

## Neighbourhood Plan

### Pre submission consultation responses

No.	Chapter/ Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Dave Smith	<p>The plan is a very detailed and well considered document and I would like to thank all those who have put time and effort into it.</p> <p>I do have a few points that could be considered for incorporation into the document:</p> <p>1) The plan is primarily about human housing and creation of new places for humans to live but I see no reason why we shouldn't plan for new places for all wildlife to live in as well - to the benefit of all of us. I suggest that the plan should include requirements for re-wilding and the creation of habitat as well as the construction of houses. The land behind Coopers lane up to the proposed policy H1 area of residential allocation has the potential for extensive tree planting, the creation of water habitat and also open communal green space for the use of all residents - all easily accessible by the majority of the village without the requirement to cross busy roads. We are poorly served for an easily accessible safe,</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>This is a correct observation, but the absence of a policy for habitat creation is a function of the status of Neighbourhood Plans in the English Planning system, and the fact that a NP's policies can only be about a) creation of a framework within which new development generally in DB will occur and b) rejection or modification (by the HDC planning committee) of actual development proposals (planning applications) on specific sites in the parish. There is a presumption in English planning that new development should result in 'biodiversity net gain', but in practice this is very difficult to</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>

			central and open green space for communal use.	attain and (partly for that reason) unlikely to be enforceable, especially at the relatively small scale of development in a place like DB [HS2-scale strategic developments take so much land that they can include (e.g.) tree-planting, wetland creation, etc. on previously low-biodiversity land within the wider site], However, we will strengthen the Plan to reference the need for 'net gain'.	
			2) I think it should be built into the plan that all new builds are to meet certain (high!) standards for energy efficiency - no gas mains to be put in and requirements for solar PV and thermal to be built into the properties from the start. This is all do-able but obviously tends to eat into the profit margins of developers. I commend the requirements of off street parking for new developments but think that the 7kW charging requirement is insufficient. In order for quicker car charging and more efficient use of hot water systems in the new properties (heat on demand only) we should require 22kW (3 phase) connections for new builds. Also fibre to the premises should be a requirement - a fibre line runs along	Policy H5g) requires development to 'meet high standards for energy and water efficiency, including the use of renewable and low carbon energy technology, as appropriate ...'  The 7kw requirement is the current standard that has to apply. The policy says 'at least ...' to promote higher levels when available.	None
				Policy E6 requires broadband access.	None

			<p>Coopers lane, any new development could easily tap into it. Creates better potential for people working from home etc.</p> <p>3) The plan to minimise artificial street light is an interesting one as I feel the village is already poorly lit! Good lighting can make people feel safer walking about after dark and reduce the likelihood of trips and falls.</p> <p>4) It is noted that speed of traffic down Coopers lane is an issue but actually it's the noise that creates more nuisance. Adding physical traffic calming measures can actually make that worse, a vehicle slowing down and speeding generates more noise and pollution than one at a steady speed. More random spot checks of speed and noise might be a solution.</p>	<p>Noted. There can be environmental harm by providing additional street lighting.</p> <p>Noted. Policy T1 seeks to promote alternative modes of transport. The proliferation of electric vehicles will help to impact on noise!</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
		Marc Gibson	<p>Having reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan we do have some concerns about the proposition for plans identified on Site A for the Residential Allocation.</p> <p>1) Concerns over the access to the site from the busy A426. Turning into Church Lane off the A426 can be challenging enough when vehicles do not slow down to let you turn in at a realistic speed. Furthermore, the houses on the same</p>	<p>Thank you for making comment.</p> <p>Noted. The Highways Authority will have to approve any access arrangements, and the developers will be required to find an acceptable solution.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

			<p>side of the A426 junction have parking spaces off Cooper's Lane, not off the busy A426. I presume this was due to the concerns over safety at the time of building these houses.</p> <p>2) Concerns relating to additional congestion driving through the village, on the narrow roads, particularly around the school drop off/collection pinch points. Families moving to Site A would more than likely drive to the school to drop off children, as we already know the majority of parents living on Station Road do this before making their onward journey. Where would these additional vehicles park at the school drop off, with the roads around and outside of the school currently at capacity during these times?</p> <p>3) It is a concern that the two "new build" properties built across the road from Elwells Avenue took nearly two years to sell from point of completion. Does this demonstrate a lack of demand from families to move into the village and does this relate to the reduced number of amenities in the village (one pub and a small village school)?</p> <p>4) What are the provisions for the school to have capacity for a further calculated 25 children (an increase in capacity of around 25%). Is there an extra class room being planned alongside additional teaching resources?</p>	<p>Dunton Bassett is required to take a minimum of 40 new dwellings and this is a problem that is likely to manifest itself wherever new development is located in the Parish. Policy CF3 supports an expansion of the current school, or replacement is a suitable location can be found. The allocated site provides for an additional car park.</p> <p>Further new build will help to sustain the remaining community facilities – but the housing requirement as set by Harborough DC is a minimum of 40 dwellings, so this figure has to be met somewhere.</p> <p>Adequate educational provision is a requirement that will be addressed at planning application stage.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------

