



# MEDBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Referendum Version - May 2018

## CONSULTATION STATEMENT

### Appendix CS-11

## Pre-submission Consultation Comments and Response

hyperlinked from main document  
NP Consultation Statement

[CLICK HERE TO RETURN](#)

## Neighbourhood Plan

### Pre- submission consultation responses

| No. | Page | Chapter/<br>Section | Policy<br>No. | Respondent | Comment   | Response  | Amendment |
|-----|------|---------------------|---------------|------------|---|---|-----------|
| 1   | 61   |                     |               | Resident   | I realise a need for a safer path for walking to connect to Leviathan Wood from the village and believe that the option from Marlow Court via the railway line would be the best option to avoid disruption to wildlife in the area as long as dogs are kept on a short lead. I do not support the idea of a path from the Hollow by the side of the brook as it would disturb nesting mallard duck and kingfishers and defeat the object of a wildlife area.   | Thank you for this comment.<br><br>We will discuss with the landowner the need to minimise the impact on wildlife for any path created.   | None.     |
| 2   |      | All                 |               | CPRE       | CPRE Leicestershire congratulates you on a very thorough Draft Neighbourhood Plan.  | Thank you for this comment.   | None.     |
| 3   |      |                     |               | Resident   | One item in the excellent Neighbourhood plan raised the question of Traffic Calming. Although Holly Farm is not directly affected I do feel strongly that more action should be taken to stop traffic shooting through the village particularly coming down Ashley road.<br><br>I am not sure how far the Parish has got on this but I do hope they will not consider the dreadful double humps which makes the entry into Uppingham such a misery. I wonder what the ambulances think of them?<br><br>I have noticed that a number of villages have introduced the illuminating signs warning you of your present speed and even thanking you if you are below the limit. I find it has a decided affect on my speed. I would also recommend that the sign is introduced at the very top of the hill.<br><br>Our very best wishes for the successful progress of the plan. | Thank you for taking the trouble to comment.<br><br>The Parish Council will take these comments into account when discussing with LCC Highways Department the most appropriate form of traffic calming. | None.     |

|    |  |                      |  |   |  |   |  |
|----|--|----------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| 4  |  |                      |  | <b>Helen Goult<br/>Executive<br/>Assistant<br/>  Chief<br/>Executive's<br/>Office</b> | Thank you for sending the above to Norman Stronach, Chief Executive of Corby Borough Council.<br>This has been forward to Terry Begley, Principal Planner - Local Plans for circulation.<br>If there are any comments these will be forwarded directly to you.   | Noted.  | None.  |
| 5  |  |                      |  | National Grid   | They point out that their Assessment shows no evidence of High Pressure Gas or Electricity but that there could be some Medium or Low Pressure pipe work within proposed development sites. Advise inform Western Power in respect of Developments. Given new emails for further Consultation although both see current plan | Noted.<br><br>This will be addressed at the planning application stage.   | None.  |
| 6  |  |                      |  | Natural England   | No specific comments merely referred to Guidance which was already taken into consideration by the Environment and Heritage Theme Group  | Noted.  | None.  |
| 7  |  | Limit of Development |  | Resident  | Thinks that the LtD extends too far beyond the end of the new houses on Drayton Road and that it should end just past number 52. He believes that as we have drawn it, it extends beyond the village boundary and we should not be encouraging building outside this boundary.   | The LtD was drawn around the boundary limit of the site with planning approval on the opposite side of the road from the current houses, as described in the methodology. | None.  |
| 8  |  | Limit of Development |  | Resident  | The triangle of land adjacent to the Uppingham Road, owned by Jean Buxton (and next to Site 1) has been excluded from the LtD.   | This was an error and was intended to be included with the LtD extending along the proposed access Road to Site 1   | LtD to be Amended to include this parcel of Land which was also in the SHLAA document. |
| 9  |  | Site 1               |  | Resident  | Site 1 – Concern regarding safe access to this site if there is a new roadway to the Uppingham Road. It is notable that a planning application has been refused on adjacent land, in part due to the proximity of the site entrance to the railway bridge.   | Noted. This matter of detail will be addressed at planning application stage.   | None.  |
| 10 |  | Site 1               |  | Resident  | Site 1 – Concern regarding the route of any permissive path through this site to Leviathan   | Noted. The Landowner is aware of the steep drop and   | None   |

|    |  |              |    |            |  |   |       |
|----|--|--------------|----|------------|--|---|-------|
|    |  |              |    |            | Wood. In particular highlighting how steep the drop is from the railway embankment to Leviathan Wood and that this would probably necessitate extensive excavation to make a safe path.  | this will be addressed by the landowner should the path be extended in this way.  |       |
| 11 |  | Site 1 and 4 |    | Resident   | A general point regarding the allocation of section 106 monies for any developments over 12 houses. This should be addressed by the NP giving some direction on how such monies should be spent, e.g. on extending the pavement along Hallaton Road to the Sports Club.  | Noted. The threshold is in excess of 10 homes on any site. Specific developer contributions have been incorporated into the respective policy and a community action (INF1) describes the process for identifying future infrastructure requirements, and Policy CF3 specifically identifies an extension to this footpath. | None. |
| 12 |  |              | H1 | Brudenells | Policy H1 seeks to make provision for the housing needs of the village over the Plan period. It is suggested that, in order to comply with the guidance set out in paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the target of 39 dwellings should be expressed as a minimum. This would provide clarity when the target figure was being approached and fully meet needs. | The housing target for Medbourne as referenced in the proposed submission HDC Local Plan is a minimum of 30. This is referenced on page 18 of the pre-submission NP. Therefore, as the NP exceeds this minimum by 30% it is appropriate to reference the number identified in the NP as 'about'.                            | None. |
| 13 |  |              | H3 | Brudenells | The introduction to this policy sets out the intended Limits to Development. This methodology is supported as being positive and reasonable. It follows that land outside of the Limits should be regarded as Countryside and the Estate support the Plan's encouragement of careful control in this area. The encouragement given to farm diversification is also supported and it is suggested     | Noted. It is not considered necessary to repeat policy contained in national guidance with respect to the conversion of farm buildings.   | None. |

