

Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

Summary of representations submitted by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to the independent examiner following the Regulation 16 Draft Plan consultation, held between 5 September 2018 and 5pm on 17 October 2018.

Rep Number	Name	Full representation
1	Highways England	<p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Submission version of the Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period 2015-2036. It is noted that the document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is the role of Highways England to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan, our principal interest is in safeguarding the A5, M42 and M69 which route 1 mile to the south, 3 miles to the west and 5 miles to the south-east of the Plan area respectively.</p> <p>We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for the parish of Sheepy is required to be in conformity with the adopted Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) and the emerging Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan (2016-2026) which is currently in its early stages of review and this is acknowledged within the document.</p> <p>We note that within the adopted Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy the village of Sheepy Magna is classified as a 'Rural Village' where at least 20 new homes will come forward, including 15 dwellings at Trout Ponds Farm with further infill development to meet local needs. Considering the limited level of growth proposed across the Neighbourhood Plan area we do not expect that there will be any impacts on the operation of the SRN. We have no further comments to provide and trust that the above is useful in the progression of the Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

2	Parish Clerk, Carlton Parish Council	<p>Organisation (if applicable): Carlton Parish Council</p> <p>Position (if applicable): Parish Clerk</p> <p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan.</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on::S 2: Public rights of way network,S3: Locally important views.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy S2: Public rights of way network?: Support.</p> <p>Please provide your reason for this view: Country walking is healthy and helps people to understand the countryside. Improvements to the local RoW network encourage tourism and attract visitors to the area.</p> <p>Carlton PC suggests that it might be helpful to show RoW reference numbers on the proposals maps.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy S3:Locally important views?: Support.</p> <p>Please provide your reason for this view:: It is important to protect significant views and vistas not only for their own sake and are important to local residents, but because they attract visitors to the area and underpin the tourism economy. Carlton PC suggests that the very extensive views from Hoo Hills (SK 3755 0345) merit inclusion in the plan, particularly as this site can be reached by public footpaths.</p> <p>Please select which section you would like to comment on:</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make, adopt or refuse the plan)?: Yes</p>
---	--	---

		Additional comments on the plans: Carlton Parish Council strongly supports this plan.
3	Severn Trent	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation. We currently have no specific comments to make, but please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice.</p> <p>For your information we have set out some general guidelines that may be useful to you.</p> <p>Position Statement As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills.</p> <p>Sewage Strategy Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works.</p> <p>Surface Water and Sewer Flooding We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer.</p> <p>We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even</p>

		<p>outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers.</p> <p>To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. More details can be found on our website. https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</p> <p>Water Quality</p> <p>Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of good quality drinking water. We work closely with the Environment Agency and local farmers to ensure that water quality of supplies are not impacted by our or others operations. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit as prepared by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Water Supply</p> <p>When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts.</p> <p>We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands.</p> <p>Water Efficiency</p> <p>Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day. We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations.</p> <p>We recommend that in all cases you consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute. • Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres or less. • Water butts for external use in properties with gardens. <p>To further encourage developers to act sustainably Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. More details can be found on our website. https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</p> <p>We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day.</p> <p>We hope this information has been useful to you and we look forward in hearing from you in the near future.</p>
4	Environment Agency	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the Submission version of the above Plan.</p> <p>I have reviewed the plan and the associated documentation. I am in support of the Plan as written and have no additional comments to make.</p>
5	National Grid	<p>National Grid has appointed Wood to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p>About National Grid National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customer. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.</p>

		<p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.</p> <p>Assets in your area National Grid has identified the following high-pressure gas transmission pipeline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FM04 - Blaby to Alrewas • FM14 - Alrewas to Churchover <p>From the consultation information provided, the above gas transmission pipeline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.</p> <p><i>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure</i> Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@cadentgas.com</p> <p><u>Electricity distribution</u> Information regarding the distribution network can be found at: www.energynetworks.org.uk</p> <p><u>Key resources / contacts</u> National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</p>
6	Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 4 September 2018.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p>

