



**Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council**

Desford Neighbourhood Plan

**Appendix 1 – Examiner’s recommended modifications and HBBC’s proposed
response**

(Part of the Regulation 18 Decision Statement)

As outlined in the ‘Decision Statement’, Regulation 18 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 also requires the LPA to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations the Independent Examiner made in their report.

Mr Tim Jones issued his report on 7 August 2020.

Below is a table of all the modifications listed in his report, the Local Planning Authority’s response to each, and the associated action, as required.

Table 1: Examiner’s proposed modifications and HBBC’s proposed response

More detail and reasoning is given by the Examiner for his recommendations in the different sections throughout his report, however for the benefit of keeping this table concise, the supporting instructions from the Examiner have been kept to those in section 9, pages 12 to 18 of the report (August 2020).

Blue text is either added text or amended text, whereas text with a strike-through is text to be deleted, as per the Examiner’s recommendations.

Modifi- cation Ref.	Page Number of plan	Paragraph number of Examiner’s Report, and Examiner’s explanation/supporting text	Examiner’s recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
1	5	46. The first two complete paragraphs require updating.	<p>Recommended modification 1</p> <p><i>Page 3 (should be page 5)</i></p> <p>Update from “<i>Before being adopted</i>” to “<i>local community referendum</i>” to reflect the situation prior to the referendum.</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Agree with the Examiner that the plan must reflect the current situation and must be written as the referendum version of the plan. As well as the below, all past-tense references must also be amended.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Delete on Page 5 of the NP:</p> <p>Before being adopted, this Neighbourhood Plan must pass an independent examination to test against ‘Basic Conditions’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with national planning policy. • General conformity with strategic policies in Hinckley and Bosworth’s Local Plan. • Compatibility with EU and human rights requirements. <p>An independent examiner will check that this Neighbourhood Plan meets these conditions. It will then be voted on in a local community referendum.</p> <p>Amend to the following:</p> <p>This Neighbourhood Plan has been written in line with the ‘Basic Conditions’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with national planning policy. • General conformity with strategic policies in Hinckley and Bosworth’s Local Plan. • Compatibility with EU and human rights requirements. <p>Before being made, this Neighbourhood Plan must pass a local community referendum.</p>
2	17	<p>47. An indication of the limitations of the figure of 163 should be given.</p> <p>48. The final paragraph is out of date and needs updating to reflect the grant of outline planning permission for the site at Peckleton Lane for up to 80 dwellings (Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/W/19/3235401.)</p>	<p>Recommended modification 2</p> <p><i>Page 17</i></p> <p>Replace the fourth sentence of the first complete paragraph with: “<i>A draft indicative and heavily caveated figure of 163 dwellings over the period 2016-2036 was provided by the borough.</i>”</p> <p>Replace the final paragraph with: “<i>Planning permission has been granted on appeal for development of up to 80 dwellings at land east of Peckleton Lane in Desford. This will increase housing provision within the parish and impact on services and traffic.</i>”</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Agree clarity must be provided around the housing figure of 163 to make it clear to the reader/user where the figure came from, and that it was heavily caveated by the borough council at the time.</p> <p>Also agree that there needs to be an update with regards to the site at Peckleton Lane following the granting of permission at appeal (Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/W/19/3235401).</p> <p>ACTIONS</p> <p>Delete and amend as follows:</p> <p>“... However, in advance of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan there are uncertainties in establishing housing requirement figures for Neighbourhood Plans. A draft indicative figure of 163 dwellings over the period 2016-2036 was provided by the borough. <i>A draft indicative and heavily caveated figure of 163</i></p>

