

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 December 2018 19:06
To: clive stretton
Cc: Rachel Dexter; np@sheepparish.com; Planning Policy; sheepparish@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan Opening Enquiries

Dear Mr Stretton

Working through your responses three immediate matters arise on which I need feedback from yourselves and the local authority (copied in).

1. On the matter of the Settlement Boundaries you comment that the current Settlement Boundaries are defined by the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD - a non-strategic development plan document. This may indeed be the case (although the Basic Conditions test refers to strategic policies not documents) but the practical effect of the redefining of boundaries - for Sheepy Magna at least - is to move land from the benefit of countryside policies to the benefit of settlement policies and such a change needs, proportionately, to be justified. The evidence document that you quote, whilst helpful as far as it goes, stops short of setting down the outcome of the application of the listed criteria from the "starting point" of the DPD document. I note that the boundary changes appear to be concentrated at the north end of Sheepy Magna; in Sibson the change appears to amount to the inclusion of a previously excluded section of road. The application of local knowledge is where neighbourhood planning can excel, but I am looking to understand the bases on which the boundary line has been realigned.

2. On the matter of the Local Green Space designation of the Mill Lake at Sheepy Parva, I can see that an extensive assessment sits behind each of the designations. However, this appears to start from a pre-defined boundary for each area/space. There is therefore no explanation in the Mill Lake case as to why the boundary has been drawn tightly around the water area rather than include all/some of the (green) setting for the lake; it would be helpful to me to know this.

3. In response to my query re the site of the Hornsey Rise Memorial home both you and the local authority have made cases for retaining this site allocation even though events have overtaken its original purpose. The question that arises from this is: does this allocation + the current housing commitments meet "the identified housing requirement" for the Plan period. The Plan does not quantify the housing requirement for the Parish but instead relies on the figure for Sheepy Magna passed down from the Core Strategy. As I noted previously, the Core Strategy runs to 2026 whereas the Neighbourhood Plan runs to 2036. The Planning Practice Guidance says: "Neighbourhood plans are not obliged to contain policies addressing all types of development. However, where they do contain policies relevant to housing supply, these policies should take account of latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need. In particular, where a qualifying body is attempting to identify and meet housing need, a local planning authority should share relevant evidence on housing need gathered to support its own plan-making". And further, "A neighbourhood plan can allocate additional sites to those in a Local Plan where this is supported by evidence to demonstrate need above that identified

in the Local Plan" ([Paragraph: 044 Reference ID: 41-044-20160519](#)). Further, your response quotes para 14b of the 2018 NPPF to satisfy which the "policies and allocations" in the plan should meet the identified housing requirement in full - a policy on a windfall allowance alone would not be sufficient (PPG Paragraph: 097 Reference ID: 41-097-20180913).

With the granting of an outline planning consent I can reasonably assume that the development addresses a local need, and I can see that the Core Strategy housing requirement to 2026 has been exceeded significantly, but there is no confirmation that the housing requirement *to 2036* has been identified/obtained from the local authority and addressed.

There may be other matters arising from my visit to the Parish but answers to 1 & 2 above in particular would help me get the most from my visit.

Kind regards

Andrew Matheson

Independent Examiner

----- Original Message -----

From: "clive stretton" <clivestretton@hotmail.co.uk>

To: "

Cc: "Rachel.Dexter@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk"
<Rachel.Dexter@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>;
"planningpolicy@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk"
<planningpolicy@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>;
"sheepyparish@gmail.com"
<sheepyparish@gmail.com>;
"np@sheepyparish.com" <np@sheepyparish.com>

Sent: Thursday, 6 Dec, 2018 At 17:17

Subject: Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan Opening Enquiries

Dear Mr Matheson,

Thank you for your early feedback last week and your opening enquiries.

The Sheepy Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have carefully considered the points you have raised along with the advice and guidance of our Planning Consultant, who has supported us through the whole project over the past 3 years.

We have put great emphasis on gathering evidence and reflecting the opinions of our parish all of which we believe are captured on our supporting website. Please find attached our detailed comments and thoughts around the questions you have asked us to consider.

Please note that we have commented on every heading apart from the last one viz 'Employment'. We are currently finalising our thoughts in conjunction with our Planning Consultant before commenting as requested and we hope to complete this section shortly. Please accept our apologies.

Should you require additional clarification please don't hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Clive Stretton.

Sheepy Parish Councillor &
Secretary to Sheepy Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

