Markfield Neighbourhood Plan: Consideration of Representations

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Michael Munsey	0	General		Loved reading your Plan, I thought that it was very professional, and covered everything. The Maps were excellent. I have learnt more about Markfield from reading this plan than in the past 20 years that I have been in Markfield.	Noted	**No change**
Barry Mingay	0	General		I have received, today, notification concerning the publication of the proposals for the above Plan. Obviously I have not had an opportunity to examine anything apart from your introduction but I note that with the current restrictions on gatherings permitting public meetings may be difficult. I am a member of the Residents Association Committee at Markfield Court Retirement Village, where we do have a large well ventilated Hall which is part of the space designated as Multi-Purpose Community Space covered by the Section 3 regulations When the definitive data is made available concerning the latest use of such spaces, later this week is expected, it may be possible to offer use of the Hall to hold several meetings if required. My offer has to be subject to approval of the full Committee (which should not take more than two days to conclude)	Noted. The Government has been clear that all members of society are required to adhere to guidance to help combat the spread of coronavirus (COVID-19). The guidance has implications for neighbourhood planning including public consultation. To be compliant with current guidance on staying at home and away from others, our Neighbourhood Plan must be prepared in a way that continues to promote effective community engagement by means which are reasonably practicable. Appropriate methods include digital consultations, video	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				and dependent upon the new regulations and how they may affect use of the buildings. If you may have a need please let me know by replying to this email.	conferencing, social media and providing documents for inspection on a public website.	
Dr Edward Hugh Mackay	0	General		I have done my best to see / read the Markfield Neighbourhood plan currently in revision but it is an enormous mass of information which is very hard to take in "on-line". I responded to the postal query last year and doubt In have much to add I am impressed by the amount of detail your group have put into the current version but cannot find anywhere to make specific comments. Broadly speaking I support most of the "high-lighted" parts of the current draft showing the intent to limit the amount of extra housing to manageable numbers and location, to preserve the green space around the village, to control as far as possible the traffic through the village. I have lived in Markfield since 1978 and worked at Leicester General Hospital for 25 years before retiring and have enjoyed my time here. Best wishes to all who have given their time to revise the District plan.	Noted	**No change**

Markfield Neighbourhood Plan: Consideration of Representations

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Iain Darby	0	General		I found this to be a thoroughly researched plan coming to a well balanced and pragmatic outline of how to meet our future needs but still retain the essential character and nature of our neighbourhood. I and my wife completely support it.	Noted	**No change**
Barry Mingay				The planning of construction for housing and employment opportunities in the future has been considered with a great deal of sympathy for the village nature and our district. You are to be congratulated.	Noted	**No change**
Christine Oakes	0	General		I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan by Markfield Parish Council. It will keep the required housing all in the most efficient area of the Markfield parish and will involve a building company who is already familiar with this area and community.	Noted	**No change**
Mike Stevens	0	General		I have been looking through the pre-submission draft of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. I would like some points of clarification and Margaret Bowler has passed on your email address as somebody who might be able to help. Firstly, can I say how much I appreciate all the work that the group has done in	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				putting this together – certainly no mean achievement.		
Michael Stevens	0	General		A very big thanks to those who have obviously put a lot of time and effort into developing the plan and it forms an excellent basis for the future direction of developments in the village.	Noted	**No change**
Patrick Godden	0	General		The plan is good and robust and will protect Markfield from any further big developers putting up unattainable houses	Noted	**No change**
Natural England	0	General		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. Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councilsor Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made. Natural England does not have any	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.		
Dr Luke Evans MP	0	General		The Office of Dr Luke Evans MP has been contacted by a Markfield resident, who expressed concerns that the emerging Markfield Neighbourhood Development Plan is not adhering to the results of the Community Questionnaire in relation to the preferred sites for development. In particular the constituent mention a sizeable proposed development on landed bounded by south London Road, Croftway, Birchfield Avenue and Doctor Wright Close. I appreciate that as is often the case with such plans that it is not possible to please everyone all of the time, hence why I have contacted yourselves for your views and to give you the opportunity to provide me with an	All representations and comments received will be considered by Markfield Parish Council and may be used to amend the Pre-Submission Draft of the Plan. Following this, a Consultation Statement, including a summary of all comments received and how these were considered, will be made available on the Parish Council website. The Plan will then be submitted to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council for publication and, under Regulation 16 of the	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				overview of the process before I respond to the constituent. To close I would like to thank everyone involved in the Neighbourhood Plan process for their dedication and hard work, as they require a great deal of time and effort.	Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, a further six-week public consultation will take place before it is sent to an Independent Examiner. The Examiner will either recommend that: ▫ the Plan is submitted to a referendum; ▫ is modified to meet the 'Basic Conditions' and then submitted to a referendum; or that ▫ the Plan is refused. If the Examiner is satisfied, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council will arrange a referendum. If the Plan is approved by a simple majority of those voting in the referendum, the Borough Council will adopt it.	
Anne-Marie Mingay	0	General		I find the content of the plan far more acceptable than I anticipated. The prepared allowance for our expansion and for a range of different	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				housing should help satisfy the changing needs of our area.		
Barry Mingay	0	General		Generally I think you have served our village well and I thank you.	Noted	**No change**
Mark Williams	0	General		I support this plan, it meets the government's need for additional housing, whilst retaining and protecting the character of Markfield village.	Noted	**No change**
Joan Callaghan	0	General		I support the Parish Plan as it meets the requirements of the village admirably.	Noted	**No change**
Christopher Waters	0	General		I support the neighbourhood plan because it meets of the village.	Noted	**No change**
Christopher Callaghan	0	General		I support the Parish Neighbourhood Plan it meets all our presnt and forseeable needs.	Noted	**No change**
Trustees of Markfield Community Library	0	General		The Trustees of Markfield Community Library (MCL) would like to congratulate those responsible for the production of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan document. The document is thorough and comprehensive and clearly the product of a considerable amount of effort. We are also grateful for the recognition given to the role that MCL plays in contributing to village life.	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Anne Waters	0	General		I support the neighbourhood plan because it meets the existing needs of our village perfectly.	Noted	**No change**
Brian Waring	0	General		I support this plan, because on balance, it meets the Government's need for additional housing whilst still retaining and protecting the character of Markfield village	Noted	**No change**
Newtown Linford Parish Council	0	General		Newtown Linford Parish Council have considered the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan and congratulate you on a comprehensive report which has clearly taken a lot of time and hard work.	Noted	**No change**
Highways England	0	General		Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan which has been produced for public consultation and covers the period of 2020 to 2036. 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. Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan, Highways England's principal interest is in safeguarding the operation of the M1 Motorway which routes through the Plan area, and the A46 Trunk Road which routes approximately 3 miles to the southeast from the Plan area.		