Modification Ref.	Page Number of plan	Paragraph number of Examiner's Report, and Examiner's explanation/supporting text	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
				<p> dwellings over the period 2016-2036 was provided by the borough”</p> <p>Delete the last paragraph as follows:</p> <p>At the time that the Neighbourhood Plan was being submitted to the local planning authority, an appeal decision against the refusal of development of up to 80 dwellings at land east of Peckleton Lane in Desford was imminent. If this appeal is upheld, the housing provision within the Parish will be considerably in excess of the minimum requirement and the negative impact on services and traffic will be considerable.</p> <p>Amend to the following:</p> <p>Planning permission has been granted on appeal for development of up to 80 dwellings at land east of Peckleton Lane in Desford. This will increase housing provision within the parish and impact on services and traffic.</p>
3	18	49. The settlement boundary should also be extended to reflect the planning permission development of up to 80 dwellings at land east of Peckleton Lane. I do not consider that the settlement boundary should be altered to incorporate land held in reserve. That would in effect make a reserved site an allocated site.	<p>Recommended modification 3</p> <p><i>Page 18, 3rd paragraph</i></p> <p>At the end of the first sentence add: “and the planning permission of development of up to 80 dwellings at land east of Peckleton Lane.”</p>	<p>RESPONSE Agree, Peckleton Lane site should be included within the settlement boundary as a site with planning permission.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>The third paragraph on page 18 should include the added text as below:</p> <p>The Plan proposes to designate a new Settlement Boundary for Desford village which will update and supersede the existing Settlement Boundary currently used by HBBC (2016), as it takes into account the residential allocation proposed in this Neighbourhood Plan, and the planning permission of development of up to 80 dwellings at land east of Peckleton Lane. Within the defined Settlement Boundary an appropriate amount of suitably designed and located development will be acceptable in principle, although this will be required to take into account the policies within the Development Plan.</p>
3 cont.	19	As above	<p><i>Page 19, figure 2</i></p> <p>Amend the settlement boundary to include the land subject to the planning permission of development of up to 80 dwellings at land east of Peckleton Lane and the immediately adjoining section of Peckleton Lane.</p>	<p>RESPONSE Agree, as above.</p> <p>The boundary of the Peckleton Lane site should be drawn as agreed in permission 18/01252/OUT, appeal ref. APP/K2420/W/19/3235401.</p> <p>The red line boundary plan can be found at the following link, using the planning application reference above - https://pa.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/online-applications/</p> <p>To aid the interpretation of the settlement boundary map it should be produced on a larger A3 pull out page, this will allow for the intricacies of the boundary to be seen clearly.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Amend the settlement boundary to include the land east of Peckleton Lane.</p>
4	20	50. The land subject to policy H2 has been granted outline planning permission and reserved matters have been approved. That does not mean that policy H2 is inevitably irrelevant. There could still be a further planning application. There is no breach of basic conditions in the policy	<p>Recommended modification 4</p> <p><i>Page 20</i></p> <p>Insert “<i>Where possible</i>” at the start of criterion (d).</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Agree, criterion d should be made more flexible to allow for the criteria to be more of an aim, rather than a demanding one.</p>

Modification Ref.	Page Number of plan	Paragraph number of Examiner's Report, and Examiner's explanation/supporting text	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		<p>remaining.</p> <p>51. Criterion (d), while desirable in principle, is too demanding.</p> <p>52. Criterion (l) not a policy, but a statement. It could also mislead, since other public bodies in addition to the two principal councils might have a proper case for a financial contribution.</p> <p>53. Criterion (m) is not justified.</p>	<p>Delete criteria (l) and (m), insert "and" after criterion (j) and replace the semi-colon after criterion (k) with a full stop.</p>	<p>Agree, criterion l is a statement of fact, and also cannot showcase the full breadth of potential stakeholders for contributions. Therefore delete criterion l.</p> <p>Agree, criterion m is not justified and therefore should be deleted from the policy.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Insert "Where possible" at the start of criterion (d), as below:</p> <p>d) Where possible all of the units to be developed will achieve Part M (2) of the 2016 Building Regulations (unless a specific waiver is granted on a plot by plot basis)</p> <p>Delete criterion's l and m, and amend wording between policies as follows:</p> <p>j) A new vehicular access will be built on the junction of Barns Way, subject to Highways Authority approval; and</p> <p>k) Priority will be given to dwellings of 3 bedrooms or fewer (see Policy H4). The inclusion of four-bedroom or larger houses in the development will be supported where they are subservient in number to two or three-bedroom accommodation.</p> <p>l) Other financial contributions will be subject to Leicestershire County Council and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council requirements; and</p> <p>m) The whole of site A is to be built as one carefully designed scheme. The residential development will only be considered as one project submitted as one planning application and the site cannot be subdivided through more than one planning application.</p>
5	20	<p>54. For the reasons given in paragraphs 38 to 43 above <i>[in Examiner's report]</i>, there should be a reserved sites policy together with supporting text and figure.</p>	<p>Recommended modification 5</p> <p><i>Page 20</i></p> <p>Insert after the current end of the page</p> <p><i>"Two reserved sites adjacent to the settlement boundary are allocated so that one or both of them will come forward if required during the Plan period should a need for further housing in the parish arise.</i></p> <p><i>Policy H3: RESERVE SITES</i></p> <p><i>Land at the following locations as shown on Figure 4 is allocated as reserved sites:</i></p> <p><i>A 5.43-hectare site immediately north of Kirkby Road;</i></p> <p><i>A 4.19-hectare site south of Hunts Lane.</i></p> <p><i>Planning applications for residential development on one or both of these sites will be supported if (and to the extent) necessary by the replacement Local Plan. In the event of only one site being needed, planning permission will be supported in respect of the site that, having considered</i></p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>The LPA advise all neighbourhood plan groups that they should build in as much flexibility as they can by allocating additional sites/identifying reserve sites should a housing requirement later set by the borough local plan be in excess of that being planned for in the neighbourhood plan. Reserve sites also allow the group to have a say in what sites may come forward or be allocated in the future if a larger housing need is determined. Reserve sites give the Local Authority and Developers a good idea of what sites the NDP have assessed as sustainable alternative sites, and this would come into consideration when/if allocating through the Local Plan process if a higher need is determined. It would also ensure that all development is planned for, rather than via speculative applications/appeals not considered by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Therefore agree with the Examiner that there should be a reserve sites policy to ensure flexibility and to allow sustainable planned development to occur if and when need arises in Desford Parish.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Insert after Figure 3 'Residential Allocation' (before Affordable Housing):</p> <p>"Reserve Housing Sites</p> <p>Two reserved sites adjacent to the settlement boundary are allocated so that</p>