		<p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on Regulation 16 of final submission of this neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>For clarification of any points in this letter, please contact XXXX on XXXX. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p>
7	Leicestershire County Council	<p>Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan Comments. Request – 5 September</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council is supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process and welcome being included in this consultation.</p> <p><u>Highways</u> Specific Comments</p> <p>P11 Policy S2: Public Rights Of Way Network (SaS) Development should protect and enhance the existing Public Rights of Way within Sheepy Parish (as shown on the Policies Map) and wherever possible create new links to the network including footpaths and cycle ways.</p> <p>P37 Policy S13: Hornsey Rise Memorial Home The construction of a footpath/cycle path from the site to the south side of Bosworth Road to the point where there is a footpath on the north side of Bosworth Road. The parish must be fully aware of the costs associated with provision of new footpaths/ cycle ways as this would need to be fully funded by a third party and not Leicestershire County Council.</p> <p>P41 Traffic and Parking (T&S) 6.8 On street parking - A detailed understanding of parking problems is required to initiate discussions regarding these concerns.</p> <p>Policy S15: Car Parking and New Housing Development (HDM) - At least two off street car parking spaces shall be provided for each new dwelling. At least three such spaces should be provided for four bedroom or larger dwellings.</p>

		<p>General Comments</p> <p>The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth.</p> <p>Like very many local authorities, the County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding.</p> <p>To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems.</p> <p>Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provide as a commuted sum.</p> <p>With regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p> <p>The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to</p>
--	--	--

		<p>address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.</p> <p>Flood Risk Management Specific Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable Development - The LLFA approves of sustainable development. The LLFA would like to take the opportunity to welcome the inclusion of environmental considerations in relation to sustainable development on 1.25. • SuDS - Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) should be prioritised as a surface water management technique on all major developments, under planning legislation the application is considered to be a major development. As such the LLFA welcomes the inclusion of SuDS in sections 2.36, 2.37 and 2.38 in the draft document. The LLFA welcomes reference to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 at 2.38, and encourages SuDS usage within major development where appropriate. With regard to new developments and surface water drainage, the LLFA refers to the Building Regulations – Approved Document H (Drainage and Waste Disposal) (2015), requiring the destination for surface water runoff to accord with highest attainable destination. The LLFA welcomes the inclusion of the National Planning Policy Framework on 2.35 (Page 20) and encourages the direction of developments away from areas of increased flood risk. The LLFA requires development to not increase flood risk off site. • Policy S6 - The LLFA welcome the inclusion of the requirement that development takes full account of flood risk from all sources, utilising Sustainable Drainage Systems manage surface water on site and to minimise flood risk off site. In accordance with National Planning Policy Framework point 165, the LLFA would like to restate that “major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate”. • Flooding - The LLFA would like to take this opportunity to welcome the inclusion of “minimising flood risk” into key issues on 1.27, along with welcoming the inclusion of “New developments will take full account of flood risk” onto page 9 – Sheepy Parish in 2036. The LLFA are aware of fluvial flood risk from the River Saint and the River Sence within the Sheepy CP boundary. The LLFA holds the following incident reports occurring in Sheepy CP on its records: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LLFA Holds one record of highway and property flooding on Main Street, Sheepy Magna
--	--	--

		<p>(2012) attributed to silted watercourses and blocked culverts.</p> <p>2. The LLFA holds one record of Highway flooding on Twycross Road, Sibson (2012) attributed to a blocked nearby ditch.</p> <p>The LLFA's flooding records are maintained and updated based on flooding incidents reported to the authority by a range of stakeholders. The above may not be an exhaustive list of flooding incidents in the area. Local and parish councils may hold further information in relation to the flooding history of the area. Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals.</p> <p>Risk of flooding from surface water map: https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p> <p>Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</p> <p>Housing and Policy S10 - With regard to housing and developments, the LLFA would like to reiterate that it requires, where appropriate, for major developments to pay due consideration to flood risk from all sources. Policy S10: Housing Development - The LLFA refers to current guidance and standards for development which requires surface water runoff from previously developed sites to be as close as reasonably practicable to Greenfield rates (non-statutory technical standards). Understanding of surface water flood risk and management has developed over a number of years as such the current guidance looks to reduce the discharge from brownfield development sites back to the equivalent un-developed rate. Whilst this is not done to specifically fix any flooding issues, it is intended to reduce existing risk through better management of surface water from these developments. This progressive approach as each brownfield site is re-developed has the potential to reduce the overall flood risk.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The County Council are fully aware of flooding that has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding, review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a statutory consultee on major planning applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure that the onsite drainage systems are designed in accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage</p>
--	--	---