Highways England	0	General		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 Markfield Parish is required to be in conformity with the adopted Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan (2006-2026) and this is acknowledged within the document. It is stated that the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has been created in line with the emerging Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan for the period up to 2036. However, it is also recognised that, as the new Local Plan will not be finalised until 2021 at the earliest, there may be a need to review the Neighbourhood Plan once the Local Pan has been adopted.	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
The Coal Authority	0	General		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. Our records indicate that there are no recorded risks from past coal mining activity at shallow depth in the Neighbourhood Plan area, or surface coal resource present. On this basis we have no specific comments to make in respect of the plan proposed. In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality it will not be necessary for you to provide The Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements. The Coal Authority wishes the Neighbourhood Plan team every success with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	0	General		Some plans require a Strategic Environmental Assessment and/or a Habitat Regulations Assessment. Markfield NDP has undertaken a screening and it was determined that a full SEA was not required to comply with this basic condition.	Noted	**No change**
Leicestershire County Council	0	General		Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) Information for Neighbourhood Planning groups regarding Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) can be found on the Neighbourhood Planning website (www.neighbourhoodplanning.org) and should be referred to. As taken from the website, a Neighbourhood Plan must meet certain basic conditions in order to be 'made'. It must not breach and be otherwise compatible with EU obligations. One of these obligations is Directive 2001/42/EC 'on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment' (Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations, 2004, available online). This is often referred to as the SEA Directive. Not every Neighbourhood Plan needs a SEA, however, it is	Some plans require a Strategic Environmental Assessment and/or a Habitat Regulations Assessment. A screening assessment of the Draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has been undertaken which concludes that a full SEA is not required to comply with this basic condition.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				compulsory to provide when submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority either: · A statement of reasons as to why SEA was not required · An environmental report (a key output of the SEA process). As the UK prepares to leave the EU in 2020, Neighbourhood Planning groups should remain mindful of any future changes which may occur to the above guidance.		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	0	General		The need for evidence is outlined in Planning Practice Guidance and this sets out that proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. Planning policies need to be based on clear planning rationale and proper understanding of the place they relate to, if they are to be relevant, realistic and to address local issues effectively. The data and analysis about a place is called the evidence base. This can include social, economic and environmental data. From the information provided in the Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan website there appears to be gap in evidence which underpins this Neighbourhood Plan. The LPA have	The Draft Neighbourhood Plan is based on proportionate, robust evidence, however this has not been yet published online. National policy indicates that local communities can identify, through neighbourhood plans, green areas of particular importance to them for special protection as Local Green Space ('LGS'). Areas designated as LGS will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. This is a very strong	**The Parish Council's website be amended to include the Neighbourhood Plan evidence base.** **Review proposed Local Green Spaces to ensure they meet relevant criteria.** **Evidence supporting the designation of Features of Local Heritage Interest**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				raised this outside of the formal consultation process in regards to certain elements of this Plan. It may be that evidence has been produced but not been made publically available through this consultation. Either way, all evidence produced to support a Neighbourhood Plan must be made available to view, during this Covid-19 Lockdown 2.0 period it is acceptable that this is made available online. The Neighbourhood Plan Group should make the evidence base a priority as part of the preparation of the Submission Document. Outlined below is a number of evidence base documents that the LPA have identified are missing from this Regulation 14 consultation: Site Selection Para 6.13 on page 57 makes reference to a site selection process using clearly defined sustainability criteria, however these assessments have not been made publically available. These assessments are a fundamental element of the Plan and respondents should be provided with the opportunity to comment on the site selection process. Local Green Space Designation There is no evidence of an assessment	protection. As a result, national policy and planning policy guidance sets out criteria against which to judge whether or not an area should be designated as LGS. The proposed LGS in the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan need to be fully justified. We have now been advised that the new Local Plan will set out the overall development strategy for Hinckley & Bosworth Borough for the period 2020 to 2039. The new Local Plan will not be finalised until 2022 at the earliest, but in the meantime the Borough Council is encouraging qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans to plan for the period 2020 to 2039 to align with the new Local Plan. We have been advised that the housing figures set out in the adopted Core	**to be compiled and published.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				of the spaces identified as Local Green Space. LGS designations need to be justified against the criteria set out in paragraph 100 of the NPPF: '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'. From the information provided it is not clear how the LGS have been identified, scored and selected or how the LGS relate to these four NPPF criteria and as a result the justification for these designations is questioned. The protection afforded to sites designated as Local Green Spaces is significant, consistent with Green Belt policy and therefore it is important to justify their designation. It appears from the information provided that the LGS designations do not have clear robust	Strategy are out of date and can no longer be relied upon for neighbourhood plan purposes. The emerging Local Plan will set out new figures for parishes however the Local Plan is not sufficiently advanced to do this yet. In the meantime, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council has encouraged groups to explore options to set their own figures. One option is a simple approach of apportioning the overall borough housing need to parishes based on the share of population in those parishes. This is the approach set out in the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 6.5. The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				evidence to support their selection and designation. Locality provide further information in regards to an assessment here. Housing Need Assessment The Borough Council were provided with a copy of the Markfield Housing Needs Assessment in March 2020 as part of the preparation of the Plan, however this document has not been made publically available as part of this consultation process. This is a key part of the Plan and should be made available for comment as part of the Regulation 14 consultation. Non-designated heritage assets The justification for these assets is not included in the Plan, is it contained within supplementary evidence base documents? Please see comments on M9. Renewable Energy There is a blanket restriction of wind turbines in policy M8, is this supported by evidence as to why the Markfield Designated Area is not an appropriate location for wind installations. Local Impact Assessment Threshold Policy M13 introduces the requirement for an impact assessment to be carried out if a proposal exceeds 200m2 of	the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039. The list of Features of Local Heritage Interest (Map 6) has been compiled from the following sources: • Self-guided Village Trail • Markfield Conservation Area Appraisal • Leicestershire & Rutland Historic Environment Record The evidence supporting the designation of Features of Local Heritage Interest needs to be compiled and published. The NPPF makes it clear that a proposed wind energy development involving one or more	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				retail space outside of a neighbourhood/local centre. This is based on a proportionate approach against Policy DM21 of the SADMPDPD. This proportionate approach is contrary to paragraph 89 of the NPPF allows for localised thresholds to be set and the NPPG provides further guidance on this. The NPPG states: 'In setting a locally appropriate threshold it will be important to consider the: · scale of proposals relative to town centres · the existing viability and vitality of town centres · cumulative effects of recent developments · whether local town centres are vulnerable · likely effects of development on any town centre strategy · impact on any other planned investment' Evidence which takes account of the NPPG criteria should be provided.	turbines should not be considered acceptable unless it is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in the development plan; and, following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by the affected local community have been fully addressed and the proposal has their backing. Policy M7 makes it clear that Markfield Neighbourhood Area is not a suitable location for wind turbine installations. When assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of Hinckley Town Centre, Policy DM21 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD requires an impact assessment if the development is over 2,500m2. The Local Plan	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					threshold for an impact assessment would therefore apply to retail provision around five times the size as the largest retail unit in the Local Centre (Co-op). Therefore, a lower threshold would be a more appropriate for Markfield given the size of the existing retail units. The Hinckley & Bosworth Town and District Centres Study does not include Markfield but does recommend an impact assessment threshold of 500 sq.m (gross) should be adopted for all applications for retail and other 'main town centre' uses.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	0	General		There appears to be an issue with the way in which maps have been inserted into the document which has resulted in the images losing clarity or being partially missing. Maps have been individually commented on in the detailed comments sections. During the examination into the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan the Examiner raised concerns in relation to the quality of the mapping and made a number of modifications to improve their quality before the document could proceed to referendum. If the Group compare the Submission and Referendum Versions of the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan you will see a stark difference in the quality and usability of the maps. The recommendations set out in these comments seek to overcome the same issues Burbage NDP Group had during the examination process before it gets to that stage to make the examination process smoother. When maps are inserted into a document it is generally best if they are inserted as a JPEG image and they should not be stretched as this can lose the scale and proportion. All maps must contain the correct	Many of the maps included in the Draft Plan have become stretched or altered so that they are no longer to scale or at the correct proportions.	**All of the maps in the Neighbourhood Plan be inserted at a recognised scale at A4 or A3 size.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				copyright message. The map titles and numbers should be checked against the references within the document as quite often these are incorrectly referenced. It may be beneficial to insert some of your maps on A3 pages or have them as a full A4 map. Consider what base map and scale you are using for the purpose of the map, so that the geographic information you are displaying can be easily interpreted by the users of the document.		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	0	General		In the preparation of neighbourhood plans a number of our Neighbourhood Plan Groups have highlighted non-planning issues or the need for community projects. There are a number of ways these can be included within a Neighbourhood Plan, Sheepy NDP included them as an Appendix whereas Burbage NDP included them as Community Action Points within the relevant document section. The Group may wish to see if there are any actions arising from the plan preparation which you wish to have more prominence similar to Burbage and Sheepy.	The process of preparing the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has highlighted non-planning issues or the need for community projects. This includes things like highways management. These matters will be considered by the Parish Council. They do not form part of the statutory Plan, so are not subject to the independent examination nor referendum.	**Ensure that non-planning issues or the need for community projects are not expressed as planning policies.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	0	General		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.	Noted	**An Equalities Impact Assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan be undertaken.**
Jelson Limited	0	General		Jelson is a family owned Leicester-based housebuilder that has been delivering quality homes and creating communities in the County and wider East Midlands for over 130 years. This has included its recently completed scheme at Lower Grange Farm in Markfield. Jelson is proud of its local heritage and employs over 700 local people across a wide variety of skills and trades. Jelson has been engaging actively with the Neighbourhood Planning Process and we hope that these representations are of assistance in progressing the MNP to the next stage in the process. Jelson is generally supportive of the aspirations of the MNP and in particular supports the proposal to allocate part of its land to the south of Markfield for	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				new housing, open space and associated development. This is an appropriate and sustainable approach to the acknowledged need for significant new housing provision in Hinckley & Bosworth and Markfield.		