Modification Ref.	Page Number of plan	Paragraph number of Examiner's Report, and Examiner's explanation/supporting text	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
			<p><i>applicable development plan policies and other material considerations at the relevant time is more appropriate. In the event of no replacement Local Plan being in place by 31st December 2022, the matter should be determined on the evidence available at the time.</i></p> <p>Insert a new figure 4.</p> <p>Renumber subsequent housing policies and subsequent figures.</p>	<p>one or both of them will come forward if required during the Plan period should a need for further housing in the parish arise.</p> <p>Policy H3: RESERVE SITES</p> <p>Land at the following locations as shown on Figure 4 is allocated as reserved sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 5.43-hectare site immediately north of Kirkby Road; • A 4.19-hectare site south of Hunts Lane. <p>Planning applications for residential development on one or both of these sites will be supported if (and to the extent) necessary by the replacement Local Plan. In the event of only one site being needed, planning permission will be supported in respect of the site that, having considered applicable development plan policies and other material considerations at the relevant time is more appropriate. In the event of no replacement Local Plan being in place by 31st December 2022, the matter should be determined on the evidence available at the time."</p> <p>Consequently a new Figure 4 will be required, with a map showing the two new reserve site boundaries.</p> <p>Subsequently renumber all of the following housing policies and figures.</p> <p>Ensure all references and page numbers have changed accordingly.</p>
6	22	<p>55. The Core Strategy sets out the tenure split of affordable housing to be for 75% social rented and 25% intermediate tenure. The substantial change from this strategic policy has not been justified by robust evidence.</p> <p>56. The phrase "high quality" is too imprecise for a planning policy. Allocation of affordable housing is a housing not a land-use planning matter and should not be included in a policy.</p>	<p>Recommended modification 6</p> <p>Page 22</p> <p>Delete the second complete sentence.</p> <p>Delete the words "high quality" from policy H3.</p> <p>Delete the second sentence of the second complete paragraph and the final sentence of policy H3.</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Agree that the Core Strategy (2009) sets out the tenure split of affordable housing. The substantial change from this strategic policy in the neighbourhood plan has not been justified by robust supporting evidence, and therefore cannot be asked for.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Delete the second complete sentence on page 22, as follows:</p> <p>"The analysis of the local evidence suggests an approximate even split of this affordable housing, to reflect the high levels of owner occupation in the plan area and to help first time buyers to achieve home ownership. The Neighbourhood Plan will specify 33% of all affordable units to be rented (social or affordable rents) 33% to be shared ownership and 34% to be "low cost starter homes for sale" at a 20% discount on full market price.</p> <p>Delete the second sentence of the second complete paragraph on page 22, as below:</p> <p>"HBBC are responsible for allocating the affordable housing to meet its statutory obligations. The local connection policy will be applied and if no applicant is found within two weeks of a vacancy being notified, the local needs policy will be set aside. The parish will also support policies that deal with under occupied properties and schemes to support people to move to more appropriate accommodation; thereby freeing up family size properties."</p> <p>Renumber to Policy H4 (as a consequence of the addition of H3 Reserve Sites),</p>