			<p>5) Considerations relating to the wider infrastructure to support more families moving into the area. Residents in the local villages use the doctor's surgeries located in either Lutterworth or Broughton Astley, do these services have additional capacity to take on new patients? We understand the site of 'Lutterworth East' was contested by the LRI due to concerns around supporting additional families moving to the area with their health in particular the A&amp;E dept. Furthermore, in our own personal experience it took us nearly two years after being on multiple waiting lists to be offered a place at a dental practice in Lutterworth.</p>	<p>A contribution to medical facilities will be provided as part of the planning application process.</p>	<p>None</p>
			<p>6) The obstruction to the view for the area. The attached image is a picture that our 7 year old son woke me up to take, as he appreciates the view from his bedroom window alongside the sunrise and sunset. Our three children also enjoy bird spotting and watching the local wildlife, including foxes, rabbits, pheasants, cows, horses due to the natural environment surrounding us. We believe this is highly beneficial for a positive influence on their mental well-being and would also have a concern around there being a reduction in the wildlife due to the additional manmade materials, pollution and noise created by site A. I've also attached an edited image of the potential view if</p>	<p>Unfortunately, the obstruction of private views are not legitimate reasons for refusing planning applications.</p>	<p>None</p>

			<p>properties are built on the proposed site, which shows the potential obstruction to the view.</p> <p>7) We understand there is a need to build additional housing in the village, however the requirement is 40 houses based upon the amenities of the village, this site proposes 50 houses, why is this? We chose to move to a village with big open green spaces and the lifestyle this offers. We would like to understand if there is a commitment from the local council to build with consideration and compassion to the pre-existing style and open spaces of a village and not build as many houses as possible onto the proposed site.</p> <p>I hope our comments are considered and if we can provide further detail in relation to any of the points raised, then please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	<p>The requirement is for a minimum of 40. It is recognised good practice to exceed this minimum requirement in order to safeguard the NP protections should the housing requirement increase in the future.</p> <p>The development will be required to meet the design requirements identified in policy H5</p> <p>Thank you again. We are sorry that the answers are probably not what you were hoping for.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
		Duncan Poultney	<p>I offer the following two observations on the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The open space in the lay-by area on Dunton Road is referenced in two places within the Plan. Neither mentions the presence of water associated with the local land drainage system although the holding area is outlined on some the maps. The holding area has been full on a number of occasions during the winter when it is quiet deep. During hot summer</p>	<p>Thank you for commenting on the draft Plan.</p> <p>Noted. The NP includes this as part of the Wildlife Corridor and is referenced in the flood map.</p>	<p>None</p>

			<p>periods it is just damp - with a consequential impact on the flora and fauna. Should the extent of this area be referred to somewhere as 'woodland and wetland'?</p> <p>If the local surface water drainage were ever to be improved then the need for this water holding feature could potentially disappear.</p> <p>8.2.4 Important Open Space Figure 6: Important Open Spaces Ref A. Dunton Road Natural Greenspace (HDC OSSR site) Page 32.</p> <p>8.2.5 Natural Environment and Biodiversity 8.2.5.1 Sites of natural environment significance Figure 7: Sites of natural environment significance Ref 017.3 Page 36</p> <p>The recent proposal for a Leicester – Rugby railway link and its potential impact are unlikely to have been considered during the development of the Plan. Has the Parish Council formulated its position on this?</p> <p>8.2.5.2 Woodland, notable trees and hedges</p>	<p>This has been considered by the Parish Council who have taken the view that this is highly unlikely to be an issue over the lifetime of the NP.</p> <p>This is already referenced in the NP</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------

				In Dunton Bassett there is a group of planted and rewilded deciduous woodlands along the M1 and Great Central Railway corridor. Page 36		
			Severn Trent	<p>Dunton Basset Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission version Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation, Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles outlined within the neighbourhood plan. There area however a few areas of the plan that we feel could be enhanced by some minor changes to assist with the delivery of the plan objectives and deliver wider benefits.</p> <p>Policy H1: Residential Site Allocation Severn Trent would not raise any specific concerns regard a development of this scale, provided surface water is managed sustainably and discharged to a sustainable outfall, in accordance with the drainage hierarchy. We would however encourage developers to contact Severn Trent early within their design process to ensure a viable outfall location can be agreed and where required any localised improvements can be programmed into our plans.</p> <p>Policy H5: Design Quality Severn Trent are supportive of the approach highlighted in bullet point e to enhance biodiversity and relate to the natural topography, however we would recommend that the bullet point also references watercourses</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>



			<p>(including ditches) such that they are protected and retained as open features where possible.</p> <p>Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to encourage and incorporate SuDS and water efficiency in bullet point g. We would however recommend that the statement also references: • the Drainage Hierarchy to ensure that surface water is discharged to the most sustainable outfall, • that SuDS are designed in accordance with current industry best practice to provide wider benefits that just retention of surface water and, • that water efficiency is designed to meet the optional target set out in Building Regulations part g Drainage Hierarchy Surface water can leave new development sites in a number of different ways, the drainage hierarchy (Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80) sets out the order in which these options should be considered based around how sustainable the outfalls are, it is vital that new 2 development directs surface water to the most appropriate outfall, and would therefore recommend that the drainage hierarchy is detailed within the Design Policy. Some example wording is: All applications for new development shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, in such that a discharge to the</p>	<p>SuDs are referenced at an appropriate level in Policy Env 11. No additional policy changes are felt necessary as it is covered by national legislation.</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	--	-------------