		<p>solution.</p> <p>The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation. • Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development. • Require development to resolve existing flood risk. <p>When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)). • Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map). • Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding. • How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff. • Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk. <p>All development will be required to restrict the discharge and retain surface water on site in line with current government policies. This should be undertaken through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites when considering the housing density to ensure that the potential site will not limit the ability for good SuDS design to be carried out. Consideration should also be given to blue green corridors and how they could be used to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, including benefits to surrounding areas.</p> <p>Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path, and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies. For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning Practice Guidance webpage.</p> <p>Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals.</p> <p><u>Planning</u></p> <p>Developer Contributions</p> <p>If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Draft North Kilworth NP and the draft Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances of your community. This would in general be consistent with the relevant District Council's local plan or its policy on planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of new development and enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations, where applicable.</p> <p>www.northkilworth.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/nk-draft-low-resolution-1.pdf http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/3599/great_glen_referendum_version_2pdf</p> <p>Mineral & Waste Planning</p> <p>The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development.</p> <p>Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood.</p> <p>You should also be aware of Mineral Consultation Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals Local Plan and Mineral and Waste Safeguarding proposed in the new Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Plan. These proposed safeguarding areas and existing Mineral Consultation Areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect mineral resources or waste operations. The County Council can provide guidance on this if your neighbourhood plan is</p>
--	--	---

		<p>allocating development in these areas or if any proposed neighbourhood plan policies may impact on minerals and waste provision.</p> <p><u>Education</u> Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two mile (primary) and three mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places. It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school. However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.</p> <p><u>Property</u> Strategic Property Services No comment at this time.</p> <p><u>Adult Social Care</u> It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and that development seeks to include bungalows etc of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.</p> <p><u>Environment</u> With regard to the environment and in line with the Governments advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of the natural environment including climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land.</p> <p><u>Climate Change</u> The County Council through its Environment Strategy and Carbon Reduction Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire's resilience to the predicted changes in climate. Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and increasing the county's resilience to climate change.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Landscape The County Council would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account Natural England’s Landscape character areas; LCC’s Landscape and Woodland Strategy and the Local District/Borough Council landscape character assessments. We would recommend that Neighbourhood Plans should also consider the street scene and public realm within their communities, further advice can be found in the latest ‘Streets for All East Midlands ’ Advisory Document (2006) published by English Heritage.</p> <p>Biodiversity The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Neighbourhood Plans should therefore seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver a strategic approach to protecting and improving the natural environment based on local evidence and priorities. Each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential development on enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity such as hedgerows and greenways.</p> <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of protected and priority Biodiversity Action Plan species. These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent Habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme.</p> <p>Contact: planningecology@leics.gov.uk, or phone 0116 305 4108</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Green infrastructure (GI) is a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities, (NPPF definition). As a network, GI includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/churchyards allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water</p>
--	--	--

	<p>bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls.</p> <p>The NPPF places the duty on local authorities to plan positively for a strategic network of GI which can deliver a range of planning policies including: building a strong, competitive economy; creating a sense of place and promote good design; promoting healthier communities by providing greater opportunities for recreation and mental and physical health benefits; meeting the challenges of climate change and flood risk; increasing biodiversity and conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Looking at the existing provision of GI networks within a community can influence the plan for creating & enhancing new networks and this assessment can then be used to inform CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedules, enabling communities to potentially benefit from this source of funding.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and in doing so they should ensure that their Neighbourhood Plan is reflective of the relevant Local Authority Green Infrastructure strategy. Through the Neighbourhood Plan and discussions with the Local Authority Planning teams and potential Developers communities are well placed to influence the delivery of local scale GI networks.</p> <p>Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land</p> <p>The NPPF encourages the effective use of brownfield land for development, provided that it is not of high environmental/ecological value. Neighbourhood planning groups should check with DEFRA if their neighbourhood planning area includes brownfield sites. Where information is lacking as to the ecological value of these sites then the Neighbourhood Plan could include policies that ensure such survey work should be carried out to assess the ecological value of a brownfield site before development decisions are taken.</p> <p>Soils are an essential finite resource on which important ecosystem services such as food production, are dependent on. They therefore should be enhanced in value and protected from adverse effects of unacceptable levels of pollution. Within the governments “Safeguarding our Soils” strategy, DEFRA have produced a code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites which could be helpful to neighbourhood planning groups in preparing environmental policies.</p> <p>High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification.</p>
--	--

Impact of Development on Civic Amenity Infrastructure

Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and the Leicestershire County Council. The County's Waste Management team considers proposed developments on a case by case basis and when it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the local civic amenity infrastructure then appropriate projects to increase the capacity to off-set the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire's Planning Obligations Policy and the Community Infrastructure Legislation Regulations.