Modifi- cation Ref.	Page Number of plan	Paragraph number of Examiner's Report, and Examiner's explanation/supporting text	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
				<p>delete the words "high quality" from policy, and delete the final sentence of the policy, as below:</p> <p>"POLICY H4: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - To meet identified needs within the community at least 40% of all new housing developments of 10 units or more will be high-quality affordable housing. The provision of affordable housing through Starter Homes or Shared Ownership schemes is supported alongside social rented housing in line with local evidence of need.</p> <p>The affordable housing stock should be made available as an integral part of the development, should be visually indistinguishable from the equivalent market housing on the site and should be provided as clusters dispersed throughout the development, subject to a registered provider being prepared to take the dwellings on if applicable. The provision of affordable homes for people with a local connection will be supported."</p>
7	24	<p>57. The design policy is not limited to housing. The heading of the section and the policy should reflect this.</p> <p>58. Parliament has specified when design and access statements are needed in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 article 9. This is law, not policy, and cannot be amended by a plan.</p>	<p>Recommended modification 7</p> <p><i>Page 24</i></p> <p>In the section and the policy heading replace "<i>housing design</i>" with "<i>housing and other design</i>".</p> <p>Policy H6 criterion (a), delete: "<i>and proposals should clearly show within a Design and Access Statement where appropriate how the general character, scale, mass, density and layout of the site, of the building or extension fits in with the aspect of the surrounding area</i>".</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Agree the policy can cover more than just housing design and therefore the section and policy title should reflect this.</p> <p>Also agree that Design and Access Statements are required as specified in law, and therefore a neighbourhood plan cannot change this.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Edit Housing Design title and policy name to 'Housing and Other Design'.</p> <p>Also change policy number to H7.</p> <p>Also delete reference to Design and Access Statements by amending as follows: "New development should enhance and reinforce the local distinctiveness and character of the area in which it is situated, particularly within the Conservation Area, and proposals should clearly show within a Design and Access Statement where appropriate how the general character, scale, mass, density and layout of the site, of the building or extension fits in with the aspect of the surrounding area. Care should be taken to ensure that the development does not disrupt the visual amenities of the street scene and impact negatively on any significant wider landscape views"</p>
8	25	<p>59. The final sentence of criterion (c) is too demanding for a policy that covers most development. Criterion (i) conflicts with NPPF paragraph 122 and should be replaced by a less demanding policy.</p>	<p>Recommended modification 8</p> <p><i>Page 25</i></p> <p>Policy H6 criterion (c), replace the final sentence with: "<i>Roof and wall construction that follows technical best-practice recommendations for integral bird nest boxes and bat breeding and roosting sites will be supported.</i>"</p> <p>Policy H6, criterion (i), replace with: "<i>Development should be of a density that respects the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting</i>".</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Agree that the last part of criterion c may not apply to all forms of development, and therefore a supportive policy is more flexible.</p> <p>NPPF Paragraph 122 states:</p> <p>"Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it; b) local market conditions and viability; c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use; d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting

