

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No.	Chapter/ Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Anglian Water	<p>Dutton Bassett is located outside of Anglian Water's area of responsibility. Therefore, we have no comments to make relating to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We serve part of Harborough district but not Dutton Bassett. The views of Severn Trent Water who provide water and wastewater services in the parish should also be sought on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted	None
		Policy H1	Sport England	<p>Residential allocation to the north of the cricket field. Whilst we have no objection in principle and it is noted that there is a requirement to provide car parking and associated green space for the cricket club.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed development gives rise to a potential conflict with the use of the playing field. Cricket balls are likely to leave the playing field and land on the application site when matches are being played. The proposed development would increase the potential liability on the owners of the land for damage to property and</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. This issue will be dealt with at planning application stage. The problem is recognised and the intention is to establish a solution such as 'ball-stop netting' or to ensure a buffer of 70m between the development and the wicket.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

			<p>personal injury, including use of the proposed green space.</p> <p>Cricket ball strikes have the potential to constitute a nuisance under the Environmental Health legislation and as such could prejudice the sporting use of the playing field. This was the case in Miller -v- Jackson [1977] QB 966 where cricket balls from a village green kept going into a nearby house.</p> <p>Sport England and ECB recognises similarities with a previous planning case that have been considered by the Courts: East Meon Forge and Cricket Ground Protection Association v East Hampshire District Council [2014] EWHC 3543 (Admin) (31 October 2014). In the East Meon case, an assessment undertaken on behalf of the Cricket Club found that cricket balls commonly travel in excess of 70 metres, at all levels and abilities. It was found to be unreasonable to expect residents to live behind shutters during summer weekends or to stay out of their gardens or away from other amenity areas. Additionally, the occupants and visitors to dwellings will be at risk of injury when entering or leaving premises during cricket matches. In the East Meon case, Sport England advised that the proposed mitigating measures (removable shutters) were unenforceable and a permanent ball-stop fence was required. Mrs Justice</p>	<p>The cricket pitch is adjacent to the A426 and there do not seem to have been problems historically in relation to this.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>Lang considered Sport England's representations to be sound. In this case the risk could relate to housing particularly the development of the send wicket but also relates to the use of the proposed public open space.</p> <p>Sport England would recommend an independent risk assessment is undertaken to gauge the likely impact of the proposed development within close proximity to the existing and proposed cricket pitch to inform the need for or design of the necessary mitigation to prevent any ball strike.</p> <p>Whilst the ball stop netting/fencing could be dealt with as part of any potential development , Sport England is aware from experience elsewhere that the ball stop netting/fencing for cricket can be up to 25 metres in height and this has caused concern for the Local Planning Authority. For this reason, Sport England considers that need for and the matter of the design and height of any required ball stop netting/fencing should be understood and resolved as part of the allocation as this may affect the allocation area.</p>		
		Policy ENV2 support	Sport England	Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy,	These general comments are noted. S106 monies will be sought to improve recreational	None

			<p>inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England’s playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.</p> <p>https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of</p>	<p>facilities in the parish. The car park associated with the cricket ground will be updated as part of the development.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Harborough District Council Has developed a Playing Pitch Strategy (see link below) and a Built Sports Facilities Strategy which includes a section on Village and Community Halls (not sure of the link)</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>For Dunton Bassett CC the strategy advises;</p> <p>Poor quality artificial grass strip with no spare capacity at peak times and recommends the replacement of the artificial grass strip if supports sports development objectives of the club.</p> <p>For Dunton Bassett FC the strategy advises;</p> <p>No spare capacity at peak time. Requires pitch improvements, the Clubhouse needs replacement showers. Walkway and additional car parking are also needed. The strategy recommends both pitch and changing room improvements.</p> <p>http://www.harborough.gov.uk/directory_record/3040/harborough_playing_pitch_strategy_2018</p> <p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</p> <p><i>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</i></p> <p>If you need any further advice, please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.</p>		
		Mike Hooper	<p>We have recently been made aware of the Neighbourhood Plan document and on reviewing it today have noted the proposal of developing on the field next to the children's playground. A number of</p>	Noted	None

				my neighbours; who we have spoken to; and ourselves on Church Close, wish to oppose these plans.		
	8.5.1		Arriva	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Dunton Bassett Neighbourhood Plan, which has been passed to me by our Customer Services team.</p> <p>We note the comment in section 8.5.1 that “the lack of a [bus] service within the main part of the village disenfranchises those living in the southern and eastern end of the village” and that public transport was identified as a concern through the Community Questionnaire.</p> <p>We therefore suggest consideration is made in relation to the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for clarity around the reference to the ‘eastern end’ of the village – is this a reference to properties fronting Station Road? In which case they are within 400m of the bus stops on Coopers Lane, which are easily accessed via the existing footway and traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing. • No reference is made to improving public transport access to the southern end of the village, although it is identified as an area of concern – is there opportunity for policy T3 to consider, where appropriate, what additional benefits may be 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed – we will remove reference to problems at the eastern end.</p> <p>We do not think the Neighbourhood Plan can address this. It is a function of increased development and therefore potentially greater usage.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>None</p>

