



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

*A Borough to be proud of*

### **Summary of Regulation 16 Consultation Responses**

This table provides a concise summary of all the representations received by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council in respect of the 6 week consultation on the final draft Neighbourhood Plan undertaken between Monday, 24 November 2014 and 5pm on Friday, 9 January 2015. Full versions of the comments can be obtained by contacting the Planning Policy Team at the Council via email at [planningpolicy@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk), telephone at 01455255898, or by visiting the Council Offices (open between 9am and 5pm Monday to Thursday and 9am to 4:30pm Friday).

<b>Rep. Number</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>
1	Joan Tomlinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supports the Plan but concerned about traffic and parking issues in relation to new housing development.</li><li>• More parking spaces should be provided in the town centre by use of the Parish Field which is largely unused.</li><li>• Town centre parking should be implemented and parking stopped in the Market Place.</li></ul>
2	Andrew Churchill(MD, JJ Churchill Ltd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supports the Plan.</li></ul>
3	Ben Handford (MD, Flying Spares)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supports the Plan.</li><li>• The NDP team have listened to local stakeholders and acted on their wishes.</li><li>• The proposed development site makes sense in every way and will have the minimum negative impact on the town while allowing existing businesses to expand and residents can continue to live in the town.</li></ul>
4	Philip Tebbutt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supports the Plan.</li></ul>
5	M T Moncur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supports the Plan.</li></ul>
6	Richard Moon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supports the Plan.</li><li>• Policy CE2 is a key policy, underpinning the essential character of the village.</li><li>• Policy CE3 is another key policy. The proposals map should show <u>important</u> views <u>from</u> Sutton Lane to east.</li><li>• Not sure if 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence of paragraph 15, page 33 is correct. Views of Battlefield Visitor Centre are to the <u>west</u> (south west) not the <u>east</u>. Not sure what “this vista” is referring to.</li><li>• Policy CE4: The proposals could include a survey</li></ul>

Rep. Number	Respondent	Summary of Comments
		<p>of important trees with a view to making TPOs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy CE5 is not strong or specific enough and could encourage ok extensions &amp; adaptations but not new development in countryside where appropriate due to lack of adverse impact. Needs to refer to countryside</li> <li>• Paragraph 7.1C: Wider &amp; safer pedestrian access to village centre from the west is a vital plan aspiration.</li> <li>• Plan could support use of underdeveloped or vacant land within settlement.</li> <li>• North of Station Road development would harm character and approach to village from west.</li> </ul>
7	Steven Wong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan</li> </ul>
8	Bryan Cole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Plan with modifications</li> <li>• Opposition to North side of Station Road due to proximity to factory.</li> <li>• No objection to land around factory on South side.</li> <li>• Development lopsided, should consider development on North side, vista not important.</li> </ul>
9	Market Bosworth Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan</li> </ul>
10	Geoff Platts Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan</li> <li>• Proposed residential site allocations are in the lowest areas of flood risk and as such are totally acceptable. No issues.</li> </ul>
11	Carole Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> <li>• Interesting plan which aims to protect the most important historic elements of the town.</li> <li>• South of Station Road site offers the best opportunities and is the least intrusive into the countryside.</li> <li>• It should be allocated in preference to North of Station Road which would offer no opportunities and obscure an important view.</li> </ul>
12	Peter Smith Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the plan.</li> <li>• Need to expand is recognised and site maintains views of countryside.</li> <li>• Improve the industrial area.</li> <li>• Potential for extension to meet future requirements.</li> </ul>
13	Mr and Mrs Lancaster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> <li>• Support the site South of Station Road as it would maintain the approach into the town along the B585.</li> <li>• Considers that development of North of Station Road would enclose all open space and highway works would result in crossing difficulties for pedestrians.</li> </ul>

Rep. Number	Respondent	Summary of Comments
14	Mr S Henshaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> <li>• South side development favourable as maintains green space on North side.</li> </ul>
15	Market Bosworth Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Plan with modifications.</li> <li>• Page 37: The correct spelling for the pool in the Country Park is 'beau' not bow and this should be reflected in the document.</li> <li>• Page 18: They suggest the correct creditation should be 'Market Bosworth Conservation Area Review 2014,' as this was a review rather than a new document.</li> </ul>
16	Peter Loseby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan</li> <li>• Full support for NDP as is the general wish of the community and should be fully regarded for site allocation.</li> </ul>
17	Sheila Loseby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan</li> <li>• Satisfied that the plan is correct reflection of her aspirations for Market Bosworth.</li> </ul>
18	John Brightmore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Plan with modifications</li> <li>• Recognises need for development, disagree with site A.</li> <li>• Believes Market Bosworth should remain a rural community.</li> </ul>
19	Susan Owen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> </ul>
20	Cllr T Chastney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> </ul>
21	R H Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Plan with modifications.</li> <li>• States that no development to be permitted in areas identified as Local Green Space.</li> <li>• Fully agrees with CE1, 2,3,4 &amp;5.</li> <li>• Supports South of Station Road and Opposes North, due to impact on landscape.</li> <li>• The playing fields and other open spaces associated with the schools should be preserved and protected for the use of the community in perpetuity.</li> </ul>
22	Robert Powell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Plan with modifications.</li> <li>• Concern for loss of buffer on land South of Heath Rd which has established woodland and wildlife.</li> <li>• Concerned that pedestrian access would encroach close to property.</li> <li>• Concerned that ditch behind property will be lost and affect drainage.</li> </ul>
23	D G Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the Old sewage works site has been omitted from plans - this area should be included, as this area alone would meet minimum housing needs and would provide extra local jobs and a new Battlefield Railway visitor centre.</li> </ul>
24	Craig Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 16: Photographs show buildings within Character Area D and not B, as stated.</li> <li>• Vista from top of hill in field west of the industrial estate is one of the best in Market Bosworth and</li> </ul>

