

Representation No 2
Godfrey Payton (agent)
On behalf of Mr
149 St Mary's Road, Market Harborough LE16 7DZ

General Objection in respect of Basic Conditions
Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

Whilst noting and welcoming the process which has been involved as part of the Neighbourhood Plan review and update 2025, it is submitted that the updated plan is not representative and has not taken due regard of the local or regional planning policy position, or the evolving national planning policy position following the revised Government housebuilding targets issued in 2025.

This is particularly as Harborough District Council approved the Regulation 19 version of the Council's Local Plan on 16/03/20 the allocation for sites of future residential development, which has not been properly considered or evaluated as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process.

Furthermore, the Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the policy requirements of the District Council in allowing for 100 new houses in the planned period (2020 - 2041) within Great Bowden

GBPC response to the examiner:

Great Bowden Parish Council commissioned the services of AECOM to report on site options and assessment The process used for undertaking the site options appraisal is tried and tested and has been completed in countless neighbourhood plans across the country. The report was signed off by Locality as the Government's agents in this.

We think that there is a misunderstanding of the housing requirement, which is met, and indeed exceeded, by a combination of the allocations in the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. HDC is proposing, in its reviewed Local Plan, that 100 new houses are built in the planning period (2020 - 2041) within Great Bowden. Great Bowden accepts that it should take an equitable share of new houses, in this period, as the other four medium villages in the district have also each been allocated 100 hundred new houses in this period.

Representation No9

Historic England THE FOUNDRY 82 GRANVILLE STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 2LH

NDP: Neighbourhood Development Plan

Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan

[Case Ref. PL00799875; HE File Ref. N/A; Your Reference. N/A]

Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan Review - Examination Submission of Neighbourhood Plan Thank you for consulting us regarding the above neighbourhood Plan. We have previously provided comments at the Regulation14 stage of the plan.

In our comments we raised concerns regarding the proposed residential site allocation- GB01- Buckminster Close. Our concerns were as follows:

We note that the draft plan proposes a residential allocation GB01- Buckminster Close. The site is located within the Great Bowden Conservation Area and adjacent to a number of listed buildings including the highly graded Church of St Peter and Paul (listed grade I) and the Old Rectory (listed grade II*). The site appears to be an important green space within the conservation area and provides a verdant setting to a number of listed buildings. The Local Planning Authority's Conservation Statement for Great Bowden states that 'Nether Green is separated from the main village centre of the Church and Rectory House by a large tree-fringed paddock, bounded by brick and mud walls and forming an important open space'. It is not clear whether this is site identified for residential allocation. The site is also identified within the existing neighbourhood plan as a site of historical environmental significance- Policy ENV4- Site V.

In any event, we consider that an Historic Impact Assessment should be undertaken to understand the potential impact of proposed development of the site as this could be a possible objection to inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. If the site is continued to be proposed as an allocation, we strongly recommend that you consult the local planning authority's conservation officer and suggest that any archaeological implications are discussed with the County Archaeologist.

We note that no Historic Impact Assessment appears to have been undertaken to address our concerns. Furthermore, the review consultation statement submitted- (appendix 6) which accompanies the neighbourhood plan, appears to make no acknowledgement of our concerns. The document also highlights that Harborough District Council recommended that a Heritage impact Assessment of the site should be undertaken within the comments.

Our concerns regarding the allocation of site GB01 within the neighbourhood plan remain. We therefore strongly advise that a Heritage Impact Assessment is undertaken to address our concerns. Any assessment should assess the potential impact of development of site on the significance of the nearby heritage assets including the highly graded listed church, as well as the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. We continue to recommend consultation with the LPA conservation officer in this regard.

GBPC response to the examiner:

Historic England have misidentified the paddock referred to in Policy H1, site GBO1, referred to in the AECOM report, GBNP Site Options & Assessment. The "large tree-fringed paddock bounded by brick and mud walls" separating Nether Green from the Church and Old Rectory lies to the *north* of Nether Green and forms the immediate setting of the Grade I Church and Grade II* Old Rectory and which has recently been granted planning permission, by HDC, for residential development!

The site in question, GB01, related to Policy H1, is the paddock south of Lime Tree Place, enclosed on three sides by modern residential development (Lime Tree Place, Quorn House and Oakley House), and has no intervisibility with the highly graded asset. GBPC respectfully suggest that this objection should, therefore, be ignored.

A site-specific heritage assessment of this immediate location already exists in the planning record. The Trigpoint Conservation & Planning Heritage Statement (October 2022, prepared by an IHBC-accredited author for app. 22/01106/FUL on the adjoining parcel) concluded that the land makes "little contribution to the overall character and appearance" of the Conservation Area, and for that site the intervening buildings and mature planting screen it entirely from the listed buildings on Sutton Road and Dingley Road. This was endorsed by the Council's Conservation Officer (Sally Hartshorne) following a site visit, and planning permission was granted and implemented — the precedent on the immediately adjacent land is directly material.

Notwithstanding the above, a proportionate Heritage Impact Assessment will be commissioned to formally address Historic England's recommendation. It will be prepared in accordance with Historic England's GPA Notes 2, 3 and 12, will engage the District Conservation Officer and Leicestershire County Archaeologist as advised, and will articulate the contribution of the site to the significance of the local heritage assets.

Allocation, with the controls Policy H1 imposes, results in less harm than unconstrained windfall development. The site already sits within the settlement boundary and could come forward as windfall under Policy H3/GB2 without these heritage-sensitive controls; the Policy H1 framework — bungalows only, restrictive covenant against upper-storey conversion, retention of boundary planting and mud-wall edge,

low-density layout, mix of 2/3-bed homes — is a positive heritage outcome enabled *by* allocation and should be welcomed rather than resisted by the heritage sector.

The interaction with Policy ENV4 (Site Vin the 2018 NP) is manageable and the two designations are not mutually exclusive. ENV4 protects sites of *local* historic-environmental and archaeological interest; it requires a proportionate appraisal and a balance against demonstrable public benefits, not prohibition. Archaeological potential at GB01 can be properly addressed through a pre-commencement condition requiring a written scheme of archaeological investigation agreed with the County Archaeologist — the standard, NPPF-compliant mechanism.

Summary. Any residual harm to the significance of the Conservation Area or to the setting of the listed buildings would, on the evidence, fall at the lower end of "less than substantial" and is to be weighed against the public benefits — addressing identified local housing need with eight age-appropriate bungalows, marketed first to Great Bowden residents and supported by the Parish Council. With the HIA in place and the mitigation embedded in Policy H1, the allocation is sound and the Inspector can be confident that the heritage tests are satisfied.

Representation No 13 Philips Planning Services 7 Kingsway Bedford For Resident Great Bowden

RE: RESPONSE TO THE GREAT BOWDEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW 2022 – 2041
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION

We are writing on behalf of our client, of, Dingley Road, Great Bowden, to OBJECT to the draft allocation of site GB01 in the draft Neighbourhood Plan Review.