Owl Partnerships	0	General		These representations have been prepared by Marrons Planning on behalf of our client, Owl Partnerships. Our client is a modern, privately-owned property developer, specialising in the construction of sustainable high-quality residential dwellings around the Midlands. Owl Partnerships has an interest in land at Ratby Lane, Markfield and this Neighbourhood Plan representation is intended to help shape the Neighbourhood Plan and ensure it meets the basic conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). These representations conclude that, in its current form, the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet some of the basic conditions required for the Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to referendum including: · having regard	A Basic Conditions Statement will be prepared to accompany the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. It will explain how the proposed Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning General Regulations 2012 (as amended) (The Regulations) and how the basic conditions of neighbourhood planning and other considerations as prescribed by Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 have been met.	**A Basic Conditions Statement be prepared.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; · contributing to the achievement of sustainable development; and · being in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area). Owl Partnerships position is that the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet all three basic conditions by: · Pursuing an un-evidenced housing requirement which fails to have regard to an emerging spatial strategy; · Allocating sites without an appropriate site assessment or sustainability appraisal process; and · preventing the achievement of sustainable development		
DCS452	0	General		Pegasus Group are instructed by DCS452 Ltd to make representations in respect of the Pre-Submission Draft of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. DCS452 Ltd control an area of land at Little Shaw Lane adjacent to the former Moto Service Area. As a general comment, we are concerned that the Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet more than two of the standard	A Basic Conditions Statement will be prepared to accompany the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. It will explain how the proposed Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning General Regulations 2012	**A Basic Conditions Statement be prepared.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				conditions required of a Neighbourhood Plan.	(as amended) (The Regulations) and how the basic conditions of neighbourhood planning and other considerations as prescribed by Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 have been met.	
DCS452	0	General		Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) states seven basic conditions that a Draft Neighbourhood Plan is required to meet in order to be put to a referendum to become a 'made' plan. In particular, the basic conditions require a Draft Neighbourhood Plan to "have regard to the national policies" and be "in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority".	A Basic Conditions Statement will be prepared to accompany the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. It will explain how the proposed Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning General Regulations 2012 (as amended) (The Regulations) and how the basic conditions of neighbourhood planning and other considerations as prescribed by Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 have been met.	**A Basic Conditions Statement be prepared.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel)	0	General		C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel) is a steel processing company that produces sheets of steel cut from coils in a variety of sizes to specific customer's requirements, they are one of a small number of companies in the UK to offer this service and the UK's leading next day steel delivery provider. The Company has been based at its Shaw Lane, Markfield site since the 1980s and has working towards consolidating its entire operations at the Shaw Lane site as part of a long-term growth plan. The company currently employs approximately 110 people in Markfield and has ambitious long term investment plans for the site at Markfield. As a general comment, we are concerned that the Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan does not support the local economy of Markfield – specifically the Draft Neighbourhood Plan does not protect all existing employment sites. Set out below is our response to the draft policies and supporting text contained within the Pre Submission Draft of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan, as well as our suggestions on what	A Basic Conditions Statement will be prepared to accompany the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. It will explain how the proposed Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning General Regulations 2012 (as amended) (The Regulations) and how the basic conditions of neighbourhood planning and other considerations as prescribed by Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 have been met.	**A Basic Conditions Statement be prepared.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				could be provided with the Neighbourhood Plan to support the Local Economy.		
C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel)	0	General		Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) states seven basic conditions that a Draft Neighbourhood Plan is required to meet in order to be put to a referendum to become a 'made' plan. In particular, the basic conditions require a Draft Neighbourhood Plan to "have regard to the national policies" and be "in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority".	A Basic Conditions Statement will be prepared to accompany the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. It will explain how the proposed Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning General Regulations 2012 (as amended) (The Regulations) and how the basic conditions of neighbourhood planning and other considerations as prescribed by Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 have been met.	**A Basic Conditions Statement be prepared.**
Leicestershire County Council	3	1.11		Believe the H&BBC Local Plan is currently being updated with the current adopted plan running until 2026. What stage is this at and should the neighbourhood plan reference the emerging local plan? Details may be limited or not yet available however the neighbourhood plan will long	The status of the Local Plan review is set out at paragraphs 1.16 and 1.17. However, these paragraphs may require updating to shaw the current status of the Local Plan review. Further, Hinckley and	**Review paragraphs 1.16 and 1.17 and update if necessary. The Neighbourhood Plan period be**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				outlast the existing Local Plan if it's dated 2006-2026. Covered para 1.16 onwards "Local Plan review…"	Bosworth Borough Council has recently agreed to amend the plan period for the emerging local plan to 2020-2039 (previously the plan was proposed to cover the period 2016-2036). Those currently preparing or reviewing a neighbourhood plan are recommended to assess the potential to align plan periods with the local plan. Aligned plan periods mean there should be closer conformity between the local plan and neighbourhood plans which should help neighbourhood plans progress through examination and meet the basic conditions. This should help minimise the risk of neighbourhood plans being out of date once the local plan is in place.	**amended to align with the emerging Local Plan 2020-2039.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
DCS452	11	3.1		The Draft Neighbourhood Plan at Chapter 3 sets out the three objectives of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). Specifically, the Employment objective looks to: "build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure".	Noted	**No change**
C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel)	11	3.1		The Draft Neighbourhood Plan at Chapter 3 sets out the three objectives of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). Specifically, the Employment objective looks to: "build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure".	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
DCS452	12			Vision Statement contains five broad statements of intent which shape the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and its policies. The fourth broad statement concerns Business and Employment and is detailed below: "To continue to support the local economy, sustaining existing businesses and providing opportunities for business diversification and new businesses to become established on suitable sites in the Parish." Pegasus Group supports this broad statement, and welcomes the support given towards sustaining existing businesses.	Noted	**No change**
C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel)	12			Chapter 3 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan also sets out the Plan's Vision Statement. The Vision Statement contains five broad statements of intent which shape the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and its policies. The fourth broad statement concerns Business and Employment and is detailed below: "To continue to support the local economy, sustaining existing businesses and providing opportunities for business diversification and new businesses to become established on suitable sites in the Parish." C.J Upton & Sons Ltd supports this	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				broad statement, and welcomes the support given towards sustaining existing businesses.		
C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel)	12			National planning policy is as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (2019) whilst the Development Plan for the area consists of the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy DPD (adopted 2009) and the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (adopted 2016). Paragraph 1.8 of the Markfield Draft Neighbourhood Plan recognises these requirements. The Framework at Chapter 6 encourages policies to create conditions where businesses can invest, expand and adapt, placing significant weight on the need to support economic growth and productivity taking into account local business needs. Whilst Draft Policy M21 achieves this for the Markfield Industrial Estate, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan does not ensure support for all businesses within Markfield, nor does it contain any policy direction or support for a business to invest in the area outside of the Markfield Industrial Estate. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan and its	The Qualifying Body is aware of several proposals for large-scale employment sites close to junction 22 of the M1. These have been considered by the 2020 Employment Land and Premises Review. The allocation of such large employment sites needs to be made in the context of the broader strategic priorities of the Borough while addressing cross-boundary issues and the need for major improvements in infrastructure. Such strategic matters are beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Neighbourhood Plan needs to explain and facilitate the allocation of strategic employment land.	**A new policy and supporting text be added which addresses strategic employment growth and Policies DM4 and DM20 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. Policy M1 (Countryside) be amended accordingly.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				policies are therefore inconsistent with the NPPF, subsequently failing to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan. Spatial Objective 1 of the adopted Core Strategy illustrates how the Borough can achieve a strong and diverse economy through providing sufficient, sustainably located, good quality land and premises. The Objective directs smaller scale employment towards the Key Rural Centres, which include Markfield, to support the rural areas of the Borough. As previously stated, C.J Upton & Sons Ltd is a long-term employer in Markfield Parish and the Borough of Hinckley and Bosworth, and has continually contributed to the growth of the Borough's rural economy. Sustainably located in close proximity to the strategic road network (junction 22 of the M1), delivering a successful and unique business, C.J Upton & Sons Ltd strengthens and diversifies the economy of the Borough, as sought by Spatial Objective 1. Yet the Draft Neighbourhood Plan fails to support all existing businesses within the Parish of Markfield and does not pay regard to Spatial Objective 1. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan and its policies	The C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel) site is currently the subject of an undetermined hybrid planning application 18/00658/HYB. The application has a resolution to permit subject to a S106 however there is no decision notice. In considering the application, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council concluded that the proposals do not make a significant contribution to economic growth and job creation within the Borough and do not lead to the enhancement of the immediate area. Therefore, the proposal was not considered to be sustainable development in the countryside in conflict with Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. In these	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				therefore do not conform with the Adopted Core Strategy, subsequently failing to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan. Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD seeks to protect the countryside, but to achieve consistency with the objectives of the Framework, provides opportunities and strict criteria where economic investment can be possible in the Countryside. Within the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, Draft Policy M1 similarly seeks to protect the countryside. Yet Draft Policy M1 does not accord with adopted Policy DM4. Where Policy DM4 identifies development that significantly contributes to economic growth, job creation and/or diversification of rural businesses as sustainable development within the countryside, Draft Policy M1 does not follow the same approach. Draft Policy M1 states that only the diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses in accordance with draft Policy M23 (Business Conversion of Rural Buildings) can be considered sustainable development in the countryside. The	circumstances, set in the countryside and outside of any settlement boundary development conflicts with the strategic approach to the provision of employment development which weighs against the application. Notwithstanding this, the proposals support the continued growth of an existing business in the rural area and in accordance with paragraph 80 and 84 of the NPPF significant weight is attributed to enabling economic growth taking into account existing local business needs and performance. Both elements of the proposal are to meet the operational needs of Upton Steel and so with adequate conditions the requirements of Policy DM20 to locate new employment in the most sustainable locations in a	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Draft Neighbourhood Plan and its policies are therefore inconsistent with the approach taken by Policy DM4 and the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD, subsequently failing to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan. Overall, it has been demonstrated that the Markfield Pre Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan fails to pay regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and fails to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted Development Plan. Therefore, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan does not meet two of the seven basic conditions a Neighbourhood Plan needs to fulfil in order to progress to a referendum. Notwithstanding this, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is also contrary to its own Vision Statement. To remedy this, we suggest the Draft Neighbourhood Plan includes a policy that is consistent with adopted Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD which balances economic benefits with landscape impact.	sequential manner do not apply to this application.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Caddick Land	12			Land at Cliffe Hill Farm, M 1 J 22 Markfield, represents an excellent opportunity to bring forward a strategically located employment site to meet the needs of Hinckley and Bosworth and to make a significant contribution to supply. The site benefits from unrivalled access to the strategic road network and is well located to provide employment opportunities and investment into the Key Rural Centre of Markfield The site has the potential to accommodate high value storage and distribution units (B 8 as it has immediate access to the strategic road network as well as a flexibility for B 1 /B 2 accommodation given the changing nature of employment floorspace where occupiers want greater flexibility of use. Initial technical and environmental appraisals of the site have demonstrated that the site is deliverable. Agreements between the owners and Caddick mean the site can be brought forward at the earliest opportunity to respond to market demand.	The Qualifying Body is aware of several proposals for large-scale employment sites close to junction 22 of the M1. These have been considered by the 2020 Employment Land and Premises Review. The allocation of such large employment sites needs to be made in the context of the broader strategic priorities of the Borough while addressing cross-boundary issues and the need for major improvements in infrastructure. Such strategic matters are beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Neighbourhood Plan needs to explain and facilitate the allocation of strategic employment land.	**A new policy and supporting text be added which addresses strategic employment growth and Policies DM4 and DM20 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. Policy M1 (Countryside) be amended accordingly.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	13		M1	In the recent Burbage Examiner's Report it was recommended that where the NDP makes reference to adopted Borough Council Local Plan policies these should removed as they repeat policy. This recommendation was agreed and taken forward. The Borough Council believes that criteria 1 of policy M1 is unnecessary as it repeats existing policy and does not provide any additional detail. If the Group would like to keep a reference to DM14 and DM15 this could be included in the supporting text as an alternative. As highlighted above, making reference to other neighbourhood plan policies is repetitive and it is recommended that references to policy codes are removed. As an alternative the group could consider the following: Amend criteria 2 to - Infill housing development Amend criteria 3 to - Development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses Amend criteria 4 to - Brownfield Development Amend criteria 6 to - Renewable energy If the group feel it would be beneficial to retain the reference to the policies this could be included outside of the	Policy M1 is consistent with the 'made' Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policy S1. The text 'development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers' is confusing and has not been formatted properly. Development by statutory undertakers is generally acceptable in the Countryside as are activities 4-6.	**Modify Policy M1: Countryside by:** • **Deleting 'Development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers'; and** • **Replace criterion 5 and 6 with:** ***5. Recreation and tourism provided it can be demonstrated that the proposed scheme cannot be provided within or adjacent to settlement boundaries;*** ***6. Renewable energy in accordance with Policy M7; and*** ***7. Development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers.***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				policy as supporting text. The policy states that 'The following types of development may be considered sustainable'. The word 'may' open the policy up to challenge and misinterpretation; it is recommended the wording is amended from 'may' to 'will'. Criteria 4-6 of the policy would only apply if a planning application were submitted by a statutory undertaker or a public utility provider. The Town and Country Plan Act (1990) defines statutory undertakers as: 'persons authorised by any enactment to carry on any railway, light railway, tramway, road transport, water transport, canal, inland navigation, dock, harbour, pier or lighthouse undertaking or any undertaking for the supply of hydraulic power and a relevant airport operator'. A public utility provider can be defined as: Businesses that provide the public with necessities, such as water, electricity, natural gas, and telephone and telegraph communication. The limitation of these criteria to the above bodies does not achieve sustainable development and would be problematic to apply at the planning application stage; the LPA would not be able to		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				restrict applicants for such uses to only these bodies. An example of where this policy is overly restrictive is if a planning application were to be submitted for a tourism facility which supports the role of the National Forest it would be considered unsustainable if it were submitted by someone who wasn't a statutory undertaker or utility body. It is suggested that this is reconsidered and there is potential that this would fail basic condition a) sustainable development as renewable energy and recreation and tourism would be considered unsustainable in the countryside if it were to be submitted by someone other than a statutory undertaker or utility provider.		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	13		M1	It is also queried that Development by statutory undertakers is read as a title or whether this should be an individual point in the policy. How has the settlement boundary changed compared to what is included in the Borough Council's Local Plan. The NDP should expand on how the settlement boundary has changed. As highlighted by a neighbourhood plan examiner in recent examinations (See the Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan	The text 'development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers' is confusing and has not been formatted properly. Development by statutory undertakers is generally acceptable in the Countryside as are activities 4-6. A Settlement Boundary Methodology has been	**Modify Policy M1: Countryside by:** • **Deleting 'Development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers'; and** • **Replace criterion 5 and 6 with:**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Examiner's Report), Neighbourhood Plans must clearly set out where settlement boundaries have changed and how. Perhaps highlighting what methodology was used to determine the new boundary. See HBBC's Settlement Boundary Revision Topic Paper as an example methodology.	prepared but has no been published to the website.	***5. Recreation and tourism provided it can be demonstrated that the proposed scheme cannot be provided within or adjacent to settlement boundaries;*** ***6. Renewable energy in accordance with Policy M7; and*** ***7. Development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers.*** **All of the evidence supporting the Neighbourhood Plan should be published on the website.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Jelson Limited	13		M1	Policy M1 'Countryside' appears to unnecessarily repeat Policy DM4 of the SADMDPD and risks conflicting with and being more restrictive than policies in the Development Plan. If the intention is for Policy M1 to allow additional forms of development in countryside, over and above those identified in the SADPD, then the policy should, in our view, be amended to refer only to those forms of development which would be considered appropriate in the countryside in addition to those already supported by Policy DM4.	Policy M1 is consistent with the 'made' Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policy S1. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD Policies DM14 and DM15 are not duplicated. They are simply cross-referenced in Policy M1.	**No change**
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	13		M1	It is important that any future development associated with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education can come forward on the existing campus and on the two adjacent plots of land (Plots A and B). This will ultimately allow a more compact, efficient and sustainable pattern of growth to materialise on the campus because it will enable the campus to operate as a central educational hub. This is recognised by Policy M12 which supports educational related development on the campus. As the campus is located outside the defined Settlement Boundary for Markfield, it is	Plot A is currently the subject of a full planning application for 48 dwellings (Ref: 20/00848/FUL). The proposal is unrelated to the Markfield Institute of Higher Education and at 05/12/2020 remains undetermined. The application is not supported by Markfield Parish Council. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan.	**Modify Policy M1: Countryside by adding an additional criterion:** ***Educational related development associated with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education in accordance with Policy M12.***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				respectfully requested that the wording of Policy M1 is amended to clarify that educational related development associated with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education can come forward on land situated outside the Markfield Settlement Boundary on both the existing campus and on the two adjacent parcels of land. Amend the wording to clarify that educational related development associated with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education can come forward outside the Settlement Boundary on both the existing campus and on the two adjacent parcels of land (Plot A and Plot B).	Planning permission was refused for 'the use of vacant land to provide extension of existing conference / educational centre with the erection of two storey teaching, administration, residential and sports hall buildings' in November 1999 (99/00697/OUT). In January 2001 planning permission was refused for 'the use of vacant land to provide extension of existing conference/ educational centre with the erection of two storey library extension / residential and sports hall' (00/01087/OUT). This application was subsequently was dismissed at appeal in September 2001 (APP/K2420/A/01/ 1058646). The development of plots A and B conflicts with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education's countryside location and	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					development here would constitute an undesirable intrusion of built development into the open countryside to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the landscape. However, there is inconsistency between Policy M1 and M12 that needs to be resolved.	