				<p>public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible SuDS Severn Trent note that industry best practice (CIRIA C753 the SuDS Manual) identifies that SuDS should be designed to perform against 4 key pillars: 1. Water Quantity (Flow rate and volume), 2. Water Quality (discharge water as clean as possible) 3. Biodiversity (support wildlife) 4. Amenity (support wider community activities) This approach can be both beneficial in terms of land take for the developer by enabling land to count towards green space and flood alleviation. It also looks to ensure that SuDS are considered as part of the initial design and incorporated into the site as resources rather than last minute additions. Some example wording to assist in the interpretation of this recommendation is: All major developments shall ensure that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off are put in place unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. All schemes for the inclusions of SuDS should demonstrate they have considered all four aspects of good SuDS design, Quantity, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity, and the SuDS and development will fit into the existing landscape. The completed SuDS schemes should be accompanied by a maintenance schedule detailing maintenance boundaries, responsible parties and arrangements to ensure that the SuDS are maintained in perpetuity. Where possible,</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>all non-major development should look to incorporate these same SuDS principles into their designs. The supporting text for the policy should also include: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be designed in accordance with current industry best practice, The SuDS Manual, CIRIA (C753), to ensure that the systems deliver both the surface water quantity and the wider benefits, without significantly increasing costs. Good SuDS design can be key for creating a strong sense of place and pride in the community for where they live, work and visit, making the surface water management features as much a part of the development as the buildings and roads. Water efficiency The increasing number of dwellings, businesses and consumers for water are putting additional strain on the sources of clean water, Severn Trent are managing the capacity of our water sources such that our abstractions cause minimal damage to the natural environment whilst also meeting the demand for water from our customers. This increasing issue has been recognised in our Water Resource Management Plan, the Humber River Basin Catchment Management Plan. It is important that new development also play's it''s part in using our vital resources sustainably.</p> <p>We would recommend that alongside the reference to water efficiency detailed</p>	<p>We cannot enforce a voluntary target.</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-------------

			<p>within your current policy the neighbourhood plan also references the optional water efficiency target set out within Building Regulations Part G, as this will provide a clear direction to developers about what is expected. 3 To assist with this recommendation we have provided some example wording: Development proposals should demonstrate that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day.</p> <p>Policy ENV1: Local Green Space Severn Trent understand the need for Local Green Space and the need for it to be protected, however local green spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes like flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation can result in additional benefits to the local green space in the form of Biodiversity or Amenity improvements. We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy ENV1 Development of flood resilience schemes within local green spaces will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the green space. Policy ENV2 Important Open Spaces Severn Trent understand the</p>	<p>This is already covered in the policy which precludes development which has an adverse effect on the LGS. If the development enhances the space, then the policy will not prevent development.</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	---	-------------

			<p>need for open space and the need for it to be protected, however open spaces like local green spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes like flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation can result in additional benefits to the local green space in the form of Biodiversity or Amenity improvements.</p> <p>We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy ENV2 Development of flood resilience schemes within local green spaces will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the green space.</p> <p>8.2.5.3 Biodiversity and habitat connectivity Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to incorporate biodiversity through new development to create Blue Green corridors through the urban landscape. We would note that watercourses (including ditches) form a vital part of this process, both as methods for conveying surface water, but as point that wildlife can access water. It is therefore important the watercourses are incorporated into the development as open features such that they can continue to perform this function. Watercourses also provide a more sustainable outfall for surface water to be discharged to,</p>	<p>The policy provides for work which does not adversely affect the open space.</p> <p>We believe that the current policy is sufficient.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------

			<p>mitigating the impact of development on the sewerage systems. We would therefore recommend that paragraph 8.2.5.3 Green blue corridors and watercourses in addition to trees and hedgerows. Wording should be included to the effect of: No development shall prevent the continuation of existing natural or manmade drainage features, where watercourses or dry ditches are present within a development site, these should be retained and where possible enhanced. Access to drainage features for maintenance should be retained and ownership of land clearly defined as part of the overall site maintenance plan. Prior to the alteration of any alignment an assessment will be required to ensure that all connections into the watercourse are retained and that exceedance flows are not then directed away from the watercourse channel towards properties 4 Development should where possible, create and enhance blue green corridors to protect watercourses, and their associated habitats from harm.</p> <p>Policy ENV11: Managing Flood Risk As detailed in our response to Policy H5 we would recommend that a reference to the drainage hierarchy is made alongside the reference for development to incorporate SuDS. Please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice. For your information we have</p>	<p>We believe that the policy is sufficient.</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	--	-------------

				<p>set out some general guidelines that may be useful to you. Position Statement As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills. Sewage Strategy Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works. Surface Water and Sewer Flooding We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer. We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers. To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% 5 discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. More details can be found on our website <a href="https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-">https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-</a></p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--



			<p>developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-andguidance/infrastructure-charges/</p> <p>Water Quality Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of good quality drinking water. We work closely with the Environment Agency and local farmers to ensure that water quality of supplies are not impacted by our or others operations. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit as prepared by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Water Supply When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts. We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands. Water Efficiency Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>litres of water per person per day. We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations. We recommend that in all cases you consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres.</li> <li>• Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute.</li> <li>• Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres per minute or less.</li> <li>• Water butts for external use in properties with gardens.</li> </ul> <p>To further encourage developers to act sustainably Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. More details can be found on our website <a href="https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-andguidance/infrastructure-charges/">https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-andguidance/infrastructure-charges/</a> We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day. We would also encourage the use of rainwater harvesting on larger developments, either residential</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>or commercial. This helps to reduce the demand on public supply, associated carbon impact of 6 supply and also reduced site run off and sewer flows. Rainwater Harvesting as a development rather than on a property by property basis is more cost efficient and can produce greater benefits. Both the River Severn River Basin Management Plan (Page 52) and the Humber River Basin Management Plan (page 46) recommend that Local Plan set out policies requiring homes to meet the tighter water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day as described in Part G of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. As such Severn Trent's recommendation is consistent with wider objectives within our water supply regions. We hope this information has been useful to you and we look forward in hearing from you in the near future. Yours sincerely Chris Bramley Strategic Catchment Planner growth.development@severntrent.co.uk</p>		
			<p>Miss Pola Walecka 2 Church Close Post Code Le17 5jy Telephone 07803317581 Email Pola.walecka9@gmail.com</p>	<p>1. Historic importance – in the Plan it has been mentioned that many areas around DB have visible ridge and furrow and other features of historic importance. I have contacted Historic England with regards to this and have been advised in writing that they have previously raised concerns about the allocation in question due to the impact on the setting of the adjacent scheduled monument and that they advised that a Strategic</p>	<p>Thank you for commenting on the draft Plan.</p> <p>It is the decision of Harborough District Council as to whether or not a SEA is required, not Historic England.</p> <p>Having undertaken a Screening Opinion, sharing this with the Consultation Bodies and taking</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