|    |  |  |    |            |  |  |                               |
|----|--|--|----|------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
|    |  |  |    |            | that, for clarification, this should include reference to the conversion of farm buildings to residential uses and/or new development where it is justified in an acceptable farm diversification scheme. Para 55 of the Framework is clear that new homes in the countryside can be justified “where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to the enhancement to the immediate setting.” This is the case with Pagets Farm site on Hallaton Road – the re-use of some of the existing farm buildings would allow the removal of less attractive farm buildings on the site, giving rise to a significant improvement in its overall appearance |  |                               |
| 14 |  |  | H4 | Brudenells | Policy H4 sets out the Plan’s support for a mixture of housing types, including small family homes (2 or 3 bedrooms). The estate is supportive of this approach and would ensure that development at Pagets Farm, Hallaton Road met identified local needs. Traditionally developers have proposed larger dwellings in rural areas as they seek to maximise returns. This has led to developments being dominated by larger “executive-style” dwellings. By retaining initial control over the development at Pagets Farm, the Estate would ensure that smaller dwellings were proposed.   | Noted.   | None.                         |
| 15 |  |  | H5 | Brudenells | Whilst being supportive of the thrust of policy H5 regarding windfall sites, the Estate feel that this policy is too restrictive in that it requires such schemes to be restricted to 3 dwellings or fewer and as they should be located within the Limits of Development of the village. The redevelopment of barns is referred to in the supporting text to the policy yet these are rarely located within the Limits. Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy advises that Limits to Development around settlements will be   | Noted<br><br>The windfall limit is to be increased up to 4.<br><br>Land outside the limits to development is to be treated as countryside and local and national policies relating to development will apply here. | Increase windfall limit to 4. |

|    |  |  |    |            |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|----|------------|--|--|--|
|    |  |  |    |            | used to shape their development and, inter alia, that housing development will not be permitted outside of Limits unless there is less than a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the proposal is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement concerned. The Council acknowledges that it cannot presently demonstrate the requisite 5 year supply. The Councils's latest Annual Monitoring work indicates that current position is that approximately 4.86 years supply is available. Accordingly the first part of the second bullet point of criterion a) of policy CS2 is engaged and the principle of developing sites outside of limits is accepted. Policy CS2 is a strategic policy. Accordingly the approach taken by policy H5 is not in general conformity with the strategic policies for the local area. | The reference to a current lack of a 5-year land supply may not apply throughout the 14-year Plan period therefore issues of conformity or otherwise with strategic policies need to be seen in this context. The respondent will be aware that where there is a Made Neighbourhood Plan in place, the LPA only has to demonstrate a 3-year land supply, which HDC currently does. |  |
| 16 |  |  | E2 | Brudenells | As indicated previously, the Estate is supportive of the approach that the plan takes to encourage new employment generation. Policy E2 seeks to encourage new employment generation with a positive policy supporting additional employment opportunities both within the village and in the countryside where criterion a) essentially seeks to restrict such development to that which is appropriate to a countryside location. The Estate support this approach and would welcome reference to "live/work" units as this would provide further encouragement to its proposals for Pagets Farm, Hallaton Road  | Noted. Support for this approach is welcome.   | Add in support for live/work units into CA E1 point b. |
| 17 |  |  | E3 | Brudenells | Policy E3 refers explicitly to farm diversification and the re-use of agricultural and commercial buildings. The policy seeks to provide support to farming businesses and it recognises that re-use of farm buildings can "provide opportunities for local people". The criteria set out in policy E3 are strict  | We don't think the conditions are too onerous and provide important safeguards against inappropriate development.<br><br>Will add in 'do not increase  | Amend policy as indicated.                             |

|    |  |  |                  |     |  |  |      |
|----|--|--|------------------|-----|--|--|------|
|    |  |  |                  |     | and do not allow ancillary or additional floor space in a farm diversification project. Such an element of flexibility would be welcomed as small-scale additions can often be needed to ensure that a scheme is viable/provides efficient accommodation   | the usable floorspace by more than 30%’. |      |
| 18 |  |  | General Highways | LCC | <p>Highways<br/>General Comments<br/>The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth.</p> <p>Like very many local authorities, the County Council’s budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire’s residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding.</p> <p>To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals</p> | These general comments are noted.        | None |

|  |  |  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems.</p> <p>Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provide as a commuted sum.</p> <p>With regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p> <p>The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where 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</p> |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