DCS452	13		M1	Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD seeks to protect the countryside, but to achieve consistency with the objectives of the Framework, provides opportunities and strict criteria where economic investment can be possible in the Countryside. Within the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, Draft Policy M1 similarly seeks to protect the countryside. Yet Draft Policy M1 does not accord with adopted Policy DM4. Where Policy DM4 identifies development that significantly contributes to economic growth, job creation and/or diversification of rural businesses as sustainable development within the countryside, Draft Policy M1 does not follow the same approach.	The Qualifying Body is aware of several proposals for large-scale employment sites close to junction 22 of the M1. These have been considered by the 2020 Employment Land and Premises Review. The allocation of such large employment sites needs to be made in the context of the broader strategic priorities of the Borough while addressing cross-boundary issues and the need for major improvements in infrastructure.	**A new policy and supporting text be added which addresses strategic employment growth and Policies DM4 and DM20 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. Policy M1 (Countryside) be amended accordingly.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Draft Policy M1 states that only the diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses in accordance with draft Policy M23 (Business Conversion of Rural Buildings) can be considered sustainable development in the countryside. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan and its policies are therefore inconsistent with the approach taken by Policy DM4 and the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD, subsequently failing to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan.		
Michael Stevens	13		M1	Finally, I am supportive of all the policies you put forward. In particular M1 (page 13) protecting the countryside outside the Settlement Boundary and M4 (page 20/21).	Noted	**No change**
Anne-Marie Mingay	13	4.2		Encouraging the use of smaller agricultural plots for equestrian use would also keep the flavour of the countryside in the area and encourage our fauna and flora.	Unlike farms, equine facilities do not have any agricultural permitted development rights, meaning that most development requires planning consent. This is because horses kept for recreation, sport and business are not classed as an agricultural activity.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					The only horses classified as agricultural are horses used as part of a farming business to, for example pull a plough. Neighbourhood Plan Policy M1 in general supports recreation in the countryside.	
Leicestershire County Council	13			With regard to the environment and in line with Government 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.	All these matters are addressed by the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. The Environment section (Section 4) deals with landscape, green infrastructure, biodiversity, climate change etc. Agricultural land, soils and brownfield land were important considerations in the selection of our preferred development site.	**No change**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	14			It is recommended that the map is focused more on the settlement boundary, it is not necessary to cover the whole of the designated area. As presented it is difficult to interpret the exact boundary and this would be problematic at the planning application stage. The map should be presented on	Agreed.	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size. Map labelling to be consistent.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				a larger scale base map and be more focused for clarity. An A3 map may also aid interpretation. This map is referred to as a map where as other maps are labelled as figures. There should be consistency in the labelling, for example all maps and diagrams be labelled as figures. This was a modification in the recent Burbage Examiner's Report.		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	15			This map has lost clarity, there is no scale and the copyright and place names can not be read. The quality of the map should be improved so it is clear where the Charnwood Forest lies. This map is referred to as a figure where as other maps are labelled as maps. There should be consistency in the labelling, for example all maps and diagrams be labelled as figures. This was an outcome of the recent Burbage Examination.	Agreed.	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size. Map labelling to be consistent.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	15			The County Council would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account Natural England's Landscape character areas; Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy; the Local District/Borough Council landscape character assessments and the Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study for Leicester and Leicestershire (2017) which examines the sensitivity of the landscape, exploring the extent to which different areas can accommodate development without impacting on their key landscape qualities. 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.	The 2019 Charnwood Forest Landscape Character Assessment reviews and refines the original Charnwood Forest Landscape Character Assessment (2008), but also intended to be used as a tool for future decision making. The overall character of Charnwood Forest is of a rolling landscape with an elevated topography and areas of woodland and agriculture closely related to geology and hydrology. There are contrasts between upland and lowland, which is closely associated with watercourses and water features within the area. The 2019 Landscape Character Assessment identified 11 distinctive Landscape Character Areas. Markfield village lies within Area 6: Thringstone/Markfield Quarries and Settlement, although other parts of the	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Parish lie in other Character areas.	
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	16			This map has lost clarity, there is no scale, or copyright, place names and the legend are blurred and difficult to read. The base map could be improved to aid its interpretation. This map is referred to as a figure where as other maps are labelled as maps. There should be consistency in the labelling, for example all maps and diagrams be labelled as figures. This was an outcome of the recent Burbage Examination.	Agreed.	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size. Map labelling to be consistent.**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	18		M2	Bullet point 5 indicates the importance of a number of views and vistas; this would be difficult to be applied to a planning application without them being mapped. What are the important views and vistas in these locations? If they are a wide 'hilltop' view then the wider area views will unlikely be uninterrupted unless there was high-	Agreed	**The important views and vistas at bullet point 5 be properly evidenced and explained.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				rise development proposed, which is unlikely. This is something which was discussed in detail at the recent Burbage NDP examination and a map was inserted (see figure 27, page 66 of the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan Referendum Version)		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	19	4.18		The Borough Council have recently published a new Green Infrastructure Study (September 2020) and it is recommended that this chapter is updated as the 2008 Study is now redundant.	Noted.	**The Green Infrastructure section of the Markfield neighbourhood Plan be updated to take account of the Hinckley and Bosworth Green Infrastructure Strategy 2020**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	19			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 bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls. 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	Paragraphs 4.16 to 4.25 of the Draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan concern Green Infrastructure.	**No change.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				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. 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.		
Jelson Limited	19		M3	Policy M3 'National Forest' appears to unnecessarily repeat Policy 21 in the adopted Core Strategy which sets out the requirements for new developments within the National Forest.	Agreed. The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan should avoid unnecessary duplication of policies.	**Policy M3 be deleted.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	19		M3	A number and title needs to be added to this policy. New developments – needs defining as this encompasses almost everything even house extensions, dropped kerb as these are classed as development. Need better definition, there is something in the text above but it needs to be within the policy for clarity. Should it just refer to national forest planting guidelines, this then allows for any update to these if there was one and avoiding the policy to become out of date. Identifies off-site planting within the neighbourhood area only, this isn't justified as it is not clear if any areas are available within the Neighbourhood Area for offsite planting? Possibly could add a sequential approach to try and get it within the neighbourhood areas first and then if they can't achieve that then it needs to be within the National Forest Area.	The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan should avoid unnecessary duplication of policies. Policy M3 effectively repeats Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy Policy 21.	**Policy M3 be deleted.**
Newtown Linford Parish Council	20		M4	Newtown Linford Parish Councillors are also in support of any opportunity to develop a multi-user greenway, linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Markfield, Newtown Linford and Thornton.	Noted	**No change.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Michael Stevens	20		M4	Finally, I am supportive of all the policies you put forward. In particular M1 (page 13) protecting the countryside outside the Settlement Boundary and M4 (page 20/21). For the latter, we are very fortunate with FP and other routes as shown in Map 3. However, many are inaccessible to young, elderly, etc since to access them requires walking on roads with no pavements and which are very busy (including HGVs) and I think that opening up access should be given more emphasis.	The maintenance of Public Rights of Way is the responsibility of the Highways Authority and falls outside the scope of our Neighbourhood Plan.	**No change**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	20		M4	Most of these points are aims and objectives – should this be moved to a community action aim rather than a policy similar to the Burbage NDP. The London Road sentence could possibly be a policy. What is the evidence for the policy and are they deliverable? Green infrastructure what is this and how is it defined as a lot in the policy appears to be about sustainable travel option. In Core Strategy we have Green Infrastructure policies and its green spaces and habitats not transport and access. This needs to be consistent.	Agreed.	**Policy M4 be revised to remove non-planning issues, ensure consistency with Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy Policy 20 and the Hinckley and Bosworth Green Infrastructure Strategy 2020.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Jelson Limited	20		M4	Policy M4 'Green Infrastructure' includes text relating specifically relating to Green Infrastructure provision on Land South of London Road. This unnecessarily duplicates the text in Policy M16 which includes various site-specific requirements in relation to Green Infrastructure provision within the site. The general text should, therefore, be removed from Policy M4. In addition, we note that the map on page 21 of the draft MNP suggests that 'Vine Cottage' is 'Local Green Infrastructure' but it is actually a private residential dwelling and garden. This should be corrected.	Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4 should not duplicate Policy M16. When viewed from the west - from Right of Way on either side of the M1 the existing tree group at the Vine Cottage site stands-out from the adjoining hedgerows etc. It's a visual reference point. When walking public footpath R29 the tree grouping on that site complements the mature hedges found alongside that Right of Way. Therefore, Vine Cottage should be retained as part of the Local Green Infrastructure network.	**Policy M4 be revised to remove reference to the development of land south of London Road.**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	21			The map appears to be stretched and is difficult to interpret. It is recommended that the Group look at Figure 21, page 47 of the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan Referendum Version and follow a similar format. This map is larger in size and uses a different base map. All spaces are numbered and labelled on the Plan making it easier for interpretation. This	Agreed.	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size. Map labelling to be consistent.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				map was a result of a modification in the Examiner's Report.		