			<p>Environmental Assessment will be required. We note from the Parish Council minutes of the steering group meeting on 09/02/2021 that Harborough District Council had advised that there was no requirement for SEA screening. We believe the information from HE means the Parish Council must undertake a SEA before any further actions are taken. In support of this, HE advised that they will contact the Council with regard to ridge and furrow and that as it stands, they believe that the allocation may present a risk to the plan.</p> <p>2. Affordable housing – the DB Plan mentions that DB does not have sufficient number of affordable houses. However, not only are there plenty of affordable housing options in close proximity to the village (Broughton Astley, Lutterworth, Gilmorton) but also there are likely to be around three thousand new houses built less than 3 miles away from DB at Whetstone Pastures. These numbers should not be disregarded simply for the fact that all may not be in Harborough District Council.</p> <p>3. Lack of facilities – DB does not have many amenities. There is only one pub, no shops and a very small school which could be an issue. It would be very unfortunate if the existing residents were unable to secure their children’s spaces at the local school due to the sudden influx of new</p>	<p>into account their recommendations, an environmental report has been prepared and its conclusions built into the NP. It is noted that development has taken place closer to the scheduled monument.</p> <p>The site subject to development does not represent the highest grade R&amp;F Policy Env 8 requires the benefit of development to be balanced against the harm caused.</p> <p>Noted. It is a District Council and national planning requirement that developments of 10 or more dwellings provide Affordable Housing. The NP cannot be in conflict with this.</p> <p>Noted. The Parish is required to take a minimum of 40 dwellings and this will help to sustain the remaining</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------------------

				<p>families moving into the village. Note. I understand that the government initiatives are to provide more housing however we need to ensure that these are built in appropriate areas. Whilst developments may be presumed as necessary, the location of any plot must be considered carefully so as not to damage the historic features of the village or put a burden on existing facilities. There appears to be other sites previously ruled out as a primary development site that should be reconsidered. (e.g. the Reserve Site, Spice45).</p>	<p>community facilities.</p>	
			Jean Ross	<p>Having read the proposal for the cricket field site I remain unconvinced of the reasons for this site over any other and in particular the reserve site. I wonder, for example, what prompted the chairman to use his/her casting vote in the way he/she did. Perhaps all will become clear at a later stage? I do feel that the proposal is for a lot of housing in one hit and ignores the bits of infill potentially already in hand. The new residents would become a significant percentage of the village population which has evolved itself in a more natural way and over much time. The potential development would it seems also be out on a limb and not in keeping with the styles of housing we so love in the village. The development appears to be dropped into the middle of a couple of fields instead of extending a natural progression of the housing lines in the village, a scheme that is so</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>The sites were selected following a detailed, comprehensive and independently led assessment process, the details of which are in Appendix 4.</p> <p>The Chair of the Parish Council has responded as follows:  'After work done by the steering groups I was presented with only 2 sites considered as suitable for a development of approx 40 houses, the attempts to reduce numbers by infill has proved unsuccessful.  I accept that both sites come with issues but I felt that the</p>	None

				<p>successfully used in other villages that we see.</p> <p>The section of the A426 for exiting the estate is already completely chaotic at certain times of the day with queues backing up towards Lutterworth. The footpath to the centre of the village is narrow and a blind exit for children tempted to run down it towards the road.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>rear of Coopers Lane was slightly preferred. The reason being as follows. It would give better access for pedestrians to the village and school. Access onto the A426 would have less impact on traffic through the village. It would also give opportunity to extend and improve the playground and hopefully provide an area for children to play football and games, I do not feel that the second site would offer the same benefits to the village'.</p>	
			Environmental	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>Thank you for giving the Environment Agency the opportunity to comment on the Dunton Bassett Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>However the environmental constraints associated with the Plan area (e.g. there being no flood zones, Main Rivers) are such that we have no formal comment to make on the proposals.</p> <p>Regards Nick</p>	Noted	None
			Mary Vitali	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is an impressive piece of work that bears testimony to the vast amount of time and effort put in by</p>	<p>Thank you for making comment.</p>	None