Modifi- cation Ref.	Page Number of plan	Paragraph number of Examiner's Report, and Examiner's explanation/supporting text	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
				<p>(including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and</p> <p>e) the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.</p> <p>The amendment to the policy makes the policy less demanding and more flexible, but still allows for development to respect the area's character and setting.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Delete and replace the last sentence of criterion c, as follows:</p> <p>"c) All new housing should continue to reflect the character and historic context of existing developments within the Parish and incorporate a diversity of materials. However, contemporary and innovative design and materials will be supported where positive improvement can be robustly demonstrated without detracting from the historic context. Roof and wall construction should follow technical best practice recommendations for integral bird nest boxes and bat breeding and roosting sites Roof and wall construction that follows technical best-practice recommendations for integral bird nest boxes and bat breeding and roosting sites will be supported."</p> <p>Delete criterion i, and replace with the following:</p> <p>i) Development should be of a similar density to properties in the immediate surrounding area; Development should be of a density that respects the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting;</p>
9	29	60. Following the listing of the Desford War Memorial, there are now 19 listed buildings.	<p>Recommended modification 9</p> <p><i>Page 29</i></p> <p>In the first paragraph, replace "18" with "19".</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Agree, Desford War Memorial was listed on 22 Mar 2018 and should be included.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Amend sentence in the first paragraph of page 29 to 19 Listed Buildings, as below:</p> <p>"There are 48 19 Listed Buildings and one Scheduled Monument."</p> <p>Replace any other references in the main plan and all appendices to ensure this is included.</p>
10	31 - 33	<p>61. The three proposed Local Green Spaces (LGSs), St Martin's churchyard, Pickard Recreation Ground and Barns Charity Field, are shown on figure 6 of the Draft NDP and considered in pages 31 to 33. (I also note the mention on page 29 and appendix F.)</p> <p>62. The NPPF provides for LGSs in its chapter 8, which is headed "Promoting healthy and safe communities". Under the sub-heading "Open Spaces and Recreation", paragraphs 99, 100 and 101 state:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>99. The designation of land as Local Green Space</i></p>	<p>Recommended modification 10</p> <p><i>Page 31</i></p> <p>Replace: "NPPF, paragraph 77" with "NPPF, paragraph 100".</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Agree, update to newest NPPF reference.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>All references to NPPF 2012, paragraph 77 to be deleted, and replaced with NPPF 2019, paragraph 100, as below.</p> <p>100. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</p> <p>a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</p> <p>b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local</p>

Modification Ref.	Page Number of plan	Paragraph number of Examiner's Report, and Examiner's explanation/supporting text	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		<p><i>through... neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should 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 updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</i></p> <p><i>100. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</i> <i>b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance,</i> <i>c) for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as</i> <i>d) a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</i> <i>e) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</i> <p><i>101. Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts.</i></p> <p>63. In considering the proposed LGS designations, I have born in mind and found helpful the recent judgment in R. (Lochailort Investments Ltd) v Mendip District Council. ([2020] EWHC 1146 (Admin), Lang J., 11th May 2020.)</p> <p>I am satisfied that the selection of the LGSs and policy ENV1 comply with the basic conditions and human rights and that each of the three sites meets the criteria in the NPPF. In particular I do not consider that the local plan designations of the sites means that an LGS designation would breach a basic condition and I am satisfied that in the context of the parish of Desford Barns Charity Field is not an "is not an extensive tract of land".</p> <p>64. There is one minor error, namely specifying the wrong NNPF paragraph. This needs correction.</p>		<p>significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</p> <p>c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Ensure all references to the Local Green Space NPPF Policy (in the main plan and in appendix f) are written as Paragraph 100, rather than 77.</p>
11	45	<p>65. I agree with HBBC that reflection and glare are not present on solar farms, since the panels are matt and absorb the light. I also agree that large-scale is imprecise, although it is clear that it is meant to cover larger scale than the previous paragraph.</p>	<p>Recommended modification 11</p> <p><i>Page 45, policy ENV 7</i></p> <p>In first criterion (a) delete "reflections, glare,".</p> <p>Replace the penultimate sentence of the policy with: "Large scale solar energy generation development proposals will generally be acceptable if the panel array does not cause significant visual harm from any valued and accessible viewpoint."</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Agree that reflections and glare are not present on solar farms, and therefore should be deleted from the policy.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Delete references to both 'reflections' and 'glare' in criterion a, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) adverse impact (noise, reflections, glare, shadow, flicker, other visual impact, water pollution, smell, air quality impairment, gaseous or particulate emissions) on the health, wellbeing or amenities of residents