This representation follows our submission to the Regulation 14 Consultation in October 2025, and the Examiner is encouraged to read this in conjunction with the objections already raised.

In preparing this submission, as well as the draft Neighbourhood Plan review and the supporting evidence base, we have reviewed Appendix 6 of the Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan Review Consultation Statement, which sets out the Parish Council's response to the Regulation 14 consultation. The following provides responses to the Parish Council's comments, which in turn raise further questions regarding the evidence supporting this review and the allocation of site GB01.

Heritage Impacts

In response to our Reg 14 comments regarding the heritage impacts, the Parish Council state at page 67 of the Consultation Statement that:

“A Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening, undertaken by HDC, determined that there would be no significant harm from this development, a judgement agreed with by Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency.”

As stated in paragraph 1.1 of The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report, the purpose of that assessment was to determine whether the draft Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan required a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). Whilst it was not considered that the heritage impacts resulted in the need for a SEA, this does not confirm that site GB01 can be developed without causing adverse harm to heritage assets. It is simply that an SEA is not required.

The Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan Review Strategic Environmental Assessment Determination (July 2025) sets out the response from Historic England to the SEA Screening Report which states that: “On the basis of the information supplied in the context of the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment Regulations [Annex II of ‘SEA’ Directive], Historic England is of the view that the preparation of a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not likely to be required.”

Again, whilst Historic England did not consider a SEA to be necessary, this is not an endorsement of the allocation of site GB01 or confirmation that it can be developed without causing an unacceptable level of harm.

The comments from Historic England in the Consultation Statement state that:

“The area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of important designated heritage assets. In line with national planning policy, it will be important that the strategy for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets so that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area. If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the planning and conservation team at your local planning authority together with the staff at the county council archaeological advisory service who look after the Historic Environment Record.”

Historic England therefore recognise that there are numerous important heritage assets in the plan area, and require these to be safeguarded. It should be noted that many of these important heritage assets surround site GB01 which is within the Conservation Area. Historic England state that the planning and conservation team at the local planning authority should be consulted. It appears that a Planning Officer responded to the Regulation 14 consultation, but it is not clear if the conservation team were consulted as the respondent is simply noted as HDC Officer in the Consultation Statement, and they have responded to numerous other issues.

At page 132 of the Consultation Statement, the HDC Officer recognises that:

“The site lies within the Conservation Area and occupies a sensitive location to the rear of several listed buildings. There are also multiple Historic Environment Record (HER) entries within or adjacent to the site. If not already, a Heritage Impact Assessment should therefore be required to evaluate the potential impact on the significance of these assets.”

In response, the Parish Council stated that:

“There was no request in the Strategic Environmental Assessment Determination that a Heritage Impact Assessment was required related to the development of site GB01. This should be picked up at planning applications stage.”

Again, the SEA determination simply related to the need for a SEA, it did not endorse the allocation of site GB01. The HDC Officer stated that a Heritage Impact Assessment should be undertaken if this has not already been done. They did not state that this should be done at the planning application stage. The heritage impacts are fundamental to the suitability of the site for development, so a Heritage Impact Assessment should have been undertaken prior to the allocation of the site in order to ascertain if it is developable without harm to nearby heritage assets including the Conservation Area and surrounding Listed Buildings. It is too late to undertake the Heritage Impact Assessment at the Planning Application stage because if, as we assess, the impacts mean that the site cannot be developed then the allocation cannot be delivered. This undermines the allocation and makes the plan unsound.

In our experience through promoting land for development we are fully cognisant of the fact that where there is concern regarding the impact of a potential allocation on designated heritage assets, these require assessment prior to the land being allocated. Indeed, we know of sites being removed from allocations by Examiners where there is a lack of a suitable assessment of heritage impacts due to the likely harm arising.

The Site Options And Assessment report (June 2024) prepared by Aecom, recognised the heritage constraints and stated that:

“The site is within the Conservation Area and also in close proximity to a number of listed and locally designated heritage assets. The site is also a locally designated site of historical environmental significance in the made NDP (Buckminster Close, Nether Green (medieval to early modern) which is protected under Policy ENV4. The site is potentially suitable for sensitive development if the heritage constraints can be resolved or mitigated and is therefore potentially suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan to meet a locally identified need.”

It has not yet been demonstrated that the heritage constraints can be resolved or mitigated so it is unclear why the Parish Council are resistant to undertaking a Heritage Impact Assessment prior to the adoption of the Plan.

Furthermore, by not undertaking a Heritage Impact Assessment prior to the allocation of the site the Parish Council are failing to take account of the legal duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Section 66 requires the decision taker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any buildings or other land in a conservation area.

The examiner must also comply with this legal duty, and in our view they do not have sufficient information before them to confirm that the allocation of this land is acceptable in heritage terms. We will be writing to the Examiner to highlight this issue when the Examination opens.

Housing Needs Assessment

In response to our comments on the Housing Needs Assessment, the Parish Council have responded: "The HNA helps to determine the mix of housing required, not the volume of housing. This has been determined by HDC, and the NP Review has exceeded this minimum requirement and so the test for para 14 of the NPPF is met."

The Parish Council acknowledge that the Housing Needs Assessment has not assessed the volume of housing required and state this has been determined by HDC. However, whilst HDC have allocated 100 dwellings to Great Bowden in the Proposed Submission Draft Harborough Local Plan (March 2025), this figure is to assist in meeting the housing requirement for Harborough District. We can see no evidence that HDC has dictated the number of 8 dwellings to the Parish Council to deliver to meet local needs. The allocation of 8 of dwellings appears to be solely driven by the Parish Council and just happens to be the number that the site can accommodate.

Furthermore, the Parish Council states that the HNA helps to determine the mix of housing required. The HNA did identify a need for affordable housing (although did not provide a specific number) but the allocation of 8 dwellings falls below the affordable housing threshold so is unable to accommodate any. As such, the Plan is fundamentally flawed as the allocation of this site will not address the identified need.

It is therefore unclear what the purpose is of identifying a site for 8 dwellings that is not based on an identified housing need, and which does not deliver any affordable housing, despite the HNA actually identify a need for this. As such, we would welcome confirmation from the Parish Council as to where the figure of 8 dwellings has come from and the evidence for it.

It should also be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan Review will not currently be able to achieve its goal of protecting against speculative development should the Local Planning Authority not be able to demonstrate a five year supply of land, as it is not based on a meaningful and robust identified housing need so fails the basic test in NPPF paragraph 14 b.

I trust these objections will be given due consideration in the Neighbourhood Plan Review.

GBPC response to the examiner:

With regard to the site GB01, the comments that Phillips Planning Services make refer to Historic England's comments in which Historic England have misidentified the paddock referred to in Policy H1, site GB01, referred to in the AECOM report, GBNP Site Options & Assessment. The "large tree-fringed paddock bounded by brick and mud walls" separating Nether Green from the Church and Old Rectory lies to the north of Nether Green and forms the immediate setting of the Grade I Church and Grade II* Old Rectory and which has recently been granted planning permission, by HDC, for residential development!