			<p>its contributors in the interests of the village.</p> <p><b>Section 8.2.1 - Policy H1 - Site Allocation</b>  The housing site allocation was always going to be the most contentious part of the plan, and it is a great pity that the landowner's determination to sell such large plots of land and the developers' greed have led to the allocation of sites that will take 50 houses. Indeed, according to verbal communication at the Parish Council meeting on 9 March, site 9 would even take an extra 20 houses. And this despite the fact that the proposed Coopers Lane development of 40 houses was rejected because it was deemed to be out of scale with the present settlement. Was there really no alternative? Having identified two suitable sites, was every avenue explored to avoid one large, out-of-proportion development? Could our housing allocation have been spread between two sites? Surely two developments of around 20 houses would have been less detrimental to the character of the village than one large development totally out of scale with the current built form? The decision to put forward site 9 (alongside the cricket field) for development rather than site 3 (North of Old Coach Road) was passed by a narrow margin of 3 votes to 2 at a meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee, with the chairman casting the deciding</p>	<p>This was a contentious process. The group looking into this matter took the view that a single development of suitable scale would be less disruptive to the village and would yield greater infrastructure benefits.</p> <p>An environmental report has been commissioned to consider the issues associated with the development and its proximity to heritage assets and any recommendations will be incorporated.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------

			<p>vote. This choice might achieve the laudable goal of avoiding increased traffic through the village centre - always provided access from the A426 is granted - but it cannot be ignored that there are significant trade-offs.</p> <p>Although the ridge and furrow area earmarked for development is conveniently classified as not well preserved, its loss will have a significant impact on the legibility of the historic landscape character surrounding the village, especially given its proximity to the scheduled monument. We are embarking on a slippery slope if we opt to ignore the historic significance of our village's landscape features. As we learned from the campaign to fight off the development on The Beat, protecting the historic setting of our heritage assets is a powerful argument in preventing undesirable development.</p> <p><b>Appendix 4 - Site Sustainability Analysis</b>  With reference to site 9, the Site Sustainability Analysis states that "Alternative access arrangements will be pursued if access from the A426 proves not to be possible". Verbal assurance was given at the meeting of the Parish Council on 9/3/2021 that only access options from the A426 would be considered. This requires confirmation before the Neighbourhood Plan is put to the vote. Any alternative access arrangements being explored should be described in the</p>	<p>Noted. The site would not achieve a planning consent if there are unresolved concerns over access. The statutory authorities will be able to comment through formal processes prior to the Referendum.</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	---	-------------



			<p>plan, so that residents can make an informed decision about the acceptability of the site. Otherwise, the Site Sustainability Appendix should be amended so that it clearly states that this site will be carried forward <i>only</i> if access from the A426 is granted.</p> <p><b>Section 8.1.3 – Policy H3 – Settlement Boundary</b>  The proposed settlement boundary has a rather strange shape, with the possible new development site forming an appendage cut off from the existing built form of the village. Is this how we want our village to develop, with a dormitory estate on its margins, or do we want new housing to be well integrated into the village, thus fostering a community spirit in new residents? From this point of view, the Old Coach Road site would appear more suitable as it is better connected to the existing settlement.</p> <p><b>Section 8.2.5.4 – Policy ENV 8 – Ridge and furrow</b>  Another effect of the proposed settlement boundary is to make the remaining area of ridge and furrow between the new development and the rear of Coopers Lane look like a tempting infill site to supply future housing needs. Although classified as a non-designated heritage asset, this area would lose all significance once it is cut off from its historic setting. This would make it</p>	<p>Noted. Each site was assessed against a set of criteria and this site was considered to be the most favourable based on consideration of all criteria.</p> <p>If housing need were to increase, then the reserve site would come into play, protecting this area, which is further protected by being placed outside of the settlement boundary.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	-------------------------

			<p>difficult to protect in future, opening up the possibility of another 50 or so houses being built on this site as housing need increases.</p> <p><b>Section 8.2.4 – Policy Env 2 – Important Open Space</b> Two of the important recreational open spaces - the cricket ground and the children’s playground - will be directly affected by development of site 9. It may seem a minor consideration, but we should not ignore the mental health benefits, both for the village children and for their accompanying adults, of a children’s playground that is embedded in the countryside, rather than being surrounded by a housing estate.</p> <p><b>Section 8.2.5.3 – Policy Env, 5 – Biodiversity and habitat connectivity</b> The habitat connectivity map on page 36 of the NP suggests that, unlike the rest of the village, the area to the east of Main Street is devoid of wildlife corridors, and the significant wild area running between the children’s playground and the rear of Nos 14 to 20 Main Street is ignored. This area is frequented by a variety of animals and birds including foxes, badgers, newts, pheasants, and buzzards, and links up with the neighbouring hedgerows to form a wildlife corridor (wildlife photos taken at the rear of Bloomhills Farm are available).</p>	<p>Noted. The location of the play area will maximise accessibility for the community.</p> <p>An extension of the Wildlife Corridor here isn’t strongly supported by evidence (the species listed by the respondent are ubiquitous across the parish); the two historic Local Wildlife Sites and deciduous woodland (the churchyard) are separated from the west of the village by buildings and paved surfaces. Applying the weak connectivity described for here is not sufficiently pronounced to make it a Wildlife corridor.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
		Nik Green LCC	Leicestershire County Council is	Noted	None

			<p>supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process and welcome being included in this consultation. Highways Specific Comments Regarding the main areas of concern, pedestrian crossings, speeding and traffic calming. LCC will only support any measures where there is sufficient evidence and where the introduction of any measure meets the criteria to do so. For example a pedestrian crossing will only be acceptable if a PV2 assessment is conducted and through this assessment the type of crossing is identified, which may be simply dropped kerbs.</p>	Noted	None
			<p>Policy H1: Residential Site Allocation Site A Residential Allocation – The LHA have previously advised regarding the potential development with access onto the A426, it would be likely to resist such a proposal if it were submitted formally as a planning application. The A426 in this location is subject to a 50mph speed limit; the proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Section IN5 (Access to the Network Policy) of the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide, which seeks to place restrictions on the creation of new accesses onto highspeed A roads, or on any site which raises concerns regarding road safety. The request for a car park alongside the cricket field for the use of the Cricket Club and residents of the Parish may not meet all the tests as set out in regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations given the scale of</p>	<p>We are aware of the concerns expressed by LCC in relation to site access and are in discussion with the Highways Authority in relation to this issue. Alternative access arrangements are also under consideration. A reserve site is identified in the NP in the event that the issue cannot be resolved satisfactorily</p>	None