|    |  |  |                     |     |   |                                   |      |
|----|--|--|---------------------|-----|---|-----------------------------------|------|
|    |  |  |                     |     | also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.   |                                   |      |
| 19 |  |  | Flooding<br>General | LCC | <p>The County Council are fully aware of flooding that has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding, review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a statutory consultee on major planning applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure that the onsite drainage systems are designed in accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage solution. The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation.</li> </ul> | These general comments are noted. | None |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development.</li> <li>• Require development to resolve existing flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)).</li> <li>• Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map).</li> <li>• Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding.</li> <li>• How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff.</li> <li>• Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>All development will be required to restrict the discharge and retain surface water on site in line with current government policies. This should be undertaken through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites when considering the housing density to ensure that the potential site will not limit the ability for good SuDS design to be carried out. Consideration</p> |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|    |  |  |          |     |  |  |      |
|----|--|--|----------|-----|--|--|------|
|    |  |  |          |     | <p>should also be given to blue green corridors and how they could be used to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, including benefits to surrounding areas.</p> <p>Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path, and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.</p> <p>LCC in our role as LLFA will object to anything contrary to LCC policies.</p> |  |      |
| 20 |  |  | Planning | LCC | <p>If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Draft North Kilworth NP and the draft Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances of your community. This would in general be consistent with the relevant District Council's local plan or its policy on planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of new development and enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in accordance with the relevant</p>  | <p>Developer contributions are identified in the housing allocations section and policy H2 'Residential site allocations'.</p> | None |

|    |  |  |                          |     |  |   |       |
|----|--|--|--------------------------|-----|--|---|-------|
|    |  |  |                          |     | legislation and regulations, where applicable.   |   |       |
| 21 |  |  | Mineral & Waste Planning | LCC | <p>The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development.</p> <p>Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood.</p>   |   |       |
| 22 |  |  | Education                | LCC | <p>Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two mile (primary) and three mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places.</p> <p>It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would 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.</p> | Noted.  | None  |
| 23 |  |  | Adult Social Care        | LCC | It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older  | Noted. The NP addresses the issue of the need for | None. |

|    |  |  |                |     |  |  |      |
|----|--|--|----------------|-----|--|--|------|
|    |  |  |                |     | population and that development seeks to include bungalows etc of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.        | accommodation suitable for older people in the housing allocation policy H2 and policy H4 on housing mix.  |      |
| 24 |  |  | Environment    | LCC | With regard to the environment and in line with the Government's advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of the natural environment including climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land.  | These general comments are noted.  | None |
| 25 |  |  | Climate Change | LCC | The County Council through its Environment Strategy and Carbon Reduction Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire's resilience to the predicted changes in climate. Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and increasing the county's resilience to climate change. | These general comments are noted.<br><br>The NP addresses these carbon reduction issues through its design policy H6 and renewable energy policy ENV8. | None |
| 26 |  |  | Landscape      | LCC | The County Council would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account Natural England's Landscape Character Areas; LCC's Landscape and Woodland Strategy and the Local District/Borough Council landscape character assessments. We would   | These general comments are noted.<br><br>A range of environmental issues are covered in the NP.  | None |

|    |  |  |              |     |  |   |       |
|----|--|--|--------------|-----|--|---|-------|
|    |  |  |              |     | 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.  |   |       |
| 27 |  |  | Biodiversity | LCC | <p>The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Neighbourhood Plans should therefore seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver a strategic approach to protecting and improving the natural environment based on local evidence and priorities. Each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential development on enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity such as hedgerows and greenways.</p> <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of protected and priority</p> | <p>These general comments are noted.</p> <p>The NP covers a range of biodiversity issues in policy ENV4 on biodiversity and wildlife corridors.</p> | None. |

|    |  |  |                      |     |  |  |       |
|----|--|--|----------------------|-----|--|--|-------|
|    |  |  |                      |     | 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.  |  |       |
| 28 |  |  | Green Infrastructure | LCC | <p>Green infrastructure (GI) is a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities, (NPPF definition). As a network, GI includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/churchyards allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls.</p> <p>The NPPF places the duty on local authorities to plan positively for a strategic network of GI which can deliver a range of planning policies including: building a strong, competitive economy; creating a sense of place and promote good design; promoting healthier communities by providing greater opportunities for recreation and mental and physical health benefits; meeting the challenges of climate change and flood risk; increasing biodiversity and conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Looking at the existing provision of GI networks within a community can influence the plan for creating &amp; enhancing</p> | <p>These general comments are noted.</p> <p>The chapter on the Natural and Historic Environment covers these issues extensively.</p> | None. |

|    |  |  |   |     |  |  |       |
|----|--|--|---|-----|--|--|-------|
|    |  |  |   |     | <p>new networks and this assessment can then be used to inform CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedules, enabling communities to potentially benefit from this source of funding.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and in doing so they should ensure that their Neighbourhood Plan is reflective of the relevant Local Authority Green Infrastructure strategy. Through the Neighbourhood Plan and discussions with the Local Authority Planning teams and potential Developers communities are well placed to influence the delivery of local scale GI networks.</p>   |  |       |
| 29 |  |  | Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land | LCC | <p>The NPPF encourages the effective use of brownfield land for development, provided that it is not of high environmental/ecological value. Neighbourhood planning groups should check with DEFRA if their neighbourhood planning area includes brownfield sites. Where information is lacking as to the ecological value of these sites then the Neighbourhood Plan could include policies that ensure such survey work should be carried out to assess the ecological value of a brownfield site before development decisions are taken.</p> <p>Soils are an essential finite resource on which important ecosystem services such as food production, are dependent on. They therefore 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</p> | <p>These general comments are noted.</p> <p>Through the process of assessing open spaces within the Plan area a ranking of sites was undertaken to help determine suitability for Local Green Space designation.</p> | None. |

|    |  |  |                              |     |   |                                   |       |
|----|--|--|------------------------------|-----|---|-----------------------------------|-------|
|    |  |  |                              |     | <p>construction sites which could be helpful to neighbourhood planning groups in preparing environmental policies.</p> <p>High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification.</p>                                |                                   |       |
| 30 |  |  | Civic Amenity Infrastructure | LCC | <p>Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and the 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 civic amenity infrastructure then appropriate projects to increase the capacity to off-set the impact have to be initiated.</p> <p>Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire's Planning Obligations Policy and the Community Infrastructure Legislation Regulations.</p> | These general comments are noted. | None. |
| 31 |  |  | Community Amenities          | LCC | <p>Consideration of community facilities in the draft Plan would be welcomed. We would suggest where possible to include a review of</p>  | These general comments are noted. | None  |