Rep. Number	Respondent	Summary of Comments
		<p>has been supported in public consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However the informal access to and vistas from this land have been ignored, and the map on page 23 is incomplete and a misrepresentation of the vistas within Market Bosworth.</li> <li>• This brings into question the choice of South of Station Road as being the only site within the town suitable for development.</li> <li>• The <i>quality</i> of the vista from the hill south of station road to is only surpassed by vista number 12.</li> </ul>
25	Judy Buckell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> <li>• Rents an allotment on Shenton Lane, questions whether it is appropriate to highlight the area of allotments currently shown as agricultural land.</li> <li>• This is important as there is a shortage of allotments in the town as identified in the Community Engagement Drop-in Even of 25/6/13.</li> </ul>
26	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments to make further to those submitted in the pre-submission consultation.</li> </ul>
27	Coal Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments to make.</li> </ul>
28	Ellen Weir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Plan.</li> <li>• Two story buildings will be imposing in garden.</li> <li>• Impacts of traffic and pedestrian access.</li> <li>• New homes will ruin character of Market Bosworth.</li> </ul>
29	Canal and River Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased to note the value of the Ashby Canal is recognised in the Plan as part of Character Area A.</li> <li>• The canal is designated as a Conservation Area and they suggest this is worth highlighting in Sections 4.3b and c.</li> <li>• Policies appear to give scope to ensure character and appearance of canal corridor will be protected without preventing water related development.</li> <li>• Proposed development South of Station Road could incorporate provision of links westward to canal corridor, helping to improve linkages between canal and town.</li> <li>• Happy to discuss aspirational project listed at 7.1c which suggests the construction of a footpath linking Bosworth Water Park to the town. Such a link would be via canal and might incorporate new accesses to towpath or require new canal bridge/works to an existing bridge.</li> </ul>
30	Persimmon Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Plan.</li> <li>• States that the Plan does not meet the legal requirements of the Basic Conditions and should not proceed to examination.</li> <li>• The Plan cannot proceed in the absence of strategic policies, which is again a legal requirement.</li> <li>• Therefore the plan should be suspended.</li> </ul>

Rep. Number	Respondent	Summary of Comments
31	Carlton Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Plan with modifications.</li> <li>• In relation to Policy BD3, they recommend that addition of the following wording: 17. Make provision for the creation of off-road pedestrian and cycle links from the west of the site to the Ashby Canal Towpath, and from the east of the site to the town centre at some future date.”</li> <li>• Supports Policies CE1-5 and BD1-3</li> <li>• Supports the commitment to consider the aspirational projects in future Plan reviews.</li> </ul>
32	Max Whitehead Bloor Homes Ltd Midlands Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Plan with modifications.</li> <li>• Support to develop in line with policy BD2.</li> <li>• Suggests rewording of policy CE4.</li> <li>• Distribution of affordable housing should be site specific.</li> <li>• BD2- Site boundaries difficult to designate at this stage.</li> <li>• BD3- Impossible to segregate employment and residential traffic. Phrase ‘Retain open landscape...’ unclear.</li> </ul>
33	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A table is provided which details conformity between Neighbourhood Plan and NPPF.</li> <li>• A table and additional information is also provided which details conformity between Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan, including the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document. One of the main issue highlighted is the potential lack of conformity between Neighbourhood Plan policy BD2 and the Core Strategy and emerging Site Allocations DPD in terms of housing provision.</li> <li>• A response to both the Consultation Statement and the Sustainability Appraisal is provided, which makes some suggested factual corrections to the documents.</li> <li>• Comments are made reflecting on the modifications made to the NDP since the pre submission version.</li> <li>• Request made to the Examiner to include houses on the road The Park in referendum.</li> </ul>
34	Martin Roe Dixie Grammar School Bursar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Plan with modifications</li> <li>• CE2- Local green space (Silk hill area), wish area to be developed for recreation, any development having minimal impact.</li> </ul>
35	Hilary Buckley, Secretary, CPRE Hinckley and Bosworth Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> <li>• Policies CE1-5 and BD1-3 balance need to protect character, environment and landscape setting of Market Bosworth with need for sustainable development.</li> </ul>
36	Michael Hampton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Plan.</li> <li>• Concerns about site being too large, buffer being insufficient and properties on heath road being affected by imposing buildings.</li> </ul>

<b>Rep. Number</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>
37	C and G Vero	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the Plan.</li> <li>• Suggests that proposed development does not comply with various local and national policies, which are referenced in letter.</li> </ul>
38	Leslie James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the Plan.</li> <li>• Suggests that proposed development does not comply with various local and national policies, which are referenced in letter.</li> </ul>
39	Patricia Cooling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> </ul>
40	Jonathan Hall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the Plan.</li> <li>• Loss of greenfield site with agricultural, ecological and leisure value.</li> <li>• Impacts on; traffic on Station road and associated hazards, crime and agriculture with loss of field.</li> </ul>
41	G and M Fidoe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> <li>• Agree with aims of the plan and consider leisure and tourism are important elements of the plan.</li> </ul>
42	Ivan Ould, County Councillor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Plan.</li> </ul>

July 2015