessity for inclusion within the Neighbourhood Plan should be reviewed.</i></p>	<p>David Wilson Homes</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>ENV2 merely requires development to take into account the significant features on the site – it does not prohibit development.</p>	<p>None</p>

	Page 76 Policy ENV 2	With regards to Policy ENV2: Protection of Other Sites of High (Natural and Historical) Environmental Significance, we fully appreciate the desire to protect heritage assets in line with Paragraph 126 of the NPPF. However, we strongly disagree with the designation of the site within this policy. As stated above, the allocation of land for protection for its environmental significance is a highly restrictive policy and as such it is reasonable to suggest that this process should be underpinned by robust evidence.	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Acknowledged ENV2 merely requires development to take into account the significant features on the site – it does not prohibit development.	
--	-------------------------	---	--	--	--

		<p>This assumption is equally important when considering the allocation of land for its historic environmental significance. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that local planning areas should ensure that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest. P/300/K8 – Kibworth North East Strategic Development Area 12 4.27. As previously stated, we have major concerns about the evidence compiled in the Environmental Inventory that is being used to justify the designation of part of the site within this policy. The specific evidence contained within the inventory about why sites have been chosen for designation is limited to a few short sentences, and there is no justification provided for how the Council arrived at the scores given for each of the Local Green Space Criteria. As such, we strongly encourage the removal of the site as a proposed designation.</p>			
102.	Page 76 Policy ENV 2	<p>We fully support the objectives of Community Action ENV2: Biodiversity in line with Paragraphs 109 and 117 of the NPPF and Policy CS8 of the HDC Core Strategy. We would encourage the removal of the code ENV2 to assist with the functionality of the plan.</p>	<p>Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>ENV2 reflects sites of local significance and as such it is proposed that they remain in the NP.</p>	None
103.	Page 77 Figure 8	<p>Our client has a legal interest in Site reference 030. However, the site is also shown on Figure 8 as a 'site of natural or historical significance and community value'. As site 030 is not referenced in Policy ENV2 and is proposed in Policy ENV1 as a Local Green Space, we presume its inclusion in Figure 8 is an error.</p> <p>To avoid confusion, the site should be removed from Figure 8 accordingly.</p>	<p>David Wilson Homes</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Field 030 is to be removed from drawing figure 8 as field 030 is in ENV 1 and figure 7.</p>	Map to be amended as proposed.
104.	Page 78	<p>We fully support the protection of trees and woodland</p>	<p>Stephen Mair –</p>	<p>Noted</p>	None

	Policy ENV 3	areas as outlined in Policy ENV3: Important Trees and Woodland in line with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF and Policy CS8 of the HDC Core Strategy. The proposed SDA development would provide a significant amount of planting and landscaping throughout the development area and the provision of public open space and green spines which would all contribute to the green infrastructure serving the Kibworths.	Andrew Granger		
105.	Page 80 Policy ENV 4	The designation of a wildlife corridor along the course of the Burton Brook is wholeheartedly supported. The area along the Burton Brook towards Carlton Curlieu is an outstanding area of unspoilt countryside forming part of the landscape area known as High Leicestershire and is rich in wildlife	Fran Brown BO Parish Council	Noted	None
106.	Page 80 Policy ENV 4	In respect of Community Action ENV4: Open Space, Sport and Recreation Sites, we fully support the provision of public open space in line with Policy CS8 of the NPPF. We would encourage the removal of the code ENV4 from the community action, in order to assist with the functionality of the plan. We would advise the Neighbourhood Plan Group that the designation of land as OSSR is extremely restrictive to development and as such any future designations to protect land should be underpinned by a robust evidence base. The proposed SDA scheme would provide up to 84 hectares of public open space, and as such could make a major contribution towards achieving the objectives of this Community Action.	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted. The NP cannot designate OSSR sites and the Community Action ENV4 merely reflects a desire to work with the District Council to designate sites that are agreed to be appropriate.	None
107.	Page 80 Policy ENV 4	In line with Paragraphs 109 and 117 of the NPPF, and Policy CS8 of the HDC Core Strategy, we fully support the protection of biodiversity that is advocated by Policy ENV4: Biodiversity of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Initial investigations undertaken by ecology consultants EDP has suggested that the SDA scheme could provide significant opportunities for biodiversity	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None