|    |  |  |                      |     |  |  |       |
|----|--|--|----------------------|-----|--|--|-------|
|    |  |  |                      |     | <p>community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. Consideration could also be given to policies that seek to protect and retain these existing facilities more generally, support the independent development of new facilities and relate to the protection of Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations.</p> <p>The identification of potential community projects that could be progressed would be a positive initiative.</p>   | <p>The section on Community facilities addresses the general points raised.</p>  |       |
| 32 |  |  | Economic Development | LCC | <p>We would recommend including economic development aspirations with your Plan, outlining what the community currently values and whether they are open to new development of small businesses etc.</p>   | <p>These general comments are noted.</p> <p>The NP addresses employment issues and policies to support small businesses.</p>   | None. |
| 33 |  |  | Superfast Broadband  | LCC | <p>High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a superfast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable, but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life. All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to superfast broadband (of at least 30Mbps) Developers should take active steps to incorporate superfast broadband at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure superfast broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete. Developers are only responsible for putting in place broadband infrastructure for developments of 30+ properties.</p> | <p>These general comments are noted.</p> <p>The NP addresses issues relating to the communications infrastructure locally.</p> | None. |

|    |    |  |            |          |  |  |   |
|----|----|--|------------|----------|--|--|---|
|    |    |  |            |          | Consideration for developers to make provision in all new houses regardless of the size of development should be considered.   |  |   |
| 34 |    |  | Equalities | LCC      | While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council's Equality Strategy 2016-2020 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work  | These general comments are noted. The NP meets the Basic Conditions in respect of the Human Rights Act.  | None.   |
| 35 | 20 |  | H2         | Resident | <p>Site 3. Manor Farm Hallaton Road</p> <p>The southerly section of the proposed site which was outside the 'Limits to Development' until this pre-submission plan has its boundary just nine yards from our Listed Building (Saddlers Cottage) which 'affects the settings of listed assets'.</p> <p>In addition, on the boundary of the south east of the proposed site, significant Roman archaeology (main villa and bath house) has been excavated and recorded, 'the full extent of the Roman features is expected to be larger than the areas investigated by archaeologists' (ref: John Martin, YourLocale). Although both the above issues are noted in the 'support for development' of this site more clarity and detail is required, as I feel that these significant points were not sufficiently investigated when selecting the sites and its associated boundaries</p> | <p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>As described in the LtD methodology, the red-line boundary has been relaxed to accommodate the development that is required in the Parish up to 2031.</p> <p>The condition to development referenced in policy H2 specifically references the proximity to the listed buildings and the need for any development to take these assets into account. We will add into the conditions the need for an archaeological survey to be undertaken on receipt of a planning application.</p> <p>The site assessment process was thorough and transparent and took all relevant information into account.</p> | Further condition to be added to require an archaeological study. |
| 36 |    |  | H1         | Highways | We recognise that in the Harborough Local Plan,  | Noted.   | None.   |

|    |  |  |                    |               |  |   |                        |
|----|--|--|--------------------|---------------|--|---|------------------------|
|    |  |  |                    |               | Medbourne is defined as a selected rural village. It is noted in Policy H1 of the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan that 39 new dwellings are set to come forward over the Plan period. Given the limited growth planned to come forward and the distance of the Neighbourhood Plan area from the SRN, we do not consider that there will be any impacts upon the operation of the A14. |   |                        |
| 37 |  |  | 5                  | BT Open Reach | Thank you very much for highlighting your plan to us, specifically policy 5. We've noted your comments and will keep them on record should we ever need to refer to this in the future. At present we have no further comments to add to this. I would like to thank you again for highlighting this to us.  | Noted.  | None.                  |
| 38 |  |  | Open Spaces        | Resident      | Re-emphasise the importance of open space notably around the stream (Medbourne Brook) running through the village  | Noted. The towpath is designated as LGS.  | None.                  |
| 39 |  |  | Open Spaces        | Resident      | Support for proposed additional protected open spaces  | Noted.  | None.                  |
| 40 |  |  | Affordable Housing | Resident      | Suggest additional paragraph in original draft regarding the importance of bungalows as part of the affordable housing mix as an accepted need in the village  | Agreed. Will specify accommodation suitable for older people.   | Amendment as proposed. |
| 41 |  |  | Housing Design     | Resident      | Concern that there are examples in the village where materials have been specified in planning applications but not adhered to without any objection by the planning authority. Want this strengthened   | Thank you for this comment. The issue is a matter for planning enforcement and outside of the scope of this NP. | None                   |
| 42 |  |  | Housing            | Resident      | The only comment I would like to make is that any new housing if adjacent to existing housing should try to be sympathetic in design and materials to its neighbouring property. An example would be the new house in between the church and Mr Polito's house, which whilst I accept may have been  | Thank you for this comment. This issue is addressed within the design policy, H6.                               | None.                  |