Communities

Communities

Consideration of community facilities is a positive facet of Neighbourhood Plans that reflects the importance of these facilities within communities and can proactively protect and develop facilities to meet the needs of people in local communities. Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to;

1. Carry out and report on a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community.
2. Set out policies which seek to;
 - protect and retain these existing facilities,
 - support the independent development of new facilities, and,
 - identify and protect Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations.
3. Identify and support potential community projects that could be progressed.

You are encouraged to consider and respond to all aspects community resources as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. Further information, guidance and examples of policies and supporting information is available at www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/useful-information.

Economic Development

We would recommend including economic development aspirations with your Plan, outlining what the community currently values and whether they are open to new development of small businesses etc.

Superfast Broadband

High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a superfast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable, but is an essential

		<p>requirement in ordinary daily life.</p> <p>All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to superfast broadband (of at least 30Mbps) Developers should take active steps to incorporate superfast broadband at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure superfast broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete. Developers are only responsible for putting in place broadband infrastructure for developments of 30+ properties. Consideration for developers to make provision in all new houses regardless of the size of development should be considered.</p> <p><u>Equalities</u></p> <p>While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council's Equality Strategy 2016-2020 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work. A copy of the strategy can be view at: www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality-strategy2016-2020.pdf</p>
8	The Coal Authority	<p>Thank you for the notification of the 4 September 2018 consulting The Coal Authority on the above NDP.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan area does not contain any surface coal resources or any recorded risks from past coal mining activity at shallow depth. Therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
9	Plant Enquiry catelecomuk	<p>Thank you for your enquiry for the above reference.</p> <p>We can confirm that Colt Technology Services do not have apparatus near the above location as presented on your submitted plan, if any development or scheme amendments fall outside the 50 metre perimeter new plans must be submitted for review.</p> <p>Search is based on Overseeing Organisation Agent data supplied; we do not accept responsibility for O.O. Agent inaccurate data.</p>

		If we can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact us.
10	Member of the public 1	<p>I wish to make representations with regard to the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood plan. These representations should be considered as objections.</p> <p>The grounds for objection are as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There may be issues of equality and discrimination in your process, which have not been adequately addressed: For many, the language used to provide notice is overly complex and would prohibit an objection being lodged as the correspondence is not easily understood. Moreover, for those who wish to make a written submission as an objection, but have no experience in doing so there is inadequate guidance and reasonable steps have not been taken to recognise this or address this. Accordingly, the consultation is flawed and may not proceed. 2. There is not clear framework to facilitate responses, which would allow responses to be appropriately categorised, leading to subjectivity in interpretation. 3. There is not clear engagement strategy and consultation plan that has been adequately communicated to all stakeholders. 4. The time for consultation for a proposal of this magnitude is too short, making comprehensive objection difficult. 5. There has been no economic impact study for the wider region, to gain a complete understanding of the impact of this proposal. 6. A social impact study is required which addresses the possibility of social problems as a consequence of a development of this magnitude. Such a study would need to consider the wider region, as research has shown that social impacts of developments manifest in a much broader geographical area than originally anticipated. 7. The infrastructure is clearly inadequate to support a development of this magnitude. Insufficient measures are proposed to address this. 8. There is no evidence that the local authority and other public bodies, can provide adequate public services for a development of this magnitude. Financial assurance is required, along with detailed business and operational plans to demonstrate this. To proceed in the absence of this may be considered negligent. 9. Electoral commission implications have not been made mention of. <p>Finally, I have not had the opportunity to scrutinise the proposal fully, so I reserve the right to make further and fuller objections once I have conducted a thorough review.</p>