				<p>delivered to other parts of the village by enhanced public transport provision subsequent to new housing development, and to identify an aim to increase modal share across the wider village to support the ongoing financial viability of the enhanced provision following expiry of the developer's financial contributions?</p> <p>Thank you, again, for the opportunity to feed back as part of the review process.</p>		
			Deb Markham	<p>I have been reading the Neighbourhood plan and would like some clarification on the paragraph on page 15 which states that the footpath through to the proposed housing site will be enhanced. The footpath has buildings to either side of it and leads directly onto Main Street, this in itself is dangerous especially when like us you live to the side of it and children run down and onto our land with no parental control. With the increase the houses would give, it would be sensible if the footpath was re-located and actually came to an entrance that did not come directly onto Main Street or that came into an area that could be enhanced as an entrance area/car park. Your comments would be much appreciated on this.</p>	<p>The enhancements that are being considered include making sure the path is properly surfaced and lit to improve safety and installing railings where appropriate.</p>	None
			National Grid	<p>Dear Sir / Madam Dunton Bassett Draft Neighbourhood Plan – Statutory Consultation period – 15/02/2021 –</p>	Noted	None

				<p>29/03/2021 Representations on behalf of National Grid National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document. About National Grid National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses. National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use. National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States. Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>assets: Following a review of the above document we have identified the following National Grid assets as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary: National Grid 17 March 2021 Page 3 avisonyoung.co.uk Electricity Transmission Asset Description ZL ROUTE TWR (109 - 213): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: EAST CLAYDON - ENDERBY - PATFORD BRIDGE 1 A plan showing details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only. National Grid also provides information in relation to its assets at the website below. • www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ Please see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure. Distribution Networks Information regarding the electricity distribution network is available at the website below: www.energynetworks.org.uk Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting: plantprotection@cadentgas.com Further Advice Please remember to consult National Grid on any</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database, if they are not already included: Matt Verlander, Director Spencer Jefferies, Town Planner nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com Avison Young Central Square South Orchard Street Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 3AZ National Grid National Grid House Warwick Technology Park Gallows Hill Warwick, CV34 6DA If you require any further information in respect of this letter, then please contact us</p>		
			Highways England	<p>Consultation on the Pre-Submission Version of the Dunton Bassett Neighbourhood Plan Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission version of the Dunton Bassett Neighbourhood Plan which has been produced for public consultation and covers the period 2020 to 2031. The document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications. Highways England has been</p>	Noted	None