|    |  |  |            |                    |   |   |                                       |
|----|--|--|------------|--------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
|    |  |  |            |                    | controversial, but it blends in very well in my opinion.  |   |                                       |
| 43 |  |  | Flood Risk | Environment Agency | <p>The proposed policy does not conflict with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Further to our letter of 04 January 2017 the Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea) has now been updated for this location. The updated information can be downloaded from <a href="https://data.gov.uk/">https://data.gov.uk/</a> or viewed at <a href="https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/">https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</a>. Consequently, the numbers of properties at flood risk quoted in the opening paragraph may not be correct and should be verified.</p> <p>We would encourage development to be set back from the top of bank of any Main River. Development may require a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within eight metres of the top of the bank of the River Welland or Medbourne Brook, both designated a 'main river'. This was formerly called a Flood Defence Consent. Some activities are also now <a href="#">excluded</a> or <a href="#">exempt</a>. A permit is separate to and in addition to any planning permission granted. Further details and guidance are available on the GOV.UK website: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits</a>.</p> <p>The <a href="#">National Planning Practice Guidance</a> refers planners, developers and advisors to the Environment Agency guidance on considering climate change in Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs). This guidance was updated in February 2016 and is</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Having checked the Flood map the figures noted in the NP remain appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. This does not affect any proposed allocation through the NP.</p> | <p>None.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None.</p> |

|    |  |          |               |   |   |   |
|----|--|----------|---------------|---|---|---|
|    |  |          |               | <p>available on <a href="http://Gov.uk">Gov.uk</a>. The guidance can be used for planning applications, local plans, neighbourhood plans and other projects. It provides climate change allowances for peak river flow, peak rainfall, sea level rise, wind speed and wave height. The guidance provides a range of allowances to assess fluvial flooding, rather than a single national allowance. It advises on what allowances to use for assessment based on vulnerability classification, flood zone and development lifetime.</p> <p>We are pleased to see a recognition of the value of watercourses within the Draft Plan. In particular, community action environment 3 provides an opportunity to deliver water quality improvement through 'slowing the flow measures' alongside flood risk benefits.</p> <p>We would ask you to consider whether there is an opportunity to include 'enhancement to the watercourse' within Community action infrastructure 1 – developer contribution?</p> <p>I hope you find the above comments informative. I would like to highlight that the Environment Agency offers a chargeable pre-application advice service where will able to review and provide comments on technical reports, for example FRA's, prior to the formal planning application submission stage. As part of the service the customer is assigned a dedicated Project Manager; we shall work to your timescales wherever possible and the service is there to help ensure the formal planning process runs as efficiently as possible.</p> | Noted.  | I don't think this will apply as any developer contributions have to be directly linked to the development .... |
| 44 |  | Overview | Langton Homes | Langton Homes are supportive of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and consider that, with slight revision, it would wholly fulfil the requirements of Schedule 48 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) including compliance with the   | Noted. Thank you for these supportive comments. | None.   |

|    |  |  |             |               |   |  |   |
|----|--|--|-------------|---------------|---|--|---|
|    |  |  |             |               | basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of that Schedule.  |  |   |
| 45 |  |  | H2 Site 4   | Langton Homes | <p>Langton Homes fully supports the Allocation of Site 4 but has concern with draft criterion c); that the development along the Hallaton Road should be a development with single storey development on the boundary to Manor Farm. The importance of the relationship with Manor Farm and with the wider landscape is acknowledged by Langton Homes but it is considered that those interests could readily be addressed during the course of any planning application for residential development of the site and that the draft policy is too prescriptive as it stands. It could easily be the case that an appropriate scheme could come forward which properly respects the relationship with Manor Farm and the wider landscape without all dwellings along the Manor Farm boundary being single storey.</p> <p>In fact, given the topography of the site and relationship with houses on the other side of the Hallaton Road it is likely to be more appropriate that all dwellings along the Hallaton Road, include the dwellings on the boundary to Manor Farm, would be 2 storey, with those positioned to the rear as single storey.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is considered that criterion c) is superfluous and could be deleted. If it is deemed necessary to reference the relationship between the site and Manor Farm then it is considered that the criterion should not be prescriptive with regard to the boundary but should be as follows:</p> <p><i>c) The development shall be of a form and scale informed by its relationship to Manor Farm"</i></p> | Agreed   | The development shall be of a form and scale informed by its relationship to its setting. |
| 46 |  |  | <u>ENV2</u> | Langton Homes | Policy ENV2 seeks to designate land known as Site 108 Land on corner of Hallaton Road and Paynes  | The figure H6 is to be redrawn to reflect the existing | Amendment to figure as proposed.  |

|    |  |                         |             |               |  |                       |  |
|----|--|-------------------------|-------------|---------------|--|-----------------------|--|
|    |  |                         |             |               | <p>Lane, and which comprises partly residential allocation Site 4 Hallaton Road, as a site or feature of environmental significance. The draft policy requires development proposals within land designated by Policy ENV2 to protect or enhance the identified features. Site 108 has well preserved ridge and furrow, views into the village and species rich hedgerows.</p> <p>It is considered that the area proposed to be allocated as Site 4 Hallaton Road should be removed from the proposed designation of Site 108 under policy ENV2 to ensure consistency with Policy H2. Alternatively , if Site 4 of Policy H2 is to remain within the area of Site 108 for policy ENV2, it is considered that the final sentence of policy ENV2 should be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Development proposals that affect them will be expected to protect or enhance the identified features in so far as is consistent with the other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan including Policy H2".</i></li> </ul> | R&F and significance. |  |
| 47 |  | <u>Ridge and Furrow</u> | <u>ENV6</u> | Langton Homes | <p>Policy ENV6 seeks protection for areas of preserved ridge and furrow earthworks within the settlement. One area of identified ridge and furrow includes residential allocation Site 4 Hallaton Road. Whilst draft policy ENV6 seeks to ensure that development proposals can come forward which result in loss or damage, that harm will need to be balanced against the significance of the heritage assets, it is considered that Policy ENV6 should exclude sites which have been allocated for residential development including Site 4 of Policy H2, to ensure consistency within the Neighbourhood Plan. Alternatively, the second part of Policy ENV6 should be amended as follows:</p>  | As above.             |  |