The site in question, GB01, related to Policy H1, is the paddock south of Lime Tree Place, enclosed on three sides by modern residential development (Lime Tree Place, Quorn House and Oakley House), and has no intervisibility with the highly graded assets and although the site lies within the Conservation Area, it does not occupy a sensitive location to the rear of several listed buildings.

Notwithstanding the above, a proportionate Heritage Impact Assessment will be commissioned to formally address the concerns that have been made.

With regard to the housing need assessment, GBPC has undertaken consultations with residents that identified bungalows were a local need. It is a combination of the allocations in the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan that represent the planned housing development for Great Bowden. HDC is proposing, in its reviewed Local Plan, that 100 new houses are built in the planning period (2020 - 2041) within Great Bowden. Great Bowden accepts that it should take an equitable share of new

houses, in this period, as the other four medium villages in the district have also each been allocated 100 hundred new houses in this period. The HDC proposal of 100 houses is an allocation to satisfy the government requirement for more houses. It is certainly not to meet a local housing need in Great Bowden!

Site GB01 can easily accommodate a mix of 2 and 3 bedroom bungalows which will be a low density layout. A problem in Great Bowden is that there are a lot of older people who are living in 4 bedroom houses, would love to downsize and stay in Great Bowden but there is no suitable housing, in Great Bowden for them to downsize to! These 8 affordable bungalows are required to meet that need, thereby freeing up larger houses for young families. Priority for purchasing these bungalows is to be given to existing residents of Great Bowden.

**Representation No 15 Avison Young 3 Brindleyplace, Birmingham B1 2JB
On behalf of Jelson Homes**

Dear Sirs,

Avison Young is instructed by Jelson Homes Ltd to provide town planning advice in relation to land which it controls to the north of Leicester Lane, Great Bowden.

Jelson responded to the pre-submission consultation carried out by Great Bowden Parish Council in respect of its proposed Review of the Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan (the 'GBNPR') in October 2025.

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the Regulation 16 consultation on the GBNPR insofar as it relates to the circa 2.5 hectares of land that Jelson controls to the north of Leicester Lane ('the site'). A site location plan is appended to these representations (Appendix 1).

Conformity with Basic Conditions

Neighbourhood Plans are required to meet certain 'basic conditions' set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulations 32 and 33 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

The basic conditions are in summary:

1. The NP must have regard to national policy and guidance from the Secretary of State
2. It must contribute to sustainable development
3. It must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area (Harborough District)
4. It must not breach or be otherwise incompatible with EU obligations, including the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive of 2001/42/EC
5. The making of the NP is not likely to have a significant effect of a European site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010(d), either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

We have concerns that the draft GBNPR fails to satisfy the first three basic conditions.

Draft Policy H1 – Residential Site Allocations

The GBNPR is running ahead of the adoption of the District Council's emerging Local Plan (eHLP), which was subject to Regulation 19 consultation between 10 March and 6 May 2025 but has not yet been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in public.

While a draft NP must be in conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force (i.e. the Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031) if it is to meet the basic conditions, that Plan was adopted in 2019, its housing requirement is significantly lower than that for Harborough District, derived using the Standard Method, and its development strategy has failed to such an extent that the Council is no longer able to meet its identified development needs.

The National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that neighbourhood plans can be prepared before or at the same time as a Local Plan. It also clarifies that whilst a draft neighbourhood plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan it is not necessary for a draft neighbourhood plan to be tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan. Nonetheless, it confirms that the “reasoning and evidence” informing the preparation of the Local Plan is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested.

The Regulation 19 version of the eHLP identifies an overall housing requirement of 13,182 dwellings in the District to 2041, of which the Plan allocates land for a minimum of 6,422 dwellings. The eHLP sets out proposed housing requirements for designated neighbourhood areas. [It identifies a residual](#) minimum requirement for 100 dwellings in Great Bowden. It proposes to allocate two sites to the east of Great Bowden adjacent to Dingley Road (Ref. GB1 & GB2) which are identified as having a combined capacity of 100 dwellings. In that context, the GBNP proposes to allocate a single site at Buckminster Close (Ref. GB01) for the delivery of 8 bungalows.

However, Avison Young has made robust representations to the Regulation 19 consultation on the eHLP, on behalf of Jelson, which demonstrate that the eHLP fails to adequately meet the District's market and affordable housing needs and does not contain sufficient contingency to deal with the proportion of Leicester City's to be accommodated within Harborough District.

Great Bowden is a sustainable settlement with the capacity to accommodate additional housing growth. It has several services and facilities and good connections by sustainable modes of transport to a comprehensive range of facilities, services and employment opportunities in Market Harborough. New development could support investment in and the expansion of existing facilities and additional population would support the vitality and viability of existing services (e.g. the local bus service). Our representations to the HLP, therefore, conclude that additional sites should be allocated in the emerging HLP ahead of its adoption, including in sustainable settlements like Great Bowden, to meet its housing needs during the plan period.

Paragraph 84 of the PPG confirms that policies in a neighbourhood plan may become “out of date” and require review if they conflict (i.e. are inconsistent with) policies in a new Local Plan that is adopted after the making of the Neighbourhood Plan which, for example, identifies a higher housing requirement for the settlement or proposes to allocate additional housing sites.

The approach in the GBNPR, therefore, fails to have appropriate regard to national policy and its ambition to “boost significantly” the delivery of housing, in accordance with the basic conditions, and risks the GBNPR being rendered ‘out of date’ in the short-term. To ensure that the GBNPR has regard to national policy and would retain control over the location of any future housing growth in the settlement, the GBNPR should be allocating additional land for housing in Great Bowden now, or, at the very least, be identifying suitable ‘reserve’ housing sites around Great Bowden which could be brought forward for housing development in the event that the need for additional housing is identified through the examination of the emerging HLP.

The supporting text in the draft GBNPR indicates that the proposed allocation of site GB01 at Buckminster Close would allow the Neighbourhood Plan to remain applicable in the presumption in favour of sustainable development for 5 years in the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF. However, even if an additional housing need is not identified for the settlement, through the examination of the eHLP, it would be impossible for the Parish Council to claim that the proposed allocation would “meet its identified housing requirement” in accordance with Paragraph 14 until such time that the eHLP is adopted. As the ability to meet the identified housing requirement is effectively reliant on proposed allocations coming forward through the eHLP, which is still subject to significant objections, yet to be submitted, examined, found sound and adopted.

Moreover, the site is within the defined settlement boundary where development is already supported and capable of coming forward in line with Policy H3 of the GBNP and Policy GB2 of the adopted Local Plan. It would, therefore, be classed as “windfall development” (i.e. sites not specifically identified in the development plan). This risks ‘double counting’ windfall development which is already factored into the Council's overall supply of housing land in the adopted and emerging Local Plan. The adopted plan anticipates that 225 dwellings would be delivered on windfall sites by 2031 and the emerging HLP assumes that an additional 450 dwellings will be delivered on windfall sites by 2041, assuming 45

dwellings per year from 2031/32. It is not, therefore, considered that the allocation of site GB01 would constitute an “allocation” to meet its identified housing requirement in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

If the Parish Council wants to benefit from the protections afforded by Paragraph 14 of the NPPF it would need to make additional allocations.