		I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email and appraise me of how my representations will be used going forward in perpetuity, rather than for a single part of the process.
11	Historic England	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England about the Neighbourhood Plan for Sheepy Parish.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make and refer you to our letter of 18 January 2018.</p>
12	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the submission version of the Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Gladman requests to be added to the Council's consultation database and to be kept informed on the progress of the emerging neighbourhood plan. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy.</p> <p>Legal Requirements</p> <p>Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the SNP must meet are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.</i> <i>(d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</i> <i>(e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</i> <i>(f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</i> <p>National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role in which they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.</p>

		<p>At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account the latest and most up-to-date evidence of housing needs in order to assist the Council in delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition.</p> <p>On the 24th July 2018, the government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework. The revised Framework states at paragraph 213 that ‘the policies of the previous Framework will apply for the purposes of examining plans, where those plans are submitted on or before 24 January 2019.’ As such the Parish Council will need to ensure that the policies contained within the SNP are consistent with the appropriate version of the NPPF. Further, the Parish Council will need to be aware that the revised NPPF is considered a material consideration which will need to be taken into account in dealing with any planning applications.</p> <p>The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 16 of the previous Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development.</p> <p>Paragraph 17 of the previous Framework further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a clear and positive vision for the future of the area and policies contained in those plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.</p> <p>Paragraph 184 of the previous Framework makes clear that local planning authorities will need to clearly set out their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. The</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that it is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>It is clear from the requirements of the Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.</p> <p>Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. It is with that in mind that Gladman has reservations regarding the SNP's ability to meet basic condition (a) and (d) and this will be discussed in greater detail throughout this response.</p> <p>Relationship to Local Plan</p> <p>To meet the requirements of the Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in the adopted Development Plan. The adopted Development Plan relevant to the preparation of the SNP is the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan, which is made up of the Core Strategy DPD and the Site Allocations & Development Management Policies DPD. The Core Strategy determined that Hinckley & Bosworth would be required to deliver 9,000 homes between 2006 and 2026.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>To meet the requirements of the Framework the Council is currently reviewing the Core Strategy and the Council is still in the early stages of plan preparation. It is therefore important that the SNP provides flexibility to ensure that the policies contained in the SNP are not overridden upon the adoption of any future Local Plan; as section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:</p> <p><i>‘if to any extent, a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approached, or published (as the case may be).’</i></p> <p>Policy S1: Countryside</p> <p>Policy S1 states that land outside of the defined settlement boundaries will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, beauty, heritage and wildlife. The policy seeks to limited development outside the settlement boundary to that which accords with a narrow list of criteria.</p> <p>Gladman do not consider the use of development limits to be an effective response to future development proposals if they would act to preclude the delivery of otherwise sustainable development opportunities, as indicated in the policy. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead without delay. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements does not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework and is contrary to basic condition (a).Beyond, this, Gladman consider it necessary that the policy recognises, that within the plan period, it may be necessary for greenfield development, outside the development limits, to come forward to assist with meeting local housing needs. As such, we recommend that sufficient flexibility is established in the policy so as to ensure that the plan can adjust to any local changes.</p> <p>Policy S3: Locally Important Views</p> <p>Policy S3 identified 14 ‘important’ views and vistas, which development should safeguard and where possible enhance.</p> <p>We submit that new development can often be located in areas without eroding the views considered to be important to the local community and can be appropriately designed to take into consideration the wider landscape features of a surrounding area to provide new vistas and views.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>In addition, as set out in case law, to be valued, a view would need to have some form of physical attribute. This policy must allow a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular locations contains physical attributes that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than selecting views which may not have any landscape significance and are based solely on community support.</p> <p>Opinions on landscape are highly subjective, therefore, without much more robust evidence to demonstrate why these views and landscape areas are considered special, the policy in its current form will likely lead to inconsistencies in the decision-making process.</p> <p>Policy S5: Ecology and Biodiversity</p> <p>Policy S5 states that development should not harm the network or ecological features and habitats within the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>Paragraph 113 of the Framework 2012 refers to the need for criteria-based policies in relation to proposals affecting protected wildlife or biodiversity or landscape areas, and that protection should be commensurate with their status which gives appropriate weight to their importance and contributions to wider networks. As currently drafted, Gladman do not believe this policy fully aligns with the Framework. The policy fails to make a distinction and recognise that there are two separate balancing exercises which need to be undertaken for national and local designated sites and their settings. We therefore suggest that the policy is revisited to ensure that it is consistent with the approach set out within the Framework.</p> <p>Policy S7: Features of Local Heritage Interest</p> <p>Policy S7 states that in determining planning applications, decision makers will need to balance the need for development, and the public benefit, against the significance of any heritage feature that may be harmed by development.</p> <p>Paragraph 132 of the Framework makes it clear that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation and that 'the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be'.</p> <p>With reference to designated heritage assets, the Parish Council should refer specifically to paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework which sets out that Councils should assess the significance of the designated heritage asset and where there is less than substantial harm, this should be weighed in the planning balance against the public benefits of the proposal. Where there is deemed to be substantial</p>
--	--	---