|    |    |  |                 |               |  |  |   |
|----|----|--|-----------------|---------------|--|--|---|
|    |    |  |                 |               | <i>"Any loss or damage arising from a development proposal (or a change of land use requiring planning permission) will need to be balanced against their significance as heritage assets having regard to the other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan including Policy H2".</i>                                    |  |   |
| 48 |    |  | Summary Comment | Langton Homes | Langton Homes are fully supportive of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and draft Policy H2. However, slight revisions are considered necessary to ensure that the policies of the Plan are mutually consistent with each other and that the Plan fulfils the basic conditions.   | Noted  | Amendments to be made as indicated above. |
| 49 | 15 |  |                 | HDC           | Vision should be time limited - e.g. by 2031.....  | Agreed   | Words to be amended as proposed.          |
| 50 | 20 |  |                 | HDC           | 40% Affordable provision must also include rented provision if we can determine need alongside affordable Home Ownership   | Noted. The policy does not preclude rented provision (if a need can be identified) but specifically supports ownership products. Medbourne has a higher than average level of social rented properties already hence the support for ownership products. | None.                                     |
| 51 |    |  | H1              | HDC           | Policy H1 could be brought within H2.  | Agreed to help streamline the document.  | Policies H1 and H2 to be combined.        |
| 52 |    |  | H2              | HDC           | Consideration should be given to providing 50% affordable housing on the sites that provide for affordable housing, as some sites do not and cost are high.<br><br>It would be better to say that shared ownership and starter homes will be accepted as part of the affordable provision, rather than be supported. | Medbourne has a slightly higher level of affordable housing than across the district so keeping to 40% is justified.<br><br>The purpose of this is to promote ownership products not just accept them.   | None                                      |

|    |  |          |    |     |   |   |   |
|----|--|----------|----|-----|---|---|---|
|    |  |          |    |     | Site 3 should request a full archaeological survey of the site prior to development, or at least a referral to LCC archaeological services. A screening report should be undertaken for SEA requirement. Speak to HDC regarding this.   | Agreed<br><br>An SEA Screening report is underway by HDC  |   |
| 53 |  |          | H2 | HDC | Site 1 Station House Livery Yard:<br>The site appears quite separate from other built development at the tail end of the village; the area should include the area of land to the south and the house. Also point e) needs to be added to make reference to the scale and design of the properties as this is a very visible site from the Hallaton Road and there have been a recent appeal decision regarding the replacement dwelling on the same side of the road further into the village. Or perhaps the group are relying on other policies to cover this issue? | The landowner does not want to develop south of the proposed site so the line has been drawn to show the area to be developed.<br><br>Amend to say that 'the development shall be of a form and scale informed by its relationship to the neighbouring properties'? | Amend as indicated  |
| 54 |  |          | H3 | HDC | b) should specifically reference rural exception sites.<br>d)? craft activities, what does this mean? We have never come across 'craft activity in the open countryside' that required planning permission, what does this mean? We don't recall it been covered in the NPPF.   | Agreed  | Criterion b to add 'through a rural exception site where local need has been identified'.<br>Amend wording re 'craft activity' to say 'development suitable to a countryside setting. |
| 55 |  |          | H3 | HDC | what is the rationale behind leaving properties along main street outside of the limits to development? Evidence will be needed.  | The line was based on HDC's 2011 LtD. We will redraw the LtD to include the properties on Main St.  | Amendment as proposed.  |
| 56 |  |          | H4 | HDC | housing mix might be better expressed on individual sites in H2   | Good point – will add this in to policy H2 as well as keeping H4 to address windfall applications ...   |   |
| 57 |  |          | H5 | HDC | include impact on conservation area and setting   | Agreed  | Further bullet point to be added.   |
| 58 |  | Environm |    | HDC | Natural environment – explanation is long, can  | Agreed. Some explanations   | Amendments to be made   |

|    |  |             |      |     |  |  |   |
|----|--|-------------|------|-----|--|--|---|
|    |  | ent         |      |     | some be moved to appendix? Evidence should be in appendix.<br>Maps need improving.<br>The evidence for LGS can be included as an appendix.   | and evidence will be moved to the appendix. Higher resolution maps will be supplied with the supporting information when the NP is submitted.  | as proposed.  |
| 59 |  | Environment |      | HDC | Suggest policy calls for surveys if areas identified as high env or historic value are brought in for development  | Agreed – can add this in.  | Request formal surveys when identified land is the subject of planning application. |
| 60 |  | Environment |      | HDC | Have landowners been specifically contacted as part of the designation of other sites of environmental significance? If not this should be undertaken a.s.a.p. as experience has shown it can lead to delays later in the process. | All landowners have been written to and consulted on the NP.   |   |
| 61 |  |             | ENV3 | HDC | Same applies for ENV3 – Important Open Spaces  | As above   |   |
| 62 |  |             | ENV3 | HDC | Should say development on the sites listed will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances and any loss must be mitigated or compensated for with replacement sites.   | The form of words in the Policy ENV3 was proposed by an Examiner at Thurcaston and Cropston and is considered appropriate.   | None.   |
| 63 |  |             | ENV5 | HDC | Conservation area should be shown on map   | Agreed. The boundary of the Conservation Area can be shown.  | Incorporate Conservation Area into figure.  |
| 64 |  |             |      |     | Ridge and furrow, could require an archaeological survey. Grades of Ridge and Furrow might help as there is quite a bit, so which is the best?   | The issue that the NP is highlighting is that Medbourne is unusual in retaining 19% of its R&F. This makes it a much more representative survivor of the medieval farm landscape than is found in most parishes (less than 10%), and allows the arrangement of ‘ploughlands’ to be seen beneath the modern fields and compared | None  |