			<p>appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Dunton Bassett Neighbourhood Plan, Highways England's principal interest is in safeguarding the operation of the M1 Motorway which routes through the Plan area, and the A5 Trunk Road and the M69 Motorway which route approximately 4 miles to the southwest and 5 miles to the northwest of the Plan area respectively. We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and District-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for Dunton Bassett Parish is required to be in conformity with the Harborough Local Plan (2011-2031) adopted in 2019, and this is acknowledged within the document. Dunton Bassett is classified as a 'Selected Rural Village' within the Harborough Local Plan and as such</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>development will be on a lesser scale to reflect the size and character of the village. Taking account of completions, commitments and an allowance for windfall development, the Local Plan requires the Parish to provide a minimum of 40 additional dwellings. We note that the Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for up to 50 additional dwellings in the plan period to be met through the allocation of a housing site at land behind the children's playground in accordance with Policy H1. In addition, Policy H2 makes provision for a reserve site for around 50 additional dwellings at the junction of Broughton Lane and Coopers Lane, should it be needed during the duration of the Plan either due to an increase in housing demands or the inability of the designated sites to provide the required scale of housing. We note that no employment sites have been allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, existing and new employment opportunities within the village's limits of development (with some exceptions for small-scale leisure and tourism activities and other forms of commercial/employment-related development appropriate to a</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>countryside location) are supported in accordance with Policies E1 and E2. Due to the scale and anticipated distribution of the additional development growth being proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan, it is unlikely that there will be any significant impacts on the operation of the SRN in the area. We therefore have no further comments to provide and trust the above is useful in the progression of the Dunton Bassett Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
			Mike Hooper	<p>My apologies for the delay in submitting our comments. I appreciate this is an unenviable task and as such I would not want to go into too much detail, I'll bullet point our concerns to help you out and then add a personal element below.</p> <p>Having viewed the Neighbourhood Plan we do have some concerns about the proposition for plans identified on Site A for the Residential Allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact on existing vista across fields from Church Close - Impact on house prices for Church Close - Impact of noise from construction - Increase in light pollution in village - Loss of green space in village 	<p>Thank you for taking the trouble to comment.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>These comments are noted. Unfortunately, Dunton Bassett is required to deliver a minimum of 40 dwellings up to 2031, so issues to do with the noise of construction, loss of</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of green space for walking route of Leicestershire Round whilst in Dunton Bassett - Modernisation of existing traditional village feel and ambiance - Knock on impact for further development 	<p>green space, increase in light pollution etc are inevitable and unavoidable.</p> <p>The view across the fields from Church Close was not highlighted as a special view and the planning system cannot protect every open view otherwise it would be deemed to be overly restrictive.</p>	None
			<p>In an attempt to be positive, if I could make the recommendation that as we're looking for 40x houses over 10 years rather than putting in a big block of a development on a single site, we could easily manage infill of developments to existing brownfield and unused sites. Dunton Bassett has been made up of small developments of 5-6 houses, as demonstrated by Church Close in the 1970s, which has allowed Dunton Bassett to remain in keeping with the traditional aesthetic.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, relying on infill development fails to secure the considerable additional powers that NPs can achieve by allocating sites to meet its housing requirement. This will help to prevent further unwanted development in Dunton Bassett. Development of this scale enables the provision of additional benefits such as Affordable Housing to help meet a local need.</p>	None
			<p>We have sites on Station Road and Lutterworth Road that could be used. We also have smaller plots within the village itself, such as on Main Street. Two new houses have been put in place on Main Street opposite Elwells Avenue, which work well.</p>	<p>Both of these sites are already in the planning system and are already taken into account in the housing requirement. Infill sites such as this are not in great supply and would not achieve the numbers</p>	None

				<p>We live on Church Close, after moving into the village two years ago. One of the decisions to move here was to start a family in a nice quiet local village, to which we fell in love with Dunton Bassett. My family are originally from the south and my wife's family are Wigston, therefore it is well located. We maxed ourselves out on our mortgage to be able to afford a house backing onto the fields, which overlooks Site A. We've done a lot of work only this year to take down some very overgrown trees that were blocking everyone's view. only now to receive the plan indicating a proposed identification of a site that could be built on said fields behind the house. We're both devastated.</p> <p>We are both key workers who work a shift pattern and having the quiet peaceful nature of how Dunton Bassett is currently would be lost out on having a residential development place on this site. We are also proud of the fact the Leicestershire Round passes through the village and goes through this existing field. We regularly use it on our dog walks. It will be such a shame to lose out on this feel to the village.</p>	<p>required.</p> <p>We understand your frustration but the houses have to be built somewhere and it is inevitable that building them close to where people live is not popular with those people.</p> <p>The site was selected following an independently-led process.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	-------------------------------------

				<p>My concern would be similar to how a number of villages have recently had developments on it, such as Gilmorton, North Kilworth, etc. where subsequently it seems as though they are in an endless state of building new houses, due to a domino effect from an initial build.</p> <p>Submitted for your consideration.</p>	Noted	
Page 14 – 2 nd para			Matt Bills HDC	<p>Should be updated to reflect Local Plan para 5.1.11: <i>'Policy H1 therefore makes provision for a minimum of 12,800 dwellings from 2011 to 2031. Of this, about 8,792 dwellings have already been built or committed (through the granting of planning permission, or through allocation in neighbourhood plans) with a further 225 anticipated on windfall sites. Policy H1 therefore provides housing land for a minimum of a further 3,975 dwellings'.</i></p>	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
Page 24: 8.2.1.1 (first paragraph)			Matt Bills	The topography if of the Plan Area.....	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		Policy H1	Matt Bills	Comment received from Historic	Noted. The site in question	None