Jelson’s view is that its land would be the most appropriate location for future growth in the village and should be allocated for housing, or, at the very least identified as a ‘reserve site’ (i.e. the future direction for growth for Great Bowden) with an appropriate ‘reserve sites’ policy which would allow reserve sites to come forward should additional housing needs be identified through the Local Plan Review process.

Approach to Site Assessment

Turning to site assessment and selection, the GBNPR indicates that the proposed allocation (Ref. GB01 Buckminster Drive) was selected following a site assessment process. It is not clear from the consultation documents how the Parish Council has arrived at this conclusion from the seven sites (including Jelson’s site – GB08) identified as “potentially suitable” in the Site Options and Assessment Report prepared by AECOM (June 2024).

Whilst site GB01 was assessed as “potentially suitable for sensitive development” the site assessment indicates that there may be unresolved constraints to development including in relation to the suitability of the site access from Buckminster Close, which appears to be in a separate private ownership, and whether heritage constraints can be resolved or mitigated, noting that the site is immediately to the north of a number of listed buildings and is within Great Bowden Conservation Area.

The requirement for site GB01 to deliver bungalows is also inconsistent with the AECOM Design Guide which talks about the scale of development in the ‘Historic Village’ being “consistent with the surrounding scale, which is prominently 2.5 storeys”.

We are not convinced that the proposed allocation is suitable and deliverable, in accordance with national policy, particularly noting that the site is already within the settlement boundary and its development for housing is already supported as a matter of principle (i.e. could come forward now if there was a desire to do so in the absence of a Neighbourhood Plan allocation), would be restricted in terms of dwelling mix to bungalows and the site does not appear to have been put forward for assessment through the Council’s SHELAA previously or been subject to any applications for planning permission.

Jelson’s site (Land North of Leicester Lane – GB08) is assessed as one of seven sites considered potentially suitable for housing development in the AECOM Report. Two of the sites identified as ‘potentially suitable’ by AECOM were ruled out as potential site allocations by the District Council in the preparation of the Regulation 19 emerging Local Plan¹ for technical reasons, as follows:

- Site GB02 – Langton Road – (Ref. 8029) – not considered ‘achievable’ due to potential noise and vibration impacts from the adjacent railway line and the extent of mitigation required given the size of the site.
- Site GB06 - Land of Welham Lane – (Ref. 8114) - ruled out due to concerns over the ability to achieve a suitable site access. Site GB07 - Land south of Dingley Road - (Ref. 8126) was also ruled out in the District Council’s Site Selection process for the emerging Local Plan because it was considered that its development would compromise the effectiveness of the existing Area of Separation between Great Bowden and Market Harborough.

This leaves three potentially suitable sites. Two of these are already identified as draft allocations in the eHLP (Ref. GB05 - Land off Dingley Road and Nether Green & GB09 – Land North of Dingley Road). However, the District Council’s Site Selection evidence indicates that there may yet be unresolved constraints to development at those sites, including in relation to flood risk, noise and access. Site GB09 was also identified as designated open space, local green space and a local

¹See HDC’s Site Selection Methodology February 2025 (and appendices)

heritage asset in the made Neighbourhood Plan. We, therefore, question the suitability and deliverability of those sites for the delivery of housing in Great Bowden and have raised these issues in our representations to the eHLP.

In terms of Jelson’s site, AECOM’s Site Options and Assessment Report, indicates that it is of high landscape and medium visual sensitivity. However, Jelson has submitted an outline planning application for the residential development of its land to the north of Leicester Lane for up to 52 dwellings (Ref.

25/01492/OUT). In support of this application, Jelson has appointed FPCR to prepare a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and this demonstrates that the site would result in a logical and modest extension to the settlement which would respond positively to the landscape and visual context of the site, retaining and reinforcing existing features of value (e.g. mature trees) and introducing new landscaping to support a sensitive transition between settlement edge and countryside.

AECOM's Site Options and Assessment Report also suggests that the westernmost part of Jelson's site contains ridge and furrow earthworks. However, Jelson has appointed RPS to prepare an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and Magnitude Surveys to carry out a Geophysical Survey of the site. Jelson has also carried out a scheme of archaeological trial trenching at the site in line with discussions with the County Archaeologist. These reports conclude that there are no ridge and furrow earthworks remaining within the boundary of the site and that archaeology is not a constraint to housing development at the site.

Jelson's view is, therefore, that there are no significant technical constraints to development of its land and that it would be the most suitable and appropriate location for housing growth in the village. Copies of the reports referred to above are available on the Council's website under application reference 25/01492/OUT.

Draft Policy G1 – Settlement Boundary

The wording of Draft Policy G1 is inconsistent with strategic policies in the adopted Local Plan and does not comply with the basic conditions.

It is significantly more restrictive than Policy GD2 and Policy GD4 of the adopted Local Plan which allow new housing and other development adjacent to settlements (i.e. outside the settlement boundary) in number of scenarios which are not allowed for by draft Policy G1.

Paragraph 1.6.6 of the adopted Local Plan is clear that the Council's view is that almost all of the policies in the Local Plan are "strategic" policies except for a series of exceptions specifically identified.

Paragraph 1.6.7 states that with the exception of these policies, neighbourhood plans should be in general conformity with all policies in the Local Plan. Policy GD2 and GD4 are not listed as exceptions so are 'strategic' policies which the neighbourhood plan must be in general conformity with.

In order to comply with the 'basic conditions' for Neighbourhood Plans, draft Policy G1 needs amending to bring it in line with the strategic policies in the adopted Local Plan. The most straightforward way of amending draft Policy G1 would be to replicate the wording of Policy H2 in the 'made' Great Bowden Neighbourhood Plan which states that: "Land outside the defined Settlement Boundary will be treated as open countryside, where development will be carefully controlled in line with local and national strategic planning policies." (our emphasis).

Draft Policy ENV 1 - Area of Separation

The GBNPR proposes a new extension to the existing 'Area of Separation' on land to the north of Leicester Lane, to the west of Great Bowden.

The adopted Local Plan states that: "Areas of Separation are defined where the potential risk of merging [between settlements] is at its greatest, ..." It goes on to state that the: "function of these areas is to ensure that development does not harmfully reduce the separation between settlements..."

The built-up area of Market Harborough does not extend to the north or west of the Grand Union Canal (i.e. to the west of Great Bowden). There are also no committed developments which would expand Market Harborough to the west of Great Bowden. There is, therefore, no immediate risk of development resulting coalescence between Market Harborough and the western edge of Great Bowden or of development threatening to compromise the individual identity and character of the two settlements.

The supporting text on page 29 of the GBNPR, indicates that the new Area of Separation (AoS) is proposed in the context of the proposed strategic allocation to the northwest of Market Harborough. However, the draft allocation referred to forms part of the eHLP which has not yet been submitted or examined and is still subject to significant objections. There is, therefore, no guarantee that development of the strategic allocation will come forward in this location or what it might look like.