Leicestershire County Council	22			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 clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, providing net gain for biodiversity, 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 or management of open spaces on enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity, such as hedgerows and greenways. Also, habitat permeability for habitats and species which addresses encouragement of movement from one location to another	Biodiversity information is based on data contained in the Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC).	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				such as the design of street lighting, roads, noise, obstructions in water, exposure of species to predation and arrangement of land-uses. 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.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	24			The map appears to be stretched and is difficult to interpret. It is recommended that the Group look at Figure 21, page 47 of the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan Referendum Version and follow a similar format. This map is larger in size and uses a different base map. All spaces are numbered and labelled on the Plan making it easier for interpretation. This map was a result of a modification in the Examiner's Report. The designated Area boundary should be included in the legend. The acronym RIGS should be in full, or are these Local Nature Reserves? There are no Local Nature Reserves shown on the map but they are included in the legend as a pink site.	Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) are shown on the Map on page 24 and the notation is explained in paragraph 4.27. The Local Nature Reserve is shown on the map but is overlayed by the Local Wildlife Site notation.	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size. Map labelling to be consistent. Amend Local Wildlife Site Notation so that Local Nature Reserve designation is more visible.**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	25		M5	The policy refers to Map 3, should it refer to Map 4? Last two points could be argued they aren't necessary to make the development acceptable, for example a tree coming to the end of its life would be a loss irrespective of development. Maybe these last 2 points should be something to consider in the landscaping of a scheme and could be placed in the text? National Planning policy sets out an	Tree planting and the provision of stock fencing will contribute to biodiversity enhancement and should be retained. Only Billa Barra Hill is designated by Natural England as a Local Nature Reserve.	**Map labelling to be consistent. Amend Local Wildlife Site Notation so that Local Nature Reserve designation is more visible.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				expectation that planning policy should distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and local designated wildlife sites, as well as to identify wildlife corridors and steppingstones. This policy sets out to achieve this by identifying Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites. It would be beneficial to make it clear that Billa Barra Hill; Hill Hole Quarry and Alter Stones are all Local Nature Reserves by including the designation title before their listing, similar to what the policy does for Local Wildlife Sites.		
Jelson Limited	25		M5	Policy M5 'Ecology and Biodiversity' states that development should not harm the network of ecological features and habitats listed. To be consistent with national policy, Policy M5 should be amended to reflect the mitigation hierarchy in paragraph 175 of the NPPF (i.e. allow for situations where if significant harm cannot be avoided for impacts to be mitigated and/or compensated for). It also states that new development "will be expected to maintain and enhance" these features. However, to ensure consistency with national policy it is considered that the wording should be amended to state that new	Agreed.	**Policy M5: Ecology and Biodiversity be modified as follows:** **First sentence to be replaced by:** ***New development will be expected to maintain and where possible enhance the following and other ecological corridors and landscape features (such as watercourses,***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				development will be expected to "maintain and where possible enhance…".		***hedgerows and treelines):*** **The following text be deleted:** ***New development will be expected to maintain and enhance these and other ecological corridors and landscape features (such as watercourses, hedgerows and treelines).***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	26		M6	Paragraph 4.37 refers to an Appendix 1; however there is not an Appendix 1 to the NDP. LGS designations need to justified against the criteria set out in paragraph 100 of the NPPF: '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'. From the information provided it is not clear how the LGS have been identified, scored and selected or how the LGS relate to these four NPPF criteria and as a result the justification for these designations is questioned. The protection afforded to sites designated as Local Green Spaces is significant, consistent with Green Belt policy and therefore it is important to justify their designation. It appears from the	Agree.	**Review proposed Local Green Spaces to ensure they meet relevant criteria. All the evidence supporting the Neighbourhood Plan should be published on the website. Appendix 1 should include a summary of the justification for designation.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				information provided that the LGS designations do not have clear robust evidence to support their selection and designation. With the exception of the Two Upper Greens (LGS I) all of the LGS are identified as Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and are protected by policy DM8 within this DPD. If it can not be demonstrated that these open spaces meet the NPPF LGS test they are still protected. Need justification for these sites to warrant LGS status. The majority of these spaces do not need designating as Local Green Space as they are already protected; this is not the point of a Local Green Space. They are existing parks should this be changed to a play and open space policy/Play provision to discuss retention and enhancement? LGS should be areas which are not protected such as an area that is well used and accessible but isn't a formal park. LGS J is not shown on the map.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Stephen Haymes	26	4.37		I would like to comment on the Local Green Spaces in paragraphs 4.37, 4.38 and Policy M6 (pages 26-27). In my opinion there is potential to do more with these spaces in relation to promoting wildlife and improve biodiversity. I consider that for the most part they are not used and only offer grassed areas that need to be cut regularly at a cost to the Council. I suggest that a minimum of 30% of the Local Green Spaces should be set aside for wild flowers / additional planting. This would still allow public access for playing / walking over the remaining 70%. Policy M6 only deals with protection of the green spaces against development. I suggest an additional statement within this Policy or elsewhere in the Plan which endeavours to enhance wildlife and biodiversity specifically within the Local Green Spaces. This initiative would link favourably with relevant National / County / Local policies in this area.	The comments are noted, however the management of Local Green Space is not a planning matter.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	27	4.39		The County Council through its Environment Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire's resilience to the existing and predicted changes in climate. Furthermore, LCC has declared a climate emergency along with most other UK councils. The County Council has committed to becoming carbon neutral as a council by 2030 and to working with others to keep global temperature rise to less than 1.5 degrees Celsius, which will mean in effect needing to achieve carbon neutrality for Leicestershire by 2050 or before. Planning is one of the key levers for enabling these commitments to be met and to meeting the legally binding target set by the government for the UK to be carbon neutral by 2050. Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and to increasing the county's resilience to climate change.	Noted. Climate change is now the greatest challenge facing our society. Our Neighbourhood Plan supports the transition to a low-carbon society, engaging communities and enabling environmentally friendly choices in everything from energy to transport.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	29		M7	The supporting text highlights the importance of renewable energy is for reducing the impact of climate change but policy is quite restrictive in how renewable energy can be achieved. A blanket assumption that Markfield Neighbourhood Area is not suitable for wind turbine installations does not promote sustainable development and is contrary to basic condition a). Is this backed by evidence? Justification for no wind turbines at all should be given to support this policy restriction. The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD does not contain a policy on wind turbines, it directs applicants to the NPPF and NPPG. The NPPG gives detailed guidance on the assessment of wind turbine applications to enable the approval of such installations in appropriate places Has an assessment of available brownfield sites or non-agricultural land available to solar farms been undertaken? This policy is restrictive and should be removed. There is a 'get out' in the policy 'wherever possible'; however the inclusion of this gives an expectation which isn't realistic.	With respect to the development of wind turbines although the NPPF recognises that the community has a responsibility to increase the use of supply of green energy, it provides the view that the need for renewable energy does not automatically override environmental protections and the planning concerns of local communities. Local Planning Authorities can only grant planning permission for wind farm development if it is sited in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. However, guidance does not state that a Neighbourhood Plan must identify suitable areas. Consultation responses received during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan illustrated that the	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					majority of the responses received objected to the development of wind turbines and wind farms. In light of the views of the local community no areas are proposed as being suitable for wind energy development. Planning Practice Guidance provides guidance on solar farm development and recognises that large scale solar farms can have a negative impact on the rural environment, particularly undulating landscapes. Criterion 1 supports solar farm development on non-agricultural land as well as brownfield land, in conformity with the relevant Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The PPG also identifies other factors to be taken into account, such as, the conservation of heritage assets in an appropriate manner, visual impact of this type of	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					development, and the need for installations to be removed when they are no longer in use and the land is restored to its previous use. Policy M7 has been prepared taking these factors into account.	
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	31		M8	It is recommended that this policy is expanded to include all new residential developments. This is something which is contained within The Good Design Guide SPD. The LPA can and have secured conditions to secure this. Supported by Policy DM10 of the SADMP DPD.	Agree.	**Policy M8: Electric Vehicle Chargepoints be replaces as follows:** ***Every new dwelling with an associated dedicated car parking space that is within the site boundary of the building should have a chargepoint. Residential development with communal parking areas and non-residential developments providing 10 car***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
						parking spaces or more should install at least one 7 kW (or more) electric vehicle chargepoint and cable routes for electric vehicle chargepoint cabling for one in five spaces.