			<p>England <i>Dear Mr Bills,</i> <i>Further to my email we have received correspondence from a member of the public reminding us that the allocation site was featured in our report “Turning the Plough” as an area of ridge and furrow. In such instances we advise that the area is treated as an undesignated heritage asset where evidence of it is still visible, as we observe it is here.</i> <i>Yours sincerely,</i> <i>Clive Fletcher</i></p>	<p>is of lower-grade ridge and furrow which is not protected through the NP policy Env8.</p>	
			<p>the Local Plan requires a minimum of 40 dwellings during the plan period. 50 are allocated. Is this required <i>(Policy comment – NPPF allows NDPs to allocate more than Local Plan – future proofing)</i></p> <p>The phrase “visually indistinguishable from the market dwellings” is open to interpretation and it may be helpful to have either clearer wording in the policy or an explanation in the text.</p> <p>The site for the main allocation seems a bit disjointed from the village and I know that Highways have raised concerns regarding access onto the A426 in the past. The site has ridge and furrow which elsewhere in the Plan is protected – should this be</p>	<p>The comment answers its own question It is good practice to allocate more than the minimum requirement</p> <p>We think this is clear. The market housing should look the same as the Affordable Housing.</p> <p>We disagree. The site is within the built area of the village. Access issues continue to be pursued with Highways and there is a reserve site identified if the is a continuing issue. The R&F is differentiated on</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

				clarified?	figure 12.2	
		H1	Matt Bills	Suggest a minimum figure (or 'around' figure) is set out in the policy. The last paragraph on page 14 refers to the identification of a reserve site with one of the criteria being 'the failure of the allocated site to deliver the scale of housing required'. However, the scale required is not set out in Policy H1. There is no reference to highway access in the policy.	Agreed. Will change to 'around'	Change to be made as indicated.
		H2	Matt Bills	Does not set out any criteria for development of the site, only about when it would come forward. This is an opportunity to set out any criteria for the development.	We will include conditions including safe access; 40% Affordable Housing and 66% of the dwellings being 3 bed or fewer.	Change to be made as indicated.
				the DM officers (that deal with the west side of the district) are not supportive of the site for the reserve allocation. To allocate 50 as a reserve may be unwise (see the appeal decision on 13/01539/FUL, the reserve site for Broughton Astley Neighbourhood Plan which was built before their main allocated sites). Most importantly this area of countryside is as sensitive, if not more sensitive, than the Coopers Lane site that was dismissed at appeal. The plan also seeks to designate views across this site as Important Open	<p>Noted. We hope that the reserve site is not needed through the Plan period.</p> <p>We will change the policy to say 'up to 50'</p> <p>It has been extremely difficult to identify appropriate sites through the NP given the range of constraints in the parish.</p> <p>Agreed. We will remove the arm looking towards the site from viewpoint 7</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>

				Views (policy ENV7) and thus there seems to be some conflict with its Reserve site allocation (<i>policy comment – NPPF allows NDPs to allocate more housing than the Local Plan – future proofing the plan</i>)		
		H4		Refers to meeting ‘identified local needs’ in first part of policy. Second part of policy refers to meeting ‘current and future needs’. Suggest both should refer to ‘identified local needs’. As regards the reference to the M4(2) Building Regulations, neighbourhood plans should not be used to apply new technical standards. It is for the Local Plan to set these out in policy. (See Hallaton NP Examiner’s Report).	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		H5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a: Second sentence doesn’t read correctly. Suggest: ‘Care should be taken to ensure that the development minimises disruption of the visual amenity of the street scene and does not not impact negatively on any significant wider landscape views. h: Wording very specific and requirements may change over time. Suggest it is less prescriptive in approach (all new dwellings 	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
					Noted. See Ryton on Dunsmore Examination for an example of where an Examiner passed such a policy.	None
					7kw is the current standard and this is likely to increase over time, so the wording is not therefore restrictive.	None

				<p>will be built to ensure that the installation of a home electric vehicle charging point can be facilitated).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> p: suggest criterion is amended: Unnecessary artificial lighting should be avoided. Avoidance of all unnecessary artificial lighting: there is no legal duty requiring any place to be lit Although this subject is more fully covered in Policy H8 and therefore this criterion is not really needed. 	Agreed. Criterion can be deleted.	Change to be made as indicated.
		H6	Matt Bills	refers to ‘the assessment of affordable housing need (2019) or later report updating this document’. It is not clear what the 2019 assessment referred to is. Is it a reference to the Housing Needs Report August 2019 if so it would be best to use the document’s title.	Yes – will use full title.	Change to be made as indicated.
		H8	Matt Bills	This is entitled ‘Use of street lighting’ but the policy covers any new lighting	Will change title to ‘new street lighting’.	Change to be made as indicated.
				the supporting text suggests both on-street and external wall-mounted lighting is of concern/to be controlled, but the policy relates solely to on street lighting. Should the supporting text be changed? Also bear in mind	<p>Agreed – will amend the text.</p> <p>The policy will apply where planning permission is required.</p>	<p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>None</p>