|    |  |  |      |     |   |   |   |
|----|--|--|------|-----|---|---|---|
|    |  |  |      |     |   | with the historic map (Fig. 10). Less prominent areas were omitted from the map. The requirement for an Archaeological survey is not considered necessary (already known to be R&F); excavation would destroy the feature and would only find (or not) pre-medieval archaeology with no current expression in the landscape.                            |   |
| 65 |  |  | ENV4 | HDC | The map of wildlife corridors is too imprecise. The boundaries need to be defined, especially within the village  | Soft-edged wildlife corridors have passed examination in other Neighbourhood Plans. The intention of the map is to indicate the soft boundaries of corridors used by e.g. birds, bats and insects (individuals and populations) moving both along the linear features (stream and old railway) within the village and between habitat sites outside it. | None  |
| 66 |  |  | ENV5 | HDC | Locally listed heritage assets should have evidence to support the listing – this can be included as an appendix in the same way as LGS.  | The evidence is available in the supporting information.  | None  |
| 67 |  |  | ENV7 | HDC | Unlikely ENV7 as written will pass through Examination. Suggest that it could be worded more as Views into and out of the village are important to the setting and character of the village. Development will be expected to respect and where possible enhance views and should include the treatment of views in the design statement. The issue with this policy as written is that it creates areas where development will not be | Agreed. The revised wording is more appropriate.  | Change policy wording to say 'Views into and out of the village are important to the setting and character of the village. Development will be expected to respect and where possible enhance views and should include the treatment of |

|    |  |  |      |     |   |  |  |
|----|--|--|------|-----|---|--|--|
|    |  |  |      |     | permitted, but the entire village is included. This could be viewed by the Examiner as an overly restrictive policy and therefore not acceptable.   |  | views in any design statement'   |
| 68 |  |  | ENV8 | HDC | Appears to only allow community renewables, I am not sure this is robust.   | This is not the intention of the policy which is worded "small-scale ... OR community initiated ... infrastructure"  | None   |
| 69 |  |  | ENV8 | HDC | Repeated number ground stability – I don't think map is good enough for DM. It may be a better if development is required to do a full survey for ground stability.   | Noted. The map is indicative only and will be referenced as such. The policy should be numbered ENV9 and refer to figure 13.<br><br>The addition of a requirement to undertake a full survey is agreed.  | To become policy ENV 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rewording caption of Fig 13 to show that the map is 'indicative only'.</li> <li>• Add form of words as recommended re. developer survey.</li> <li>• The reference to Figure 12 in Policy ENV 9 (was 8) needs to be corrected (to 13).</li> </ul> |
| 70 |  |  | ENV8 | HDC | The wording on flood zones and development is not really representative of NPPF.  | Noted. The relevant paragraph will be removed.   | Remove paragraph before policy.  |
| 71 |  |  | ENV9 | HDC | As worded is unclear where it should be applied. Are all allocated sites in low risk flooding areas? I am not sure DM will be able to do much with this as currently worded. It would be helpful to show river flooding and surface water separately. | The intention of the policy is to require these conditions of all developers both of the allocated sites and in future windfall development.   | None   |
| 72 |  |  | E1   | HDC | What is a strong presumption?   | Will remove the word 'strong'.   | Amend as proposed.   |
| 73 |  |  | E2   | HDC | Is rather restrictive   | It is considered that the policy identifies the conditions that are required locally to ensure that employment opportunities are developed sensitively. They reflect policy conditions that have been considered suitable in other NPs within the District that have passed Examination. | None.  |

|    |  |  |                     |                      |  |  |       |
|----|--|--|---------------------|----------------------|--|--|-------|
| 74 |  |  | E5                  | HDC                  | Access to superfast broadband is not in the gift of the LPA. New developments should be capable of accepting superfast, but the actual speed cannot be enforced on an ISP  | This form of words has passed Examination elsewhere in the District (see Hungarton/Great Easton) and reflects the current minimum standards whilst allowing for future increases in speed. | None  |
| 75 |  |  | Opening Summery     | Gladman Developments | This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the submission version of the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy.   | Noted.   | None. |
| 76 |  |  | Adopted Local Plan  | Gladman Developments | The adopted Development Plan relevant to the preparation of the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan consists of the adopted Harborough Core Strategy covering the period from 2006 – 2028. This plan was adopted in November 2011 and therefore is out of date against the requirements of the Framework which requires local planning authorities to identify and meet full Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for housing. Whilst this is the Development Plan that the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan will be tested against it is important that sufficient flexibility is included within the Plan so that its contents are not superseded by the provisions of S38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. | Noted.   | None. |
| 77 |  |  | Emerging Local Plan |                      | To meet the requirements of the Framework, the Council has commenced work on a new Local Plan, covering the period from 2011 and 2031. The Proposed Submission version of the plan is currently subject to a six- week consultation, closing on the 3rd November. Whilst the policies of   | Noted. The NP has taken the proposed submission Local Plan and its evidence base into account.   | None. |