		enhancement. The scheme seeks to enhance local biodiversity through the provision of green 'spines' and a series of landscaping features such as trees, hedgerows and ponds.			
108.	Page 82	<p><u>Ridge and Furrow</u></p> <p>No evidence of how the ridge and furrow survey was conducted is provided. This is important as it appears to have missed out an important area of ridge and furrow on the playing fields between Hillcrest Avenue and the railway line. This land is shown edged red on the plan of 1940s ridge and ridge at Figure 1 below. Despite this land being publically accessible (making surveying easy) and clearly having excellent surviving ridge and furrow, it is not included on the map at Figure 11 of the draft KNP. This raises questions regarding the robustness of the assessment and we suggest this is reviewed and details of the survey and its methodology be published to ensure transparency.</p>	MOH	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Environment Group recognised the importance of the R&F on the recreation ground but this is a protected area of open space and as such it wasn't included due to its existing designation, however it shall be included for reasons of transparency and completeness thanks to the suggestion by MOH.</p>	None
109.	Page 82 Policy ENV 5	<p>With regards to Policy ENV5: Ridge and Furrow fields, we fully support the preservation of heritage assets, including ridge and furrow, in line with Paragraph 126 of the NPPF and Policy CS11 of the HDC Core Strategy. Preliminary investigations into the proposed development have recognised that there are designated and non-designated heritage assets located on the subject site. Significant consideration has been given to these assets when arriving at the proposed masterplan and this has resulted in important heritage assets being incorporated into large areas of open space, in order to enhance their survival and protection.</p>	<p>Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance</p>	Noted	None

110.	Page 82	"A few hedges in Kibworth warrant protection because of their demonstrable antiquity or ecological value. Rather calls into question the need for any further detailed survey work to be done.	Resident	Noted Disagree – further survey work will maintain an updated list of important hedges.	None
------	---------	--	----------	--	------

111.	Page 82	Page 82. "A few hedges will warrant stronger protection..." Is questionable as no detailed survey not yet available.	Resident	Noted change wording to 'Many of the hedges in the Kibworths will warrant stronger.... As we believe that the survey will identify additional hedges of value.	None
112.	Page 83 and 85 Figure 12 and Figure 13	The assessment of landscape within the plan clearly highlights the importance of the outward and inward views from the ridge line running along Warwick Road and the visual intrusion of development on residential amenity and landscape. Currently the trees and hedgerows on the bund to the north of Warwick Road effectively landscape the Priory Business Park. This area of forest/hedgerow should be designated as priority for protection within the plan.	Resident	Noted The environment group have considered this already and agreed that it should be protected and so the hedgerow should be added to the map figure 12 and to figure 9a and 9b as it is both a hedge and a woodland belt.	Map to be amended as proposed.
113.	Page 83 Community ENV 3: Hedgerows	"A survey will be carried out.." The community will require more encouragement than this to become involved in such a survey if they have the same response as I have to the above.	Resident	Noted There are volunteers keen to maintain and enhance many aspects of our environment including hedgerows.	None
114.	Page 83 (Figure 12)	Does not show all the correlated hedge rows between those that now exist now and those recorded in 1779 and which may prove to be of historical significance.	Resident	Noted. This reinforces the need for a survey Supporting evidence will be provided in a in a supplementary document.	None
115.	Page 85 Policy ENV 7	Kibworth is surrounded by valued views particularly to the north east and west and should be protected and therefore we support this policy.	Fran Brown BO Parish Council	Noted	None

116.	Page 85 Policy ENV 7	<u>Important Views</u> On the map at Figure 13 of the draft KNP, important views appear to cover almost the entire area of the parishes. In this context, it is considered that in order for draft Policy ENV 7 to avoid unnecessary constraints to sustainable development, further details of the assessment conducted, its methodology and of the particular aspects of each view that are considered to be important should be published as a matter of priority.	MOH	Noted Agree – a more detailed description of views is to be provided.	<u>Document</u> to be added as proposed.
------	-------------------------	--	-----	--	--

117.	Page 85 Policy ENV 7	<p>We fully support the principle of protecting important views as outlined in Policy ENV7:</p> <p>Protection of Important Views, in line with Paragraph 115 of the NPPF. However, whilst we appreciate and support the principle of this policy, we are highly concerned by the negative P/300/K8 – Kibworth North East Strategic Development Area 13 wording of its current format as it prevents any impact, even if it is positive. We would suggest that it should be amended to state: ‘New development will be required to preserve and enhance the identified locally important and valued views and skylines wherever possible.</p> <p>Proposals will be required to demonstrate that every effort has been made, and where it is proved that preservation is not possible, measures should be taken to mitigate or, as a last resort, compensate for any negative impact’</p> <p>The proposed SDA scheme has given significant regard to its location and the resulting potential landscape impact. The proposal includes the creation of several green ‘spines’ which will retain the physical connection to the wider countryside landscape. The development will include the retention and enhancement of trees and hedgerows to create a complimentary interface between the proposal and its wider landscape.</p>	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	<p>Noted</p> <p>We disagree with this proposed rewording.</p> <p>You cannot compensate for the loss of a view and we think that the current wording is reasonable. Impact can be positive or negative and planning applications have to make a case for it being an exceptional case.</p>	
118.	Page 87 Policy ENV 9	<p>This policy creates an area of separation between Kibworth and Smeeton Westerby. Should the north east Kibworth SDA be approved in the new local plan then it will be important to have a zone of separation on the Kibworths parish boundary with the Burton Overy parish boundary. This would protect the countryside abutting the Burton Brook from development encroaching in that direction following the construction of a new by pass to accommodate the SDA.</p>	Fran Brown BO Parish Council	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This will be considered with any review of the NP once the position relating to the SDA is known.</p>	None