			<p>development proposed.</p> <p>Site B – Reserve Site – The LHA would assess this site on its own merits should a proposal be submitted for pre application advice or formally.</p> <p>Policy H5 : Design Quality Response to point l) Parking and garage dimensions should be in accordance with the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) Policy, Economy &amp; Community, Chief Executive’s Department, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA T: 0116 305 7309 E: nik.green@leics.gov.uk For further information visit: <a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm">http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm</a></p> <p>Policy T3 : Transport Asessment for New Housing Development Response to point c) The Local Highway Authority (LHA) could only secure cycle routes and improvements to public transport (e.g. increase in frequency/ additional bus services) if it could be demonstrated this was necessary and proportionate to the scale of any developments proposed in the area</p> <p>Response to point f) While this is generally dealt with on a site by site basis, the minimum threshold for travel packs and passes is usually around 26 dwellings.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This is referenced in the policy</p> <p>Noted. The policy says ‘where appropriate’. This is deemed to be appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. Will add in ‘...of an appropriate scale’ after ‘on residential developments’.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>General Comments 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 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. 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</p>	<p>Noted. It is inappropriate at Regulation 14 to make general comments about what the NP can include without making specific references to the Dunton Bassett NP.</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-------------

			<p>sought to address existing problems. Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provided as a commuted sum. In regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped ie they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding. The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third-party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third-party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing Policy, Economy &amp; Community,</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>Chief Executive's Department, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA T: 0116 305 7309 E: <a href="mailto:nik.green@leics.gov.uk">nik.green@leics.gov.uk</a> For further information visit: <a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm">http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm</a></p> <p>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. Flood Risk Management The County Council are fully aware of flooding that has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding, review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a statutory consultee on major planning applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure that the onsite drainage systems are designed in accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage solution. The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>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. When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: • 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 flood risk. 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</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--



				<p>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. 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 Policy, Economy &amp; Community, Chief Executive's Department, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA T: 0116 305 7309 E: <a href="mailto:nik.green@leics.gov.uk">nik.green@leics.gov.uk</a> For further information visit: <a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm">http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm</a> 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. LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies. For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Practice Guidance webpage. Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals. Risk of flooding from surface water map: <a href="https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map">https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</a> Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): <a href="https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/">https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</a> Planning Developer Contributions If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Adopted North Kilworth NP and the Adopted Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances of your community. This would in general be consistent with the relevant District Council's local plan or its policy on planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of new development and enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations, where applicable. North Kilworth Adopted Plan (Leicestershirecommunities.co.uk) Great Glen Adopted Plan (Leicestershirecommunities.co.uk) Mineral &amp; Waste Planning The County</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>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. 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. You should also be aware of Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan (Leicestershire.gov.uk). These safeguarding areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect minerals resources or waste operations. The County Council can Policy, Economy &amp; Community, Chief Executive's Department, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA T: 0116 305 7309 E: nik.green@leics.gov.uk For further information visit:  <a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm">http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm</a>  provide guidance on this if your neighbourhood plan is allocating development in these areas or if any proposed neighbourhood plan policies</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>may impact on minerals and waste provision. It is noted that there is a reserve housing site allocation located outside the Dunton Bassett settlement boundary in a Sand &amp; Gravel Mineral Consultation Area. Any planning application that is submitted for development at this site should be accompanied by a minerals assessment in accordance with Policy M11 of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Property Education 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. It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school. However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one. Strategic Property Services No comment at this time. Adult Social Care It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>and that development seeks to include bungalows etc of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.</p> <p>Environment Specific Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no reference regarding electric vehicles and their charge points either on street or in the workplace. The Prime Minister has recently stated new cars and vans powered wholly by petrol and diesel will not be sold in the UK from 2030. The Planning Group may wish to address this.</li> <li>• The plan does not reference the possible introduction of renewable energy sources (such as wind turbines and solar farms) in the Parish or have a policy regarding this. Other neighbourhood plans we have seen make reference to this. Policy, Economy &amp; Community, Chief Executive's Department, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA T: 0116 305 7309 E: <a href="mailto:nik.green@leics.gov.uk">nik.green@leics.gov.uk</a> For further information visit: <a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm">http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm</a></li> </ul> <p>General Comments With regard to the environment and in line with Government advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>Plans cover all aspects of the natural environment including climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land.</p> <p>Climate Change The County Council through its Environment Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire’s resilience to the existing and predicted changes in climate. Furthermore, LCC has declared a climate emergency along with most other UK councils. The County Council has committed to becoming carbon neutral as a council by 2030 and to working with others to keep global temperature rise to less than 1.5 degrees Celsius, which will mean in effect needing to achieve carbon neutrality for Leicestershire by 2050 or before. Planning is one of the key levers for enabling these commitments to be met and to meeting the legally binding target set by the government for the UK to be carbon neutral by 2050.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and to increasing the county’s resilience to climate change. Landscape The County Council would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account Natural England’s Landscape character areas; Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy; the Local District/Borough</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>Council landscape character assessments and the Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study for Leicester and Leicestershire (2017) which examines the sensitivity of the landscape, exploring the extent to which different areas can accommodate development without impacting on their key landscape qualities. We would recommend that Neighbourhood Plans should also consider the street scene and public realm within their communities, further advice can be found in the latest 'Streets for All East Midlands' Advisory Document (2006) published by English Heritage. LCC would encourage the development of local listings as per the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and LCC have some data on the social, cultural, archaeological and historic value of local features and buildings (<a href="https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-andcommunity/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record">https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-andcommunity/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record</a>)</p> <p>Biodiversity The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, providing net gain for biodiversity, and</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>reducing pollution. Neighbourhood Plans should therefore seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver a strategic approach to protecting and improving the natural environment based on local evidence and priorities. Each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential development or management of open spaces on enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity, such as hedgerows and greenways. Also, habitat permeability for habitats and species which addresses encouragement of movement from one</p> <p>Policy, Economy &amp; Community, Chief Executive's Department, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA T: 0116 305 7309 E: <a href="mailto:nik.green@leics.gov.uk">nik.green@leics.gov.uk</a> For further information visit:</p> <p><a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm">http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm</a></p> <p>location to another such as the design of street lighting, roads, noise, obstructions in water, exposure of species to predation and arrangement of land-uses. The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