The draft allocation in the eHLP simply defines an allocation boundary which encompasses an extensive area of land, extending to approximately 160 hectares, identified for the delivery of 1,700 dwellings, a primary school, a secondary school, a replacement showground, retail and community infrastructure. In addition to these uses the draft allocation will be expected to deliver substantial areas of green infrastructure and public open space to support the new population.

The draft allocation under Policy SA03 of the emerging Plan requires the draft allocation to come forward in accordance with a comprehensive masterplan which is to be approved by the Council. This masterplan has not yet been prepared. Given the scale of the strategic allocation, in the absence of this masterplan, it is impossible to know how the land might be developed and whether there might ultimately be any justification for a new AoS to the north of Leicester Lane, between the Grand Union Canal and the western edges of Great Bowden.

Furthermore, Policy SA03 in the draft Local Plan states that the comprehensive masterplan for the strategic allocation “must” maximise the provision of Green Infrastructure along the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area and respect the setting of the Conservation Area. It also specifically states that the masterplan for the strategic allocation “must” respect and maintain the visual separation from Great Bowden and prevent coalescence to retain the identity of each settlement.

On this basis, there is at currently absolutely no justification for the creation of a new AoS in this location through the GBNPR. The proposed designation of an additional AoS to the north of Leicester Lane between the Grand Union Canal and the western edge of Great Bowden is, therefore, entirely premature and should be removed from the GBNPR.

If necessary, the need for an AoS could be reviewed once the Local Plan has been adopted (i.e. when the strategic allocation can be treated as a ‘committed development’) and a comprehensive masterplan has been prepared and approved by the District Council which shows how the proposed strategic allocation to the north of Market Harborough will be built out. Only in this context would it be possible to understand whether there is actually any justification for a new AoS in this location.

We are concerned that the expansion of the AoS under Policy ENV1 of the GBNPR would be used as a tool for restricting or constraining development in the most sustainable locations around the settlement, including those areas which are well connected to facilities and services in Market Harborough, without any justification to do so. This would fail to have regard to national policy which seeks to boost the supply of housing and direct development to sustainable locations. It could, therefore, unnecessarily constrain the delivery of important national policy objectives and would fail to comply with the basic conditions.

Policy G2 - Design Standards

Draft Policy G2 requires applications for new development to demonstrate how the Design Guide and Codes prepared by AECOM has been taken into account in the design of proposals.

The draft Design Guide and Codes was prepared in August 2024 prior to the publication of the emerging Local Plan. The text on page 14 of the Design Guide (i.e. the suggestion that the village is not expected to have any significant housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan) is, therefore, out of date, inconsistent with the and fails to recognise the scale of development directed to Great Bowden in the emerging Local Plan. It is also inconsistent with national policy which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and the basic conditions.

The Design Guide identifies three important views in addition to those identified in draft Policy ENV7. The Design Guide states that these key views should be preserved/ protected and enhanced as part of future new development. It also states that development proposals must be unobstructed of key views. There does not appear to be any evidential basis for the additional views identified.

Furthermore, the wording of the Design Guide appears to effectively set new spatial planning policy requirements which is inappropriate for a document which is intended to offer guidance over the design of new developments.

Furthermore, the Landscape and Visual Assessment, prepared by FPCR, in support of Jelson’s site indicates that the site does not contain any landscape features which are particularly rare or special. Therefore, reference to these additional views should be deleted from the Design Guide.

Similarly, the references on page 77 of the Design Guide, to maintaining separation between Great Bowden and Market Harborough are inconsistent with and more restrictive than adopted and emerging Local Plan policies and to draft Policy ENV 1 of the GBNPR which relate to development in designated AoS. These policies do not preclude development from taking place in the AoS provided that development does not compromise the effectiveness of the AoS in protecting the identity and distinctiveness of the settlements. References to development in the defined AoS should, therefore, be removed from the Design Guide, or, refer to the relevant Local policy requirements.

Policy H2 – Housing Mix & Policy H3 – Affordable Housing

Policy H2 should be removed or, as a minimum, be amended to provide flexibility to reflect the fact that, as set out in Paragraph 150 of the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA), prepared by AECOM, aside from demographic change there are a number of other factors which ought to be considered in determining the appropriate mix of housing on any site.

It is also noted that the HNA, dates from 2022 (i.e. is almost 4 years old), relies on Census data which is out of date and does not reflect the content of the emerging Local Plan. The report also refers to anecdotal evidence that there has been a “substantial increase” in 4 bedroom dwellings in Great Bowden since 2011. However, no evidence is provided to back up this statement or to quantify the number of 4-bedroom dwellings which have actually been delivered in the village since 2011, relative to dwellings of other sizes.

We, therefore, question the extent to which the HNA can be relied upon as providing an up to date and robust assessment of the size of dwellings needed in Great Bowden. The PPG is clear that where neighbourhood plans do contain policies relevant to housing supply “these policies should take account of latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need” (our emphasis).

Policy H3 proposes to introduce a requirement that, where First Homes are to be provided, they are made available at a discount of 50%, subject to viability. The PPG (Paragraph 1) is clear that policy requirements in plans, including those relating to types of affordable housing, should be subject to a proportionate viability assessment. Paragraph 2 of the PPG goes on to confirm that the role for viability is primarily at the plan-making stage to ensure that policies are realistic. In relation to affordable housing, it states that such policies should be prepared in such a way that there is no “need for further viability testing at the decision-making stage”. Therefore, in the absence of any viability testing as part of the preparation of the GBNPR, the requirement should, therefore, be removed to have regard to national policy and ensure compliance with the basic conditions.

Furthermore, the reference to First Homes is inconsistent with the adopted and the emerging Local Plan which do not set any specific requirements in relation to First Homes. Indeed, it is noted that the requirement to deliver at least 25% of affordable homes as First Homes was removed by the Government in the revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework published in December 2024. The reference to First Homes ought to be removed from the draft policy to comply with the basic conditions.

Policy ENV3 – Important Open Spaces

The proposed wording of Policy ENV3 is unduly onerous. The policy overstates the value of the open spaces identified with no justification provided to back up the statement that the open spaces identified offer “high local value for sport, recreation or amenity”.

The GNPR is accompanied by an ‘Inventory’ to inform the assessment of sites as ‘Local Green Space’. It is not clear whether this has also informed the identification of ‘Important Open Spaces’. However, the assessment appears to be based on a largely subjective assessment against poorly defined criteria. It is also not clear whether there is a ‘threshold’ above which land would be considered ‘Important Open Space’.

The Leicester Lane verge is, for example, scored 3/5 for recreation value. The scoring criteria suggests “membership sports facilities, very well used park or other recreational space will full or comprehensive public access... semi-natural parkland ... with public footpaths and no restriction of access” would all score 3/5 for recreational value. These all have very different characteristics and contributions towards recreational value. We, therefore, question the validity of the scoring criteria and cannot see how a highway verge would fall within this bracket.