119.	Page 87 Policy ENV 9	Area of Separation - Saddington Parish is fully in favour of this policy. Kibworth should not be allowed to coalesce with Smeeton Westerby, and it is right that a green open space should be maintained to define the sense of community.	Chris Carter, Chairman, Saddington Parish Council	Noted	None
120.	Page 88 Figure 15	Separation areas should be open countryside, the area around the school should not be included. The group need to work with Smeeton Westerby to allow for the area to be designated over the border.	HDC Officers	Noted. Boundary to be revised.	Amendment to be made as proposed.
121.	Page 88 Policy ENV 10	Reference is made to development proposals being viewed positively where they have addressed sustainable drainage which is welcomed. The supporting text of this policy cross also refers to the requirements of Policy ENV11. Please see comments below relating to Policy ENV 11.	Anglian Water	Noted	None
122.	Page 88 Policy ENV 10	Page 89 Para 1,point d, line 2, after hirundines, please insert "house sparrows", rest of point d is very good, no further changes to d. House sparrows have faced 60% decline, on red list and BAP species. House sparrow nesting boxes really help the species.	Resident	Agreed	Amendment to be made as proposed.
123.	Page 89 Policy ENV 11	Policy ENV 11 is unlikely to be compliant with NPPF. The sequential test is required in flood zones 2 and 3 and in flood zone 1 for developments over 1 hectare. In addition areas adjacent to flood zone 2 or 3 should be checked against the climate projections.	HDC Officers	Agreed	Amend to The sequential test is required in flood zones 2 and 3 and in flood zone 1 for developments over 1 hectare. In addition areas adjacent to flood zone 2 or 3 should be checked against the climate projections.
124.	Page 89 Policy ENV 11	Anglian Water welcomes the reference made to the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) as part of new development. We support the use of SUDs to reduce risk of surface water and sewer flooding.	Anglian Water	Noted	None

125.	Page 89 Flooding	<p>Flood Risk Management</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</p>	Flood Risk Management LCC	Noted	None
------	---------------------	--	---------------------------------	-------	------

		<p>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">• Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation.• Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development.• Require development to resolve existing flood risk. <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">• Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)).• Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map).• Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding.• 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.• Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>flood risk.</p> <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 our role as LLFA will object to anything contrary to LCC policies.</p> <p>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.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

TRANSPORT

No:	Plan section/ policy number	Comment	From	Response	Proposed Amendment
126.	Transport General Comment	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. Like very many local authorities, the County Council's	LCC Highways	Noted	None

		<p>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.</p> <p>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 maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provided as a commuted sum.</p> <p>With 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</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>once the contributions have stopped i.e. 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 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>Given pressures on public finances, funding considerations have to be based on clear evidence of the issues and the likely effectiveness of solutions.</p>			
127.	Page 94 Policy T1 to T6	<p>Suggest: introduction of a 20mph speed limit to the 'main shopping area' and outside both schools, speed tables installed in the High Street/Smeeton Rd/Station St, junction improvements at Smeeton Rd/High St to better allow safe access for school buses and delivery lorries plus improve line of sight when exiting Smeeton Rd, reduction in width of some pavements to allow better on-street parking, zebra crossing on Station St (outside The Railway) and top of the High St (near the Coop), attend to pavement parking by allowing it or engineering works to accommodate it, work with partners to deal with parking issues, consider formulation of 'one way' system in the White St area.</p>	Resident	<p>Noted</p> <p>Traffic management solutions will be considered in conjunction with other parties in line with Policy T5.</p>	None
128.	Page 94 Policy T1	<p>We fully support the requirement for new development to consider its impact on the wider highway network as outlined in Policy T1: Location of New Housing, in line with Paragraph 30 and 35 of the NPPF and Policies CS1 and CS5 of the</p>	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College	Noted	None