				that much of the public highway (and thus on-street lighting) is owned by LCC and they are unlikely to need PP for alterations/additions/changes to their streetlights.		
		Policy ENV 2		Should refer to Figure 6 not Figure 5.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		ENV4		tree survey requirement for trees/hedges: the BS standard doesn't apply to hedges as far as I know, it is only trees. It would seem unreasonable to ask for a survey when it's a hedge. Hedges in private gardens are rarely protected by Planning legislation.	Agreed. We will remove the reference to hedges.	Change to be made as indicated.
		Policy ENV 6:		Closing bracket missing after Figure 9.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		ENV10		the map with this policy shows the reserve site (or part of it) within Limits, however H3 doesn't include this site in limits. Should this be clarified?	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		Policy ENV 11:		last part of policy – suggest deleting 'strongly' before supported as superfluous.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		Policy CF1:		'which complies with the other general policies of the Neighbourhood Plan' is not needed.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		Policy CF2		a) is unnecessary cross-reference to another policy.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.

		Policy E1:		Is reference to B-class still appropriate given changes to Use Classes Order? B-Class only includes 'Industrial' and 'Storage and distribution' (of which there probably aren't any in DB) now whereas the new E-Class includes offices and light industrial.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		Policy E2		Question why criterion h) is necessary. Why does development have to integrate and complement existing businesses? It could a stifle new or innovative business from setting up	We would prefer to keep this criterion to ensure that development remains appropriate and sympathetic to its location.	None
		E2 d)		residents support the idea of a café/shop, yet this policy doesn't allow houses to be converted to an employment use and wants new employment to be within the limits, in existing buildings or on PDL. Other policies protect the village hall, school, pub etc. How does the Plan support residents' aspirations? Maybe this policy needs better wording?	We wanted to avoid employment sites being created in residential areas, hence the requirement to avoid conversion of existing dwellings. Existing community facilities can evolve over time to provide changing community wishes in terms of services delivered.	None
		Policy E3:		unnecessary to refer to other policies in the plan as the plan needs to be read as a whole.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		Policy E4:		Suggest the policy should allow for well-designed new buildings.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
		General	Matt Bills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dunton Basset NP makes 	The allocation policy	None

		<p>comments about the plan:</p>		<p>reference to two key sites for housing, an allocated site for up to 50 dwellings and a 'potential' site near the existing cricket ground. One of the key matters to be raised in terms of existing housing is the large number of detached 3/4 bedroom houses (38%) and the relatively small proportion of one bedroom dwellings (8%) and the acknowledgment in the draft Dunton Bassett NP of an under occupation of dwellings and a need for smaller sized houses e.g. one & two bedroom dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of a planning obligations policy would be a recognition new development can bring significant benefits for a local community, for example, new homes and jobs/employment opportunities and assist in securing through a S106 legal agreement for example a proportion of affordable 	<p>addresses this issue</p>	
--	--	---------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------	--

				<p>housing on any proposed housing development that come forward and are implemented. S106 planning obligations are used to secure infrastructure or funding from a developer to mitigate the impacts of a new development, towards for example local infrastructure and affordable housing where appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S106 Planning obligations must meet the three legal tests in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended) – necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development, fair and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development • The CIL charge regime was introduced by the Planning Act 2008 and it came into force on 6th April 2010. The CIL is a means for local authorities in England and 		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>Wales to help deliver infrastructure to support new development in their area. To date, Harborough District Council has not introduced a CIL charge in the District. This however is being kept under review in conjunction with partner authorities across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration should be given to a developer contributions policy in the Neighbourhood Plan recognising the priorities for example infrastructure, affordable housing are consistent with the Harborough Local Plan. 		
			Alan Coltman	<p>Very good informative, detailed report.</p> <p>Can you confirm how many houses Dunton Bassett has to have built under Market Harborough plans. 40? How many have been recently built, or at an application stage and do they count? Do these count towards the number needed?</p> <p>I would want to preserve as much green space as possible.</p> <p>Site A – Old field, signs of ridge and</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>40 is the minimum requirement taking into account existing approvals including currently identified infill sites. Providing for around 50 helps to future-proof the Plan against future increases in housing need.</p>	None

				<p>furrow. Should this be preserved? Site B – Edge of village. I would prefer to see this site developed. Hopefully any plan would eliminate the bad righthand bend from Coopers Lane into Broughton Lane. How many accidents have been there where vehicles have taken the bend too fast? A new junction or mini island could be designed to remove this accident hazard.</p>	<p>Well-preserve ridge and furrow is protected in the NP.</p> <p>Access to either site will need to be satisfactory for development to go ahead.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--