Modification Ref.	Page Number of plan	Paragraph number of Examiner's Report, and Examiner's explanation/supporting text	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
				<p>and visitors.</p> <p>Delete and replace the penultimate sentence, as follows:</p> <p>"... Large scale solar energy generation development proposals will generally be acceptable if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) The panel array is not visible from any valued and accessible viewpoint f) Reflection (glare) is not evident from any viewpoint <p>Larger scale solar energy generation development proposals will generally be acceptable if the panel array does not cause significant visual harm from any valued and accessible viewpoint."</p>
12	49	66. A policy cannot require an improvement of highway safety.	<p>Recommended modification 12</p> <p><i>Page 49, policy F2</i></p> <p>Replace criterion (b) with, "Does not harm highway safety".</p>	<p>RESPONSE Agreed, amend as necessary.</p> <p>ACTION Delete/amend as below:</p> <p>POLICY F2: NEW OR IMPROVED COMMUNITY FACILITIES - Proposals that improve the quality and/or range of community facilities, will be supported provided that the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Meets the design criteria stated in Policy H6 where appropriate; b) Will improve Does not harm highway safety;
13	54	67. Policy T3 is not a land-use planning policy	<p>Recommended modification 13</p> <p><i>Page 54, policy T3</i></p> <p>Replace "Policy" with "Community Action" and re-colour.</p>	<p>RESPONSE Agreed, Policy T3 is more of an action for the Parish Council and does not concern land-use planning policy, therefore should not be included as a policy in the plan.</p> <p>ACTION Amend from a policy to a Community Action, and re-colour to orange/brown as per the rest of the plan.</p>
14	55	68. Policy T4 could be read as applying to individual buildings (albeit subject to the words "where appropriate"). That would be too demanding and could affect the viability of needed development. The policy requires modification but not to the extent that would leave it requiring only one charging point in larger developments	<p>Recommended modification 14</p> <p><i>Page 55, policy T4</i></p> <p>Delete "<i>in the building</i>".</p> <p>Replace "<i>point</i>" in each place where it appears with "<i>points</i>".</p>	<p>RESPONSE Agreed, the amended policy would now apply a site, rather than individual buildings, and the addition of the plural 'points' allows the policy to be more flexible (and more ambitious) in achieving electric vehicle charging.</p> <p>ACTION Amend policy number to T3 following the change of the Footpaths Bridleways and Cycle Routes to a community action.</p> <p>Delete 'in the building', and amend the word "point" to plural "points" as follows:</p> <p>"POLICY T3: ELECTRIC VEHICLES - Housing and commercial developments will be required, where appropriate, to provide 7KW cabling to the most practical points in the building to facilitate subsequent installation of an electric vehicle</p>

Modification Ref.	Page Number of plan	Paragraph number of Examiner's Report, and Examiner's explanation/supporting text	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
				charging points. The provision of communal vehicular charging points within the Parish will be encouraged, where there is universal access and their presence doesn't impact negatively on existing available parking in the Parish."
15	Appendix F	69. This refers to a former NPPF. The current version should be used.	Recommended modification 15 <i>Appendix F</i> Replace: "NPPF 2012, paragraph 77" with "NPPF 2019, paragraph 100". Replace the whole of the box at the end of the Appendix with: "100. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is: a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land."	RESPONSE Agree, update to newest NPPF reference. ACTION All references to NPPF 2012, paragraph 77 to be deleted, and replaced with NPPF 2019, paragraph 100. Box at the end of the appendix deleted, and replaced as below: 77. The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; • 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, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and • where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. 100. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is: d) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; e) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and f) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.
N/A	N/A	Additional comment from the Examiner: 70. It may be that certain passages need updating. Nothing in this report should deter appropriate updating prior to the referendum in respect of incontrovertible issues of primary fact.	N/A	RESPONSE HBBC agrees that there may be passages of the plan that need updating prior to the referendum, Desford Parish Council and Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council will work together to ensure the plan that goes to referendum is factually accurate.
N/A	N/A	Additional comment from the Examiner: 71. I have considered whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated plan area. However, I can see no sufficient reason to extend the area and therefore recommend that the referendum area be limited to the parish.	The referendum area remains limited to the Parish area.	RESPONSE HBBC agree that if the plan were to proceed to referendum the referendum area should remain as just the Parish. ACTION No action.

The Local Planning Authority's recommendations

The LPA has included a number of proposed modifications below to either enhance the usability of the plan, or to correct factual errors/update information that has come to light since the submission of the plan.