Leicestershire County Council	31	4.54		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	Noted. The Neighbourhood Area has an elevated landform that slopes steeply away from the edge of Markfield village. There is no fluvial flood risk posed to Markfield. Surface water flow paths follow the topography from high ground to lower ground in the south. In the 30-year event, there is only one overland surface water flow route in the settlement, flowing south on Chitterman Way before draining into an unnamed watercourse south of London Road. In the 100-	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage solution. The LLFA is not able to:· 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. When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: · 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	year event, this overland flow route is more accentuated and has additional flow routes joining it from Linford Crescent, London Road and properties between Launde Road.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				well as manage surface water runoff. · Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk. 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. 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		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				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. 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. 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. Risk of flooding from surface water map: (no longer available) Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Historic England	31			The area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of important designated heritage assets. In line with national planning policy, it will be important that the strategy for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets so that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area. If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the planning and conservation team at your local planning authority together with the staff at the county council archaeological advisory service who look after the Historic Environment Record. They should be able to provide details of the designated heritage assets in the area together with locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway . It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society or local historic groups in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan. Historic England has produced advice	The Leicestershire & Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER) is the most complete record of Leicestershire and Rutland's known archaeological remains, including historic buildings. The HER identifies four historic buildings in Markfield which are not already listed and 24 archaeological remains. These are protected by Policy M9: Non-Designated Heritage Assets	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				which your community might find helpful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. You may also find the advice in "Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level" useful. This has been produced by Historic England, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Forestry Commission. As well as giving ideas on how you might improve your local environment, it also contains some useful further sources of information. This can be downloaded from: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf If you envisage including new housing allocations in your plan, we refer you to our published advice available on our		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				website, "Housing Allocations in Local Plans" as this relates equally to neighbourhood planning.		
Paul Redding	33			Heritage section from map on page 33 to details on page 34: For accuracy please note that the barn originally part of Stepping Stone Farm on Forest Road was converted in the year 2000 and retained its Grade 2 listed status due to its age (circa 1700) and significant heritage importance. As it is now a Land Registry recognised separate property to the farm, Stepping Stone Barn on Forest Road and its outbuildings should be included in your plan alongside the other listed buildings. This is important going forward as it sits in the conservation area at the very end of the village.	The general principles are that all buildings built before 1700 which survive in anything like their original condition are likely to be listed, as are most buildings built between 1700 and 1850. Listed Building designation is by the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and outside the scope of neighbourhood plans.	**No change**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	34	4.64		Should this read Map 6 rather than Map 5?	Agree	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
						Map labelling to be consistent.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	34			The map appears to be stretched it is recommended that the map is reinserted within the document	Agree	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size. Map labelling to be consistent.**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	35	4.66		These paragraphs read like a policy rather than supporting text.	Paragraphs 4.65-4.67 reflect the National Planning Policy Framework. The Neighbourhood Plan should not include policies that duplicate the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.	**No change**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	36			The map does not fit on the page; the title is missing and the copyright.	Agree	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size. Map labelling to be consistent.**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	38			The map does not fit on the page, the copyright is missing.	Agree	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
						Map labelling to be consistent.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	39		M9	This policy lists a number of non-designated assets and refers to their location on maps. It would be useful if these assets could be identified on the map so that the policy can be consistently applied. It is recommended that the Group look at Figure 21, page 47 of the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan Referendum Version and follow a similar format. There are 24 features of local heritage interest identified in Policy M9: Non-Designated Heritage Assets. Some of these features need clearer (full) addresses so their location can be identified, as the associated map only gives a general idea. It is not clear as to what is significant about these features; this must be clearly articulated in the Plan to allow for appropriate decision taking etc. Significance is defined in the NPPF as "the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic of historic". More detail on these categories of interest is provided in the	The list of Features of Local Heritage Interest (Map 6) has been compiled from the following sources: • Self-guided Village Trail • Markfield Conservation Area Appraisal • Leicestershire & Rutland Historic Environment Record The evidence supporting the designation of Features of Local Heritage Interest needs to be compiled and published.	**Evidence supporting the designation of Features of Local Heritage Interest to be compiled and published.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Planning Practice Guide (Paragraph 006 Reference ID: 18a-006-20190723): https://www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment. This is further broken down within the Borough Council's selection criteria for identifying heritage assets: https://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/downloads/file/3571/suggested_selection_criteria The above guidance provides the framework to identify significance, and it could be articulated in the Plan in many ways (see the Sheepy Plan for an example). Alternatively, if the NP Group feels that the information is already articulated in the supplementary evidence documents then this should be made clear and clearly signposted in the Plan. In terms of Policy M9, there has been inconsistency between Inspectors so far (within the Borough) on whether a local heritage asset/non-designated heritage asset policy should be included in the plan. Sheepy NP has a local heritage asset policy that is consistent with Policies DM11 and DM12 of the SADMP DPD and para.197 of the NPPF, Burbage had drafted a similar policy but the Inspector suggested it was removed as		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				it repeated local and national policy. The consistent element of both plans was the clear identification of local heritage assets and what makes them of significance, so that is the key element that needs to be achieved in this Plan.		
Leicestershire County Council	39		M9	LCC would encourage the development of local listings as per the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and LCC have some data on the social, cultural, archaeological and historic value of local features and buildings https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record	A list of Features of Local Heritage Interest (Map 6) has been compiled from the following sources: • Self-guided Village Trail • Markfield Conservation Area Appraisal • Leicestershire & Rutland Historic Environment Record	**No change**
Jelson Limited	39		M9	Policy M9 'Non-designated Heritage Assets' requires a minor amendment to ensure that the first paragraph reflects the wording of the test at paragraph 197 of the NPPF (i.e. the determination of planning applications which would affect non-designated assets would require "a balanced judgement … having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.").	Agree.	**The first paragraph of Policy M9: Non-Designated Heritage Assets be modified to read:** ***The determination of planning applications which would directly or***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
						indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets (including those listed below and shown on Maps 6 and 7 and the Policies Maps) will balance the need for the proposed development against the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	42		M10	Define jitties and setts in the text as this isn't clear and could be up for interpretation.	Noted.	**A footnote be added to Policy M10: Design to explain the meaning of 'jitties':** ***Jitties are the tiny lanes that zig-zag around the backs of old cottages linking the community together. One***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
						such jitty is The Pieces. **Paragraph 4.88 be modified by the insertion of the following sentence after the third sentence:** **The stone was principally used for road metalling although it was also used for steps, sills and paving setts and to construct village buildings and walls.**
Leicestershire County Council	42		M10	This policy is strong but could be further strengthened by mentioning aspects such as incorporating sustainable design and construction techniques to meet high standards for energy and water efficiency (for example, rainwater harvesting techniques) and incorporating features that are beneficial to wildlife (for example, the inclusion of bat friendly	By 2025, the Government is intending to introduce a Future Homes Standard for new build homes to be future-proofed with low carbon heating and world-leading levels of energy efficiency. Currently, energy efficiency requirements for new homes are set by Part	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				roosting techniques, bird nesting boxes and hedgehog friendly fencing).	L (Conservation of Fuel and Power) and Part 6 of the Building Regulations. Our Neighbourhood Plan cannot be used to set energy efficiency standards for new homes that exceed the requirements of the Building Regulations.	
Jelson Limited	42		M10	Policy M10 'Design' largely reflects the requirements of adopted policy and guidance, including the Borough Council's 'Good Design Guide'. The wording of the policy which states that development "must" comply with all of the criteria listed is onerous. It would be more appropriate for the policy to state that development "should where possible comply with the following criteria". Point 2 of Policy M10 requires development to "Protect important features such as jitties, setts, traditional walls, hedgerows and trees;". To ensure that this criterion is not unduly onerous it should include the words "where possible…". It is also not clear what is meant by 'setts'. If this is intended to refer to badger setts then these	Markfield has been subjected to standard, 'identikit' homes that typify new developments built by some volume house builders. Some of our housing looks the same as developments elsewhere and could be anywhere in the country. Too often new developments are dominated by the same, identikit designs that bear no resemblance to local character. Our Neighbourhood Plan establishes more local and detailed design principles for the area. They are based on appropriate evidence of the defining characteristics of the area,	**A footnote be added to Policy M10: Design to explain the meaning of 'jitties':** ***Jitties are the tiny lanes that zig-zag around the backs of old cottages linking the community together. One such jitty is The Pieces.*** **Paragraph 4.81 be modified by the insertion of the following sentence after**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				are protected by law and there is no need for a specific reference in policy.	such as its historic, landscape and townscape character.	**the third sentence:** **The stone was principally used for road metalling although it was also used for steps, sills and paving setts and to construct village buildings and walls.**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	43		M11	This is a weaker policy than the one contained in the Borough Council's Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD and would weaken the position in Markfield. It is recommended that the NDP could just include in the text for the purposes of DM25 these following site are applicable …	Policy M11: Community Services and Facilities cross-references Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD Policy DM25.	**No change**
Leicestershire County Council	43	5.1		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	Markfield has a good range of services and facilities with a primary school, shops, churches, pubs, GP surgery, allotments, library and sports & recreation facilities. Policy M11: Community Services and Facilities protects against the loss of	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				allotments and their importance with your community. 2. Set out policies that 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 of 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.	key services and facilities that residents currently enjoy.	