|    |  |  |    |         |  |   |       |
|----|--|--|----|---------|--|---|-------|
|    |  |  |    |         | the proposed plan have not yet been subject to Examination in Public, the strategic direction that the Council is proposing to take is clearly set out. The Parish Council should ensure sufficient regard is had to the emerging Local Plan to ensure than any conflicts are minimised whilst including sufficient flexibility within the plans policies to ensure the plan can react to any changes that may arise through the current consultation and subsequent Examination.  |   |       |
| 78 |  |  | H1 | Gladman | This policy sets out that about 39 new dwellings will be provided in the plan period through allocations. This adds a buffer to the housing requirement as set out in the emerging Local Plan however as the overall requirement in the Local Plan states 'at least' Gladman suggest the policy wording is modified to state that this will be a minimum. A similar issue was considered in the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report where the examiner found that 'given the strategic objective of the plan refers to 'at least 130', I assume it to be a minimum. It if were to be a maximum this would not allow for the flexibility the Framework seeks in responding to changing conditions.' The change as suggested would ensure greater conformity with the objectives of the Framework and so that this policy meets basic condition (a). | The use of the term 'about' has been chosen based on other NPs where the word was proposed by the Examiner as an appropriate reflection of housing requirements.<br><br>As the housing number built into the NP is in excess of the minimum housing requirement for the Parish, its use is considered appropriate and is in general conformity with the housing evidence base used by the District Council in determining housing distribution across the District. | None. |
| 79 |  |  | H2 | Gladman | This policy allocates several sites for residential development to deliver the housing provision as set out in policy H1. Whilst noting the site assessment produced to inform the site allocations Gladman suggest that this could be taken further with a summary of each site and why the allocated sites have progressed and others have not, this would ensure transparency around the decisions  | The site assessment evidence will be provided as part of the range of evidence available when the Plan is submitted.  | None  |

|    |  |  |    |         |  |  |                         |
|----|--|--|----|---------|--|--|-------------------------|
|    |  |  |    |         | <p>taken. Further, as the plan allocates numerous housing sites Gladman query whether a Strategic Environment Assessment Scoping Report has been undertaken to inform preparation of the plan and assess whether there will be any significant environmental effects from the allocation of housing. The preparation of neighbourhood plans may fall under the scope of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SEA Regulations) that require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be undertaken where a Plan's proposals would be likely to have significant environmental effects.</p> <p>The SEA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of a Plan's preparation. It should assess the effects of a neighbourhood plan's proposals and whether they would be likely to have significant environmental effects and whether the Plan is capable of achieving the delivery of sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives. Both the SEA Directive and Neighbourhood Planning PPG make expressly clear that an SEA Screening Assessment should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity.</p> | <p>The SEA Screening Report has been undertaken by HDC.</p> <p>The SEA Screening Report could not be undertaken until it was clear which residential sites would be included within the NP. As soon as this was determined the Screening exercise was undertaken by HDC.</p>   | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
| 80 |  |  | H3 | Gladman | <p>This policy seeks to set Limits to Development (LTD) for Medbourne. The emerging Local Plan does not seek to set LTD instead setting out a more flexible criterion based approach where development would be permitted directly adjacent to the built-up area. As it is clear this the approach Harborough District Council are progressing, Gladman suggest that the Parish Council aligns this policy with that of the emerging Local Plan to avoid unnecessary conflict as the Local Plan progresses.</p>  | <p>There is no conflict with the proposed submission Local Plan as the provision of LTD is a matter of detail and not a strategic element. This principle has been established through many recently Made Neighbourhood Plans and has been confirmed in Harborough District through NPs that have recently passed Examination at Great Easton,</p> | <p>None.</p>            |

|    |  |  |      |         |   |   |                    |
|----|--|--|------|---------|---|---|--------------------|
|    |  |  |      |         |   | North Kilworth and Hungarton which all re-establish LTD in the District.  |                    |
| 81 |  |  | H5   | Gladman | This policy supports infill and redevelopment sites of three dwellings and less. It is not clear why this is the limit that would be acceptable and Gladman suggest that this is overly restrictive and as such does not accord with the Framework.   | The windfall limit will be increased to 4 in line with the proposed submission local plan.  | Amend as proposed. |
| 82 |  |  | ENV7 | Gladman | This policy seeks to protect the identified important and valued views except in exceptional circumstances. At this time Gladman have seen no evidence to support the protection of these views. Paragraph 109 of the Framework states that 'the planning system should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...' without defining what is considered a 'valued landscape'. Numerous appeals have sought to bring clarity to this term and the consensus suggests that for a landscape to be considered as valued it must exhibit some demonstrable physical attributes which elevate its importance above simply being an area of undeveloped countryside. To warrant the inclusion of this policy Gladman suggest evidence will need to be produced to demonstrate how each of the views identified is elevated above merely being a view of a nice field. | See 67.<br><br>The description of the views identified as being locally important is available in the supporting information.   | None.              |
| 83 |  |  | ENV8 | Gladman | Whilst acknowledging the concerns raised within this policy Gladman consider this to be a strategic policy beyond the remit of neighbourhood plans and suggest this is an issue to be dealt with through higher-level plans and as such suggest that it should be deleted.  | Policy ENV 8 (renewables) is not a strategic policy. Local communities are empowered through NPs to express their support or otherwise for energy infrastructure proposals and this policy sets out the conditions under which such proposals would | None               |

|    |  |  |     |         |   |   |                    |
|----|--|--|-----|---------|---|---|--------------------|
|    |  |  |     |         |   | be supported.   |                    |
| 84 |  |  | CF3 | Gladman | Gladman raise concerns with elements of this policy and suggest as worded elements of the policy contradict themselves. It is unclear how potential improvements to the existing paths and tracks can be considered to be having an 'adverse effect' on pedestrian links as opposed to a potential benefit. Gladman suggest this element of the policy should be deleted. | The sentence commencing 'Any change from the existing character ...' will be deleted. | Amend as proposed. |