Modification Ref.	Page Number of plan	HBBC requested modifications to correct errors and enhance the usability of the plan
16	34	HBBC recommends that Figure 7 Sites and Features of Environmental Significance (now Figure 8 after addition of Reserve Sites map) is increased in size, to aid the interpretation of the map. It should be produced on a landscape A4 page (turn the page to look at the map landscape rather than a smaller portrait map as is in the Submission Version). This will allow for the intricacies of the sites to be seen clearly.
17	36	HBBC recommends that Figure 8 Important Open Spaces (now Figure 9 after addition of Reserve Sites map) is increased in size, to aid the interpretation of the map.
18	39	HBBC recommends that Figure 10 Surviving Ridge and Furrow (now Figure 11 after addition of Reserve Sites map) is increased in size, to aid the interpretation of the map.
19	40	HBBC recommends that Figure 11 Heritage Assets (now Figure 12 after addition of Reserve Sites map) is increased in size, to aid the interpretation of the map.
20	17	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan currently states the following: “One of the key aims of the Plan is to deliver the necessary housing construction required to meet the housing need in the Parish to 2036. This has increased in significance as the local planning authority, at time of Submission of the Neighbourhood Plan, cannot demonstrate a 5-year land supply.”</p> <p>This needs to be amended to reflect the plan’s status and current situation. HBBC suggests the following:</p> <p>“One of the key aims of the Plan is to deliver the necessary housing construction required to meet the housing need in the Parish to 2036. This increased in significance during the preparation of the plan, as the local planning authority could not demonstrate a five year supply at the time of submission.”</p>
21	18	Again, similar to the above, HBBC agrees that there may be passages of the plan that need updating prior to the referendum, in particular factual elements such as updates on sites and/or planning permissions. Desford Parish Council and Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council will work together to ensure the plan that goes to referendum is factually accurate.

Policy and figure numbers

Due to the addition of Policy H3 Reserve Sites and its associated map (figure 3), and the amendments of Policy T3 to a Community Action, the rest of the plan must be changed accordingly. For ease, the LPA have provided a table below which gives the previous policy numbers and figure numbers, and the new numbers once the changes have been made.

Additionally ensure that all page numbers are amended, and the relevant changes made in the table of contents and any cross-references throughout the plan and appendices.

Figure Name	Old Figure Number	New Figure Number	Changes Required to the Figure/Map? (If Y, see above for amendments needed)
Designated Area	1	1	N
Settlement Boundary	2	2	Y
Residential Allocation	3	3	N
Reserve Sites	NEW	4	NEW
Geology of Desford (left) (adapted from BGS mapping) Topography of Desford (right)	4	5	N
The Saxon origin of Desford's name (left), and its entry in Domesday Book as 'Deresford' (right)	5	6	N
Local Green Spaces	6	7	N
Sites and Features of Environmental Significance	7	8	Y
Important Open Spaces	8	9	N
Wildlife Corridors	9	10	N
Surviving Ridge and Furrow in Desford is a significant Heritage Asset	10	11	N
Heritage Assets (designated and non-designated) within the Parish	11	12	N
Important Views	12	13	N
Rights of Way	13	14	N

Policy Name	Old Policy Number	New Policy Number	Changes Required to the Policy or section of the plan? (If Y, see above for amendments needed)
Settlement Boundary	H1	H1	Y
Residential Site Allocation	H2	H2	Y
Reserve Sites	NEW	H3	NEW
Affordable Housing	H3	H4	Y
Housing Mix	H4	H5	N
Windfall Site Development	H5	H6	N
Housing and Other Design	H6	H7	Y
Protection of Local Green Space	ENV1	ENV1	Y
Protection of Other Sites and Features of Environmental Significance	ENV2	ENV2	N
Biodiversity General	ENV3	ENV3	N
Ridge and Furrow	ENV4	ENV4	N
Local Heritage Assets	ENV5	ENV5	Y
Safeguarding Important Views	ENV6	ENV6	N
Renewable Energy Infrastructure	ENV7	ENV7	Y
Retention of Existing Community Facilities	F1	F1	N
New or Improved Community Facilities	F2	F2	Y
Traffic Management	T1	T1	N
Desford Railway Station	T2	T2	N
Footpaths, Bridleways and Cycle Routes	T3	N/A – Change to Community Action	Y

Electric Vehicles	T4	T3	Y
Existing Employment Use	E1	E1	N
Support for New Employment Opportunities	E2	E2	N
Home Working	E3	E3	N
Farm Diversification	E4	E4	N
Tourism	E5	E5	N
Mobile Phone and Broadband Infrastructure	E6	E6	N