		HDC Core Strategy. The proposed SDA scheme will provide a bypass which is anticipated to reduce the number of cars travelling through the villages by 50% by 2035. The masterplan has been designed to incorporate safe pedestrian and cycle routes which would provide connections throughout the new development and into the existing village.	and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance		
129.	Page 95 and 96	A roundabout at New Road is now URGENT provided with s.106 moneys from MOH approvals.	Resident	Noted. Traffic management solutions will be considered in conjunction with other parties in line with Policy T5.	None
130.	Page 96 Policy T2	With regards to Policy T2: Access onto the A6, we fully appreciate the concerns that residents have regarding access onto the A6. The proposed SDA development would include the provision of a bypass which would reduce traffic that currently travels through the Kibworths. This would assist in improving connectivity to the existing A6 and wider afield. The bypass would join the A6 with one roundabout to the north and one roundabout to the south east of the Kibworths, thus improving the ease of access for existing residents.	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None
131.	Page 97 Policy T3	Saddington Parish would like to see additional car parking provided in Kibworth so that the through routes can be kept clear(er) of parked traffic and hence safer for the community. Overall, we think that the plan is well considered, well laid out and comprehensive. Good luck with the completion of the plan and the referendum!	Chris Carter, Chairman, Saddington Parish Meeting	Noted Policy T3 protects existing car parks and supports additional ones being provided.	None
132.	Page 98 Policy T4	Both roads mentioned are very dangerous so I would like to add a pavement and cycleway along Fleckney Road and Warwick Road linking up the built up areas of Kibworth Harcourt, Kibworth Meadows and Kibworth Beauchamp with the football ground, allotments, garden centre and other amenities. Every day I see allotment holders cycling to and from home along	Resident	Noted These concerns will be taken into account when specific proposals are being considered.	None

		Fleckney Road. I also cycle it many times and it is a really winding dangerous highway.			
133.	Page 98 Policy T4	<p>We fully support the proposals to improve road safety as outlined in Policy T4:</p> <p>Improvements to Road Safety, in line with Paragraphs 30 and 35 of the NPPF and Policy CS5 of the HDC Core Strategy. The proposed SDA development would provide safe pedestrian and cycle access between the existing village and the wider landscape.</p>	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None
134.	Page 98 Policy T5	<p>With regards to Policy T5: Traffic Management, we fully support the desire to resolve the existing issues with the highways network in and around the Kibworths in line with Paragraphs 30 and 35 of the NPPOF and Policy CS5 of the HDC Core Strategy. The proposed SDA scheme would provide a bypass around the north of Kibworth Harcourt and the downgrading of the A6 through the Kibworths. This is projected to reduce the levels of traffic travelling through the Kibworths by 50% by 2035.</p>	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None
135.	Page 98 Policy T6	<p>In respect of Policy T6: Air Quality, we fully support the objectives of improving Air Quality and reducing reliance on less sustainable forms of transport in line with Paragraphs 30 and 95 of the NPPF and Policies CS1 and CS5 of the HDC Core Strategy. As previously stated, the proposed SDA will provide a bypass which is anticipated to reduce the amount of traffic travelling through the Kibworths by 50% by 2035. In addition, the proposed scheme will provide safe pedestrian and cycle access between the new development and the existing villages, whilst there is also the potential to bring additional bus services through the subject site. These transport measures will collectively contribute to improving the air quality and the pedestrian experience for existing residents of the Kibworths.</p>	Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger on behalf of Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance	Noted	None

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

No:	Plan section/ policy number	Comment	From	Response	Proposed Amendment
136.	Page 99 Policy E1	<p>With regards to Policy E1: Primary Shopping Area, we fully support the provision of new retail development, and the protection of existing retail uses in line with Paragraphs 23 and 28 of the NPPF and Policy CS6 of the HDC Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed SDA developments scheme would provide 5 hectares of employment land which would provide the opportunity for roadside facilities that encourage a range of employment uses.</p>	<p>Stephen Mair – Andrew Granger</p> <p>Merton College and Leicester Diocesan Board of Finance</p>	Noted	None

137.	Economic Development General Comment	<p>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>Although this has been included, we feel that this could be strengthened. Public realm could be considered. With the amount of potential new development foreseen over the coming years, the plan should consider where any new retail development should be located and reflect this within the plan. A positive public realm should be maintained to ensure a vibrant village centre, suggested funding could be sought through Section 106 to deliver this. Consider whether to resist retail outside of immediate town centre area. Examples can be found with Barrow on Soar and Ashby de la Zouch Draft Plans.</p> <p>www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/uploads/draft-plan-12.pdf</p> <p>www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/uploads/draft-plan-20.pdf</p>	LCC	<p>Noted</p> <p>There was limited support for this.</p> <p>Resisting retail outside the shopping centre would diminish access for the rest of the Parish</p>	None
138.	Page 102 Policy E5	<p>On farm diversification etc, point c after the words environment features at end, please add "...including wildlife. Consideration in line with Environment Policy ENV10 to be included to replace possible lost habitat and help wildlife". This is very important as many farm buildings are nesting sites for bats, barn owls, other birds and wildlife. Changes to the buildings could destroy the resident wildlife</p>	Resident	Agreed	Amendment to be made as proposed.