		<p>harm, then the proposal would need to achieve substantial public benefits to outweigh that harm.</p> <p>For non-designated heritage assets, the policy must reflect the guidance set out within paragraph 135 of the Framework. This states that the policy test that should be applied in these cases is that a balanced judgement should be reached having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Gladman believe that this policy needs to be redrafted in order to ensure that it conforms with the guidance and requirements set through national policy.</p> <p>Policy S9: Local Green Space</p> <p>Policy S9 identifies 7 sites that are proposed as Local Green Space Designations.</p> <p>In order to designate land as LGS the Parish Council must ensure that it is able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet national policy requirements set out in the Framework. The Framework 2012 makes clear at §76 that the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development for the wider area. Paragraph 76 states that:</p> <p><i><u>‘Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.’</u></i></p> <p>Further guidance is provided at §77 which sets out three tests that must be met for the designation of Local Green Spaces. Paragraph 77 states that:</p> <p><u>‘The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</u> - <u>Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including</u>
--	--	---

		<p>as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</u> <p>Gladman suggest that the evidence that has been produced to support the designations of LGS is not considered robust or detailed enough and instead demonstrates how at least 3 of the parcels of land are considered extensive tracts of land and therefore do not meet the requirements of the Framework.</p> <p>The issues surrounding LGS designations have been considered in a number of other Examiner's reports across the country and we highlight the following decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Seldlescombe Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report1 recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately <u>4.5ha</u> as it was found to be an extensive tract of land. - The Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan Examiners Report2 recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately <u>5ha</u> and also found this area to be not local in character. Thereby failing to meet 2 of the 3 tests for LGS designation. - The Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report3 identifies that both sites proposed as LGS in the neighbourhood plan '<i>in relation to the overall size of the Alrewas Village</i>' to be extensive tracts of land. The Examiner in this instance recommended the deletion of the proposed LGSs which measured approximately <u>2.4ha</u> and <u>3.7ha</u>. - The Freshford and Limpley Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report4 identified that the six LGS proposed did not meet the criteria required by the Framework either collectively or individually. Indeed, the Examiner identified that the combination of sites comprised of an extensive tract of land. The Examiner also considered that the protection of fields to 'prevent agglomeration between the settlement areas... is not the purpose of Local Green Space designation'. - The Eastington Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report5 recommended the deletion of three LGS (16ha and 2ha) considered to be extensive tracts of land. The third proposed LGS was deleted due to the lack of evidence demonstrating its importance and significance to the local community. - The Tattenhill and Rangemore Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report6 recommended the deletion of 2 LGS comprising of 4.3ha and 9.4ha. - The Norley Examiner's Report7 identified a total of 13 parcels of land to be designated as LGS. The Examiner recommended at §4.98 that the identification of these extensive tracts of agricultural land was contrary to NPPF policy and recommended that the policy should be deleted. The
--	--	---

		<p>proposed LGS measured in the range of 1ha – 4.3ha.</p> <p>Policy S10: Housing Development</p> <p>Policy S10 states that infill housing development within the defined settlement boundaries will be supported. Outside the settlement boundary, the policy states that permission for housing will be limited to that which meets a defined list of criteria.</p> <p>Gladman would like to remind the Council that it is not within the remit of a Parish Council to determine planning applications and as such where reference is made to ‘permissions for housing’ being limited, we recommend that the policy wording is amended to ‘support for housing’.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the SNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area.</p> <p>Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic conditions (a), (d) and (e). The plan does not conform with national policy and guidance and in its current form does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.</p>
--	--	---