It is, impossible to see how a relatively narrow section of highway verge to the north of Leicester Lane, adjacent to existing agricultural land, would offer “high local value for sport, recreation or amenity”. The reference to the Leicester Lane Verge should in Jelson’s view be removed from Policy ENV3.

Policy ENV8 & ENV9 – Biodiversity

Policy ENV8 and ENV9 are largely unnecessary and should be deleted given that there are existing legal and policy requirements relating to protected species (e.g. bats and great crested newts) and

biodiversity net gain in new developments. The NPPF, paragraph 16, is clear that plans should avoid unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area, including policies in the Framework.

Policy ENV12 – Flood Risk Resilience

Policy ENV12 is unnecessary in the context of existing national policy and guidance relating to development and flood risk. As above, the NPPF, paragraph 16, is clear that plans should avoid unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area, including policies in the Framework. The draft wording of Policy ENV12 is also inconsistent with national policy. For example, its reference to the application of the sequential approach to land at risk of surface water flooding is inconsistent with paragraph 27 of the PPG, which was updated in September 2025, and states that: “Where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development (therefore addressing the risks identified e.g. by Environment Agency flood risk mapping), without increasing flood risk elsewhere, then the sequential test need not be applied.” (our emphasis)

Policy T1 – Parking Provision and New Dwellings This policy not justified and is inconsistent with the Design Code, prepared by AECOM, which clearly identifies tandem parking as an appropriate and efficient parking solution in some circumstances and states that where possible “parking should be set back behind the building line and located to the site of a property...”. Policy T1 should, therefore, be deleted.

Policy EMP3 – Broadband Infrastructure

The policy, as worded, is inconsistent with the requirements set out in Building Regulations, which were updated in January 2023. Building Regulations now require new homes to be installed with the fastest broadband connections available or, where this is not possible, new homes to be future proofed with the physical infrastructure to support the gigabit-capable broadband connections in the future when they become available. The policy should either be deleted or be amended to provide consistency with the requirements in Building Regulations.

Merits of Jelson’s Land

Jelson has submitted an outline planning application for the residential development of its land to the north of Leicester Lane for up to 52 dwellings (Ref. 25/01492/OUT). The application is currently pending determination by the District Council. The site is, therefore, clearly available for housing development and is capable of contributing towards the housing needs of Great Bowden in the short-term.

The outline planning application is accompanied by a comprehensive suite of robust technical reports and assessments which demonstrate that the site is in a sustainable location, with good access to a range of services and facilities in the local area, and that there are no significant constraints to residential development at the site.

The application is submitted in outline, such that matters of detail relating to the layout, scale and appearance of the proposed dwellings is reserved for approval at a subsequent stage. However, the Development Framework Plan and Design and Access Statement, prepared by FPCR, demonstrate how the site could be developed whilst respecting the character and identity of Great Bowden and integrating the new development into the countryside beyond, by creating a soft transition between the western edge of Great Bowden and the Countryside.

The Development Framework Plan (see Appendix 2) shows how the site could be developed at a net density of c. 30 dwellings per hectare to deliver up to 52 dwellings, including a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4+ bedroom properties. The developable area of the site extends to approximately 1.75 hectares and would be set within a framework of Green Infrastructure.

Approximately 0.98 hectares of green infrastructure is proposed, which equates to approximately 36% of the total site area. The proposed public open space is focussed towards the north and west of the site and will create an attractive multi-functional landscape setting to the development, including a circular walk, strategic landscaping, a play area and SuDs features. A tree-lined green corridor is also proposed along the eastern edge of the site to provide an appropriate landscape setting to the existing PRoW which provides connections to the countryside beyond.

The proposed access will pass through a short section of the existing verge along the northern side of Leicester Lane. However, the vast majority of the verge and the existing good quality trees within it will be retained. The public use of the verge, which is identified as an “Other Important Open Space” in the

'made' Neighbourhood Plan, will also be enhanced, through the extension of the existing footway at Frank Burditt Drive to the PRoW within the site and the proposed site access beyond.

The Local Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority has raised no objection to Jelson's proposals subject to conditions and S106 contributions.

For these reasons Jelson's view is that its land would be the most appropriate location for future growth in the village and should be allocated for housing in the GBNPR.

We trust that our responses to the Regulation 16 Consultation on the draft GBNPR are useful to the Parish Council and the appointed Examiner.

Jelson's view is that if the GBNPR proceeds to examination in its current form then the examination should be conducted by way of a public hearing, to allow oral submissions on the issues raised, in order "to ensure adequate examination of the issues" and to allow it "a fair chance to put a case" in accordance with paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (As Amended).

We would wish to attend any hearing undertaken in relation to the examination of the GBNPR should the Inspector consider one to be necessary.

Should you require any further information in relation to the representations made in this letter or Jelson's proposals please do not hesitate to let us know.

We would be grateful if you could please confirm receipt of this letter and thereafter keep me informed on the progress of the GBNPR and advise of the dates of any hearing sessions.

Yours faithfully Director

For and on behalf of Avison Young (UK) Limited

GBPC response to the examiner:

Since Avison Young have made this representation, HDC have granted outline planning permission for this development of 52 houses, (25/01492/OUT).

Avison Young are obviously not aware of the huge growth in housing that has taken place in Great Bowden over the last few years when they criticise GBNP Policy H1 which has no planned allocation of houses except for 8 bungalows.

Between 2011 and 2020, over 230 dwellings have been built, increasing the number of houses from 449 to 679, a 51% increase. Under Regulation 19 - Proposed Draft Local Plan Submission contains the policy that a further 100 houses will be built in GB which would represent a 73.5% increase in the size of the village! This level of growth is having and will have an adverse impact on the character of the village, and result in inadequate infrastructure, including parking facilities, roads, and the local school and now a further 52 houses have to be accommodated with this ad hoc development. GBPC accepts that Great Bowden has to take an allocation of the district's housing need. This has been done by HDC in an equitable manner in that the other Medium Villages are also expected to take an extra 100 houses.

GBPC refutes Alison Young's statement that 'Great Bowden clearly has the capacity for additional housing development' and 'there is no evidence at all to suggest that the village is not capable of accommodating the level of growth generated by the proposals' and the ludicrous statement that 'the settlement like others of this scale, needs additional growth to support local services and facilities and to enable them to remain vital and viable'.

The required housing development in Great Bowden is met, and indeed exceeded, by a combination of the allocations in the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. Avison Young have used a dismissive tone relating to GB reviewed NP policy H1 for the building of 8 bungalows: 'It proposes to allocate two sites to the east of Great Bowden adjacent to Dingley Road (Ref. GB1 & GB2) which are identified as having a combined capacity of 100 dwellings. In that context, the GBNP proposes to allocate a single site at Buckminster Close (Ref. GB01) for the delivery of 8 bungalows.'