			<p>protected and priority Biodiversity Action Plan species. These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent Habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme. Contact: <a href="mailto:planningecology@leics.gov.uk">planningecology@leics.gov.uk</a>, or phone 0116 305 4108</p> <p>Green Infrastructure (GI) is a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities, (NPPF definition). As a network, GI includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/churchyards allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls. The NPPF places the duty on local authorities to plan positively for a strategic network of GI which can deliver a range of planning policies including: building a strong, competitive economy; creating a sense of place and promote good design; promoting healthier communities by providing greater opportunities for recreation and mental and physical health benefits; meeting the challenges of climate change and flood risk; increasing biodiversity and conserving and enhancing the natural</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>environment. Looking at the existing provision of GI networks within a community can influence the plan for creating &amp; enhancing new networks and this assessment can then be used to inform CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedules, enabling communities to potentially benefit from this source of funding. Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and in doing so they should ensure that their Neighbourhood Plan is reflective of the relevant Local Authority Green Infrastructure strategy. Through the Neighbourhood Plan and discussions with the Local Authority Planning teams and potential Developers communities are well placed to influence the delivery of local scale GI networks. Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land The NPPF encourages the effective use of brownfield land for development, provided that it is not of high environmental/ecological value. Neighbourhood planning groups should check with Defra if their neighbourhood planning area includes brownfield sites. Where information is lacking as to the ecological value of these sites then the Neighbourhood Plan could include policies that ensure such survey work should be carried out to assess the ecological value of a brownfield site before development decisions are taken. Policy, Economy &amp; Community, Chief</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Executive's Department, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA T: 0116 305 7309 E: <a href="mailto:nik.green@leics.gov.uk">nik.green@leics.gov.uk</a> For further information visit:</p> <p><a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm">http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm</a></p> <p>Soils are an essential finite resource on which important ecosystem services such as food production, are dependent on. They should be enhanced in value and protected from adverse effects of unacceptable levels of pollution. Within the governments "Safeguarding our Soils" strategy, Defra have produced a code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites which could be helpful to neighbourhood planning groups in preparing environmental policies. High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification. Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) Information for Neighbourhood Planning groups regarding Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) can be found on the</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Neighbourhood Planning website (<a href="http://www.neighbourhoodplanning.org">www.neighbourhoodplanning.org</a>) and should be referred to. As taken from the website, a Neighbourhood Plan must meet certain basic conditions in order to be 'made'. It must not breach and be otherwise compatible with EU obligations. One of these obligations is Directive 2001/42/EC 'on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment' (Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations, 2004, available online). This is often referred to as the SEA Directive. Not every Neighbourhood Plan needs a SEA, however, it is compulsory to provide when submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A statement of reasons as to why SEA was not required</li> <li>• An environmental report (a key output of the SEA process).</li> </ul> <p>As the UK has now left the EU, Neighbourhood Planning groups should remain mindful of any future changes which may occur to the above guidance. Impact of Development on Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and Leicestershire County Council. The County's Waste Management team considers proposed developments on a case by case basis and when it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the local HWRC</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>infrastructure then appropriate projects to increase the capacity to off-set the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire’s Planning Obligations Policy (2019) and the relevant Legislation Regulations. Communities Consideration of community facilities is a positive facet of Neighbourhood Plans that reflects the importance of these facilities within communities and can proactively protect and develop facilities to meet the needs of people in local communities. Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to;</p> <p>Policy, Economy &amp; Community, Chief Executive’s Department, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA T: 0116 305 7309 E: nik.green@leics.gov.uk For further information visit:  <a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm">http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm</a></p> <p>1. Carry out and report on a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. 2. Set out policies that seek to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protect and retain these existing facilities,</li> <li>• support the independent development of new facilities, and,</li> <li>• identify and protect Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations.</li> </ul> <p>3. Identify and support potential community projects that could be progressed. You are encouraged to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>consider and respond to all aspects of community resources as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. Further information, guidance and examples of policies and supporting information is available at <a href="http://www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/n/p/useful-information">www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/n/p/useful-information</a>. Economic Development 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>Fibre Broadband High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a fast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life. All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to ultrafast broadband (of at least 100Mbps) and allow mechanisms for securing a full fibre broadband provision for each premise and business from at least one network operator, provided on an open access basis. Such provider must deploy a Fibre to the Premise (FTTP) access network structure in which optical fibre runs from a local exchange to each premise. Developers should take active steps to incorporate adequate broadband provision at the preplanning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure fibre broadband is available as</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>soon as build on the development is complete. Where practical, developers should consider engaging several telecoms providers to encourage competition and consumer choice. The Council supports a 'dig once' approach for the deployment of communications infrastructure and a build which is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Council encourages telecommunications build which does not significantly impact on the appearance of any building or space on which equipment is located and which minimises street clutter. Policy, Equalities While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council's Equality Strategy 2020-2024 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work. A copy of the strategy can be view at:  <a href="https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/have-your-say/previous-consultations/equality-strategy2020-24-consultation">https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/have-your-say/previous-consultations/equality-strategy2020-24-consultation</a> NIK GREEN (MRS) Policy Officer   E: <a href="mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@leics.gov.uk">neighbourhoodplanning@leics.gov.uk</a></p>		
			<p>John Roberson 5 Church Close DB</p>	<p>The plan exceeds the number of houses for development. We need to plan for 40 dwellings not more. Current planning applications are likely to provide some of this number. In</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.  The housing requirement is a minimum of 40. Providing only</p>	<p>None  None</p>