The proposal for 8 bungalows meets a need and that is that there are a lot of older people who are living in 4 bedroom houses, who would love to downsize and stay in Great Bowden but there is no suitable housing, in Great Bowden for them to downsize to! These 8 affordable bungalows are required to meet that need, thereby freeing up larger houses for young families. Priority for purchasing these bungalows is to be given to existing residents of Great Bowden. It should be noted that the location of this site is within 300 yards of the facilities in the centre of the village.

As site GB01 is within the settlement boundary, it could have come forward as a windfall site under Policy H3 without the various controls and conditions that were discussed with the landowner and the GBPC which resulted in Policy H1 Accordingly, it is definitely not a windfall site.

Buckminster Close, which appears to be in a separate private ownership, and whether heritage constraints can be resolved or mitigated, noting that the site is immediately to the north of a number of listed buildings and is within Great Bowden Conservation Area.

It seems that Avison Young have misidentified the paddock referred to in Policy H1, site GBO1. It is not the paddock separating Nether Green from the Church and Old Rectory situated to the *north* of Nether Green forming the immediate setting of the Grade I Church and Grade II* Old Rectory

The site in question, is the paddock south of Lime Tree Place, enclosed on three sides by modern residential development (Lime Tree Place, Quorn House and Oakley House), and has no intervisibility with the highly graded asset. GBPC respectfully suggest that this objection should, therefore, be ignored.

GBPC is not aware of access problems to Buckminster close as access arrangements will be granted through legal rights and the access road is confirmed as acceptable for the development by Leicester Highways Authority. Sewerage and drainage provisions will be adequately addressed through third-party agreements and on-site solutions. Maintenance contributions are governed by established legal precedent and equitable cost-sharing arrangements.

This development in Leicester Lane will be in open countryside outside the settlement boundary and development here conflicts with the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy set out in the adopted Harborough Local Plan 2011–2031 (adopted 30 April 2019). The development of this speculative site in this location undermines the plan-led approach to growth and the Council's chosen distribution of housing. Specifically, it conflicts with Policy GD3 in the local plan, where building in open countryside is strictly controlled and also Policy H2: Limits To Development in Great Bowden's Neighbourhood Plan (GBNP).

The Council's published 5 Year Housing Land Supply Statement (31/10/2025) records a 5YHLS of 3.1 years. However, the Council's Housing Delivery Test result of 210% (HDT 2020–2023) is a strong indicator of robust delivery relative to past requirements and is acknowledged in the Council's statement. Not being able to demonstrate a 5YHLS should not automatically justify developments in unsustainable locations outside the plan strategy.

Avison Young are concerned that the expansion of the AoS under Policy ENV1 of the GBNPR would be used as a tool for restricting or constraining development in the most sustainable locations around the settlement. GBPC refers the examiner to, '**Response to Examiner's question re Policy Env1: further elaboration**'

Avison Young imply by the use of the phrase 'the most sustainable locations around the settlement' that these are on the perimeter of the separation land between Great Bowden and Market Harborough. It

also depends very much on how one defines, 'sustainable location'. The centre of this development in Leicester Lane is one mile from the facilities in the centre of Great Bowden. Most people would not be willing to walk this distance which would take about 20 minutes. Certainly, older people would not walk this distance. A 10-minute walk is widely used as a benchmark for access to local shops and services in planning guidance and local plans (see Manual for Streets; DfT 'Gear Change'; NPPG and local authority policies). As a result, the residents of this development would drive into the centre of the village. This would result in about 30 extra cars per day looking for a place to park round the central greens adding further to the unsustainable congestion that we already suffer.

Avison Young comment that It is, impossible to see how a relatively narrow section of highway verge to the north of Leicester Lane, adjacent to existing agricultural land, would offer "high local value for sport, recreation or amenity". The reference to the Leicester Lane Verge should in Jelson's view be removed from Polcy ENV 3

The Policy of classifying the Leicter Lane verg as an important open space is in our current neighbourhood plan which obviously passed examination. Accordingly, GBPC refutes the above comments. This new housing estate will give rise to an unbalanced on the western periphery of the village contrary to the existing character of the village. In addition, the potential formation of a new access into the site from the Leicester Lane would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Leicester Lane verge, an identified Important Open Space. The open space and hedgerow has been identified as a Local Wildlife Site (LWS91427) a site of great importance that provides essential habitat for rare species and acts as a corridor that allows wildlife to move freely between these corridors. A bat survey carried out has also shown that 50% of the proposed site is an important foraging and roosting site for bats.

Policy T1 – Parking Provision and New Dwellings. The reason that tandem parking is not supported is that inevitably, when there is more than one car parked at a house, whoever will be leaving the house first will park on the road. This can then cause obstructions to emergency vehicles.

Policy EMP3 – Broadband Infrastructure

The policy, as worded, is inconsistent with the requirements set out in Building Regulations, which were updated in January 2023. Building Regulations now require new homes to be installed with the fastest broadband connections available or, where this is not possible, new homes to be future proofed with the physical infrastructure to support the gigabit-capable broadband connections in the future when they become available. The policy should either be deleted or be amended to provide consistency with the requirements in Building Regulations.

We are content for the Examiner to recommend amending the wording if he sees fit to do so.

Various comments from residents about Policy H1.

Representation No 5 Resident Nether Green Great Bowden p.wood7@btinternet.com

Lack of access capacity via private drive

Legal and easement deficiencies preventing lawful use of services and roads

Design failures requiring third party land

Unresolved maintenance and liability obligations across multiple owners

Fundamental deliverability barriers

Site erroneously scored as suitable

Currently agricultural access

Access capacity at maximum (private drive currently serving maximum of six dwellings)(unaccepted)

No residual capacity to intensify traffic to serve new development

Highway design requires third party land and full reconstruction

Private Road and Drive not designed or constructed to acceptable standards for any wider development beyond the consented homes

Private road stops approx. 30m short of the agricultural gate converting to a private drive that does not meet LCC adoptable standards. Would only be feasible with third party land as would be widening. Not passable without third party land. Constrained by narrow entrance and constrained by public footpath. LCC planning consultation response 2011/118903 ' The proposed roads do not confirm to an acceptable standard for adoption and therefore they will not be considered and future maintenance by the Highways Authority ref doc 44.

GB01 does not appear to have made any express rights to use the private road /drive or to connect to private sewers and services therein. Those sewers were only designed to take the current designated capacity at maximum.

Any historic /agricultural access cannot lawfully be relied upon to justify and intensified residential use. This is a fundamental delivery barrier independent of planning merit.

LCC have previously advised the proposed roads would not be adopted.

Perpetual private maintenance obligations are secured through transfer documents for properties served by the private road. Any intensification would require unanimous agreement on liabilities and contributions across multiple owners which would need resolving before planning consideration.

GB01 is not deliverable or viable given access and capacity limits, highway non compliance, third party land dependencies, easement gaps and maintenance consent complexities.

GB01 should be removed from consideration as an allocation in the neighbourhood plan.

These objections have been presented to Gt Bowden Parish Council who have not responded, yet have persisted with GB01 for reasons that are unclear to me. Transparency is absent

GBPC response to the examiner:

The access road referred to, from Nether Green to the entrance to the site, is in third party ownership with rights granted for access to the residents of Lime Tree Place, Stokes Yard.