			<p>addition, current plans for Harborough look to exceed the number of dwellings required by 2031, We should not add to this by planning further over provision.</p> <p>Over a ten-year period, the requirement for new houses could be met by careful infill and small grouping of new dwellings. Dunton Bassett is not a village which would be well served by a new "Housing Estate"</p> <p>If the new development has to be concentrated, a far more modest number of houses could be built on the Reserve Site B. The Reserve site B provides a much less intrusive development than Residential allocation A.</p> <p>Site A sits higher than B and dissects an uninterrupted rural view for houses from Church Close, Main Street, Coopers Lane and Lutterworth Road the (A426). It sticks out like a sore thumb.</p> <p>Reserve site B should take precedence over A</p>	<p>the minimum number leaves the NP vulnerable to increases in housing need in the future and potentially fails to secure the infrastructure benefits needed.</p> <p>Noted. The site was selected following a comprehensive assessment process.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>Noted. This was not the view of the Advisory Committee or the Parish Council.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
		<p><b>Mr and Mrs Terry and Sue Pike</b>  <b>2 Bloomhill Courtyard</b>  <b>Main Street</b>  <b>Dunton Bassett</b></p>	<p><b>Plan Section 8 Housing Policies</b>  <b>Paragraph 8.1.1 Page 14</b></p> <p>We are concerned about the housing provision in the neighbourhood plan for the following reasons:-</p>	<p>Thank you for commenting on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None</p>



			<p><b>LE17 5JN</b></p> <p>There are 330 dwellings in the village so an increase as proposed of 40 homes would represent an increase of over 12% - too high an impact on the village in our view.</p> <p>The requirement for 40 homes is before 2031 so why is the allocation being built all at the same time.</p> <p>The type of houses we assume will be like the modern homes we see all around especially in Lutterworth. Dunton does have some modern houses but it does not have large plots of such dwellings which might be described as small estates. The village comprises many different homes of different designs which adds to the beauty of the village itself. A development of 40 modern houses, particularly near the centre of the village, would not in our opinion be in keeping with the character of the village.</p> <p>Regarding the choice of site, we have an interest as we live to the east of Main Street in the village. The site next to the cricket ground seems to have been chosen in a very short meeting of the Steering Group and <b>no particular reason given</b> by the Chairman in using his casting vote.</p> <p>In the Site Sustainability Analysis this site stretches to the edge of the properties on</p>	<p>For the NP to proceed it needs to confirm that the housing allocation can be delivered. Doing this on one site at the same time gives benefits of delivering additional infrastructure than would be the case if the development was spread over many years on many sites.</p> <p>Policy H5 establishes the design standards that have to be met for a planning application to be successful. This includes enhancing and reinforcing the character of the area.</p> <p>The site was selected following a comprehensive assessment process.</p> <p>The development will be contained within the red line</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

			<p>Coopers Lane but in the Plan it seems to be just an area in the middle of the available land. We think this needs explaining, as it leaves open the possibility of future development that would enlarge the “estate”.</p> <p>The assumption is that only access via the A426 will be created for this site, so we think it needs clarification as to why there is a peculiar section on the site drawing, that seems to reach up to the gardens of houses in Ralphs Close.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that this land is Ridge and Furrow land and a non-designated heritage asset and key to conservation in the village. We do not think development of such heritage land can be mitigated in any way unless it is completely lost. We believe there are several precedents of planning permission being refused for exactly this reason.</p> <p>The wilded area between Bloomhills farm and the playing field is a rich natural habitat with a huge variety of insect and bird life including an abundance of bees and dragonflies and red and green woodpeckers. These all make use of the hedgerow and the self-seeded mature trees. The area provides a run for wild animals and reptiles including badgers, foxes and newts. The loss of such natural diversity from this area of the village would be detrimental to the wildlife and</p>	<p>boundary, which offers protection against further development of the wider site.</p> <p>The preferred access for this site is via the A426. If this proves to be unviable an alternative site will be chosen.</p> <p>The Ridge and Furrow within the development site is less distinct than the well preserved non-designated heritage assets recognised in the Plan.</p> <p>Noted. A Planning decision about any development proposal on this land (or adjacent to it) will have to balance biodiversity significance against the merits of the development.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	--	-------------------------------------

				to the health and wellbeing of the people living here.		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--