The landowner is in detailed discussions with the third party owner of the access road to broaden historic access rights to Buckminster Close to facilitate the development (as have been granted to the developer of the adjoining paddock). The agreement with the road owner will encompass comprehensive sewerage and drainage rights, including provisions for any necessary upgrades resulting from the development.

Additionally, there has been designed a potential on-site solution to manage the incremental sewerage and water demand generated by the eight new units, providing flexibility and minimizing impact on existing infrastructure.

There is no legal requirement for a private road to be adopted, nor for it to meet adoption standards for this development to proceed.

Leicester Highways Authority have confirmed that as the access road is not adopted/under private ownership, they have no objection to the proposed additional 8 units being served via the existing road and gated access to the development site.

07 Resident Great Bowden Mkt Harborough

GB01

Lack of access capacity via private drive – access capacity at maximum (currently Servicing 6 dwellings) (unadopted) with no capacity to extend to accommodate additional traffic.

Does not appear to have any express rights to use the private drive /road or to connect to private sewers and services therein.

GB01 is not deliverable or viable given access capacity

(Some comments were obscured. A request for the comments to be resubmitted made on 16/4/2026.

Resubmission will be forwarded when received)

GBPC response to the examiner:

The access road referred to, from Nether Green to the entrance to the site, is in third party ownership with rights granted for access to the residents of Lime Tree Place, Stokes Yard.

The landowner is in detailed discussions with the third party owner of the access road to broaden historic access rights to Buckminster Close to facilitate the development (as have been granted to the developer of the adjoining paddock). The agreement with the road owner will encompass comprehensive sewerage and drainage rights, including provisions for any necessary upgrades resulting from the development. Additionally, there has been designed a potential on-site solution to manage the incremental sewerage and water demand generated by the eight new units, providing flexibility and minimizing impact on existing infrastructure.

There is no legal requirement for a private road to be adopted, nor for it to meet adoption standards for this development to proceed.

Leicester Highways Authority have confirmed that as the access road is not adopted/under private ownership, they have no objection to the proposed additional 8 units being served via the existing road and gated access to the development site.

10 Resident Great Bowden

GB01

The suggested access is already at capacity with a maximum of 6 dwellings. In addition the road is currently a private drive

The suggested access road is not wide enough for 2 cars to pass and the road cannot be made wider
GB01 do not have express permissions to use the private drive

GB01Refers to the site as Buckminster Close. This site not a registered postal address and does not exist.

GB01 do not have permission to connect to the private sewer services

The sewers are already at capacity and only designed to facilitate the existing dwellings

GB01 is not deliverable due to access and capacity limits . GB01 should be removed from any neighbourhood plan.

GBPC response to the examiner:

The access road referred to, from Nether Green to the entrance to the site, is in third party ownership with rights granted for access to the residents of Lime Tree Place, Stokes Yard.

The landowner is in detailed discussions with the third party owner of the access road to broaden historic access rights to Buckminster Close to facilitate the development (as have been granted to the developer of the adjoining paddock). The agreement with the road owner will encompass comprehensive sewerage and drainage rights, including provisions for any necessary upgrades resulting from the development. Additionally, there has been designed a potential on-site solution to manage the incremental sewerage and water demand generated by the eight new units, providing flexibility and minimizing impact on existing infrastructure.

There is no legal requirement for a private road to be adopted, nor for it to meet adoption standards for this development to proceed.

Leicester Highways Authority have confirmed that as the access road is not adopted/under private ownership, they have no objection to the proposed additional 8 units being served via the existing road and gated access to the development site.

14 Resident Great Bowden

GB01

The identified access relies on a private road serving Lime Tree Place and Stokes Yard, transitioning to a private drive that already serves the maximum six dwellings permitted off it. It is not adopted by the Local Authority. The Road serving Lime Tree Place and Stokes Yard is Private and not Adopted by the Local Highway Authority and remains in separate ownership. The extent of Public Highway stops near Nether House. There is no residual capacity to intensify traffic to serve an additional eight dwellings (or more).

The private road and private drive were not designed or constructed to adoptable standards for any wider development beyond the consented homes being 12 properties in Lime Tree Close, 5 properties off Stokes Yard, Huntsman Cottage (formerly Pond Cottage) and 1 other plot which is now being developed.

The private road stops ~30m short of the agricultural gate before changing to the private drive. The private drive sub-base/specification does not meet LCC adoptable standards and would require full excavation, widening, and rebuild—not possible without third-party land. Widening of the Private Drive would also be required to meet current Highways standards which are in third party control. The existing gate is too narrow to achieve minimum width, further constrained by the public footpath along the western boundary.

Furthermore, LCC state in their Planning Consultation response to 2011/1189/03 ' The proposed roads do not conform to an acceptable standard for adoption and therefore they will NOT be considered for adoption and future maintenance by the Highway Authority'. Accordingly, perpetual private maintenance obligations are secured through transfer documents for properties served by the private road. Any intensification would require unanimous agreement on liabilities and contributions across multiple owners—a lengthy and uncertain legal process that must be resolved before any planning consideration.

To the best of my knowledge, GBO1 has no express rights to use the private road/private drive or to connect to the private sewers and services laid within it. Those sewers were only ever designed to take the current designed capacity, which is now at its maximum and therefore an alternative drainage solution will have to be found for this proposal. Any historic/agricultural access cannot lawfully be relied upon to justify an intensified residential use. This is a fundamental deliverability barrier independent of planning merit.

Given the access and capacity limits, highway non-compliance, third-party land dependencies, easement gaps, and maintenance/consent complexities, GBO1 is not deliverable or viable. These issues materially affect the site's suitability scoring and should place GBO1 in the 'Not Suitable' category. In contrast, other assessed sites (e.g., GB09, GB02) appear more feasible on objective grounds. Early engagement with LCC Highways would likely confirm that safe design standards for what would effectively be ~26+ dwellings in total cannot be achieved within the existing confines.

The proposal should be removed from consideration as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan and re-scored to reflect its non-deliverability.

GBPC response to the examiner:

The access road referred to, from Nether Green to the entrance to the site, is in third party ownership with rights granted for access to the residents of Lime Tree Place, Stokes Yard.

The landowner is in detailed discussions with the third party owner of the access road to broaden historic access rights to Buckminster Close to facilitate the development (as have been granted to the developer of the adjoining paddock). The agreement with the road owner will encompass comprehensive sewerage and drainage rights, including provisions for any necessary upgrades resulting from the development.

Additionally, there has been designed a potential on-site solution to manage the incremental sewerage and

water demand generated by the eight new units, providing flexibility and minimizing impact on existing infrastructure.

There is no legal requirement for a private road to be adopted, nor for it to meet adoption standards for this development to proceed.

Leicester Highways Authority have confirmed that as the access road is not adopted/under private ownership, they have no objection to the proposed additional 8 units being served via the existing road and gated access to the development site.