Leicestershire County Council	43	5.3		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	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				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.		
B J Wardle	43			Still cannot see London Road upgrade or layby for rear entrance to school (planned when school planning was first proposed)	Many traffic matters fall outside the scope of planning. For example, changes to traffic management on existing transport networks are usually a matter for the highway authority to deal with.	**No change**
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44	5.7		The Markfield Institute of Higher Education is situated on a 3.58-hectare campus that is located to the east of Ratby Lane towards the south of Markfield. The campus is occupied by a range of buildings including the Markfield Institute of Higher Education building; the Markfield Conference Centre; the on-campus prayer hall, known as the Markfield Mosque; administrative	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				buildings/offices; a number of residential buildings for students, staff, research scholars and visitors; and one of the largest Islamic libraries in Europe, which holds over 40,000 books and journals and provides a research resource for students, researchers and academics all over the world. The campus is allocated as a community facility (MARK33 – Markfield Conference Centre) in the Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (SADMP DPD).		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44	5.7		The Markfield Institute of Higher Education was established by the Islamic Foundation as an independent Higher Education institution in 2000 and is a "pioneering educational Institute at the forefront of Islamic studies in the UK". The campus was visited by HRH The Prince of Wales in 2003 for the official opening of the new Markfield Institute of Higher Education academic building. The Institute's vision is "…to become a world-class higher education and research Institute, specialising in the pursuit of Islamic disciplines…". Since its inception, the Institute has developed an international reputation for its expertise in Islamic studies, Islamic education, Muslim chaplaincy, and Islamic banking, finance and management. The Institute's mission is "…to contribute to the development of scholars who have a broader, deeper and critical understanding of Islam in the modern contemporary context…". More than 750 students have graduated from the Institute since 2000 and it currently offers the following academic programmes, which are all validated by	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Newman University: • BA Islamic Finance and Accounting • BA Islamic Studies • BA Islamic Studies with Arabic • MA Islam and Sustainable Development • MA Islam, Pastoral Care and Counselling • MA Islamic Studies • MEd Islamic Education • MSc Islamic Economics, Finance and Management The Institute also offers a Certificate in Muslim Chaplaincy course along with a selection of short courses, run over two or three days with small groups of highly trained professionals in the fields of economic Islamic banking, internal finance, and inter-faith.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44	5.8		Future Plans The Markfield Institute of Higher Education regularly receives new enquires from prospective students in the UK and abroad in relation to new diploma and certificate programmes. However, the lack of suitable educational, teaching, residential and recreational facilities on the campus is currently restricting the ability of the Institute to build on its current strengths and widen the range of educational programmes it offers. Furthermore, the lack of suitable facilities on the campus is starting to prevent the Institute from being able to offer some of its courses in Markfield. As a result, some of the Institute's courses have had to relocate to alternative locations in other cities, such as London. Ideally, the Institute would like these courses to return to the Markfield campus in the future because this will enable the Institute to deliver its programmes from a central educational hub. The campus also lacks good quality indoor sports and leisure facilities for students, staff and users of the site. However, the Institute understands that	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				students, staff and users of the site would like to participate in sport and recreational activities as part of their day-to-day use of the campus. The Institute therefore has an ambitious long-term strategy that aims to deliver the sustainable modernisation and expansion of the campus. These plans seek to increase the capacity and enhance the quality of the facilities on the campus. Ultimately, this will enable the Institute to meet the growing demand for its courses. Delivering these plans is therefore key to securing the future success of the Institute. A brief overview of the Institute's long-term strategy is set out below.		
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44	5.8		Current Planning Application (20/00887/FUL) The Markfield Institute of Higher Education recently submitted a planning application to Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (20/00887/FUL) for the: Demolition of existing conference centre and a residential building and erection of a new conference centre, including indoor sports facility, and new residential building with associated	Planning Application 20/00887/FUL remains undetermined at 5 December 2020. It is considered that the proposal is consistent with Neighbourhood Plan Policy M12 and there are no objections from the Parish Council.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				landscaping. In summary, the scheme involves demolishing two of the old buildings on the campus which have become unsustainable and uneconomical to operate due to their age and condition. These buildings will be replaced with a new conference centre and a new purpose-built residential building that will provide 30 en-suite bedrooms (a net addition of 18 bedrooms) for staff, students, research scholars and visitors. 2.16 This scheme demonstrates the Institute's commitment towards delivering its long-term vision for the campus and represents the initial phase of a series of works that are required to upgrade the campus.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44	5.8		Long-term Growth Plans In the longer term, the Markfield Institute of Higher Education aspires to deliver a wider programme of growth which will involve expanding the campus on to the two parcels of land that are shown as Plot A and Plot B on Drawing No.: MPD333-PLM-01 (Appendix 1). Plot A is located immediately to the west of the campus and measures circa 1.7 hectares and Plot B is situated to the north of the campus and measures approximately 0.8 hectares. The Institute is working towards developing a detailed masterplan to achieve its long-term vision for the campus. It is envisaged that the masterplan will primarily focus on improving the teaching facilities and education buildings; enhancing the residential accommodation for users of the campus; providing a wider range of sport and recreational facilities; and delivering new areas of green space and landscaping across the campus. A broad overview of these aspects of the masterplan is set out below: • Teaching facilities, education buildings and administrative buildings: The proposed expansion of the campus will enable the Institute to enhance the	Plot A is currently the subject of a full planning application for 48 dwellings (Ref: 20/00848/FUL). The proposal is unrelated to the Markfield Institute of Higher Education and at 05/12/2020 remains undetermined. The application is not supported by Markfield Parish Council. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. Planning permission was refused for 'the use of vacant land to provide extension of existing conference / educational centre with the erection of two storey teaching, administration, residential and sports hall buildings' in November 1999 (99/00697/OUT). In January 2001 planning permission was refused for 'the use of vacant land to provide extension of	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				quality of the teaching, learning and research facilities that are available to staff, students and research scholars. Additional administrative space may also be required to support the increased educational activities on the campus. • Residential Accommodation: The future development of the campus will provide the Institute with the opportunity to continue upgrading the quality of the on-site accommodation. This will enable the Institute to provide its staff, students and research scholars who choose to reside on the campus with a better quality living environment. Additionally, it will allow the Institute to increase the number of bed spaces that are available on the campus. This will help to encourage more sustainable travel and living behaviours as more students will be able to live on the campus and so will not be required to travel to and from the campus on a regular basis. • Sport and Recreational Facilities: The Institutes hopes that the future expansion of the campus will enable it to improve the quality of the sports and recreational facilities that are available for its staff, students and research	existing conference/ educational centre with the erection of two storey library extension / residential and sports hall' (00/01087/OUT). This application was subsequently was dismissed at appeal in September 2001 (APP/K2420/A/01/ 1058646). The development of plots A and B conflicts with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education's countryside location and development here would constitute an undesirable intrusion of built development into the open countryside to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the landscape.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				scholars to use. There may also be scope to make these facilities available to local community groups. • Green space, tree planting and landscaping: High quality landscaping, new areas of open green space and new tree planting would form a key element of the Institute's masterplan for the campus. This would provide an opportunity to improve biodiversity, enhance the site for local wildlife and deliver an overall increase in tree cover, both in terms of numbers and quality, across the campus in the long term. It is hoped that the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan will support the Institute's long-term vision for the campus by safeguarding the two plots of land adjacent to the existing site for educational related development associated with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education. The comments provided in Section 3 set out how this could be achieved.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	44		M12	This policy makes reference to Map 10; however Map 10 shows the potential housing allocation and not the Markfield Institute for Higher Education. This should be addressed through the preparation of the Submission Version document. Point 2 – the buildings on site aren't of high quality and we don't want new buildings to reflect the existing, a more modern design would help enhance the character of this site. Recommend that this is changed this should be changes to be in accordance with the design policy and SPD. Point 3 – This should be re-worded to read additional access should be avoided Point 4 – This is not justified as a landscaping scheme would not necessarily be needed unless a redevelopment of the site is proposed. Suggest change to landscaping on site should provide an improvement in biodiversity….	The design of new development is adequately addressed by Policy M10: Design. The principal purpose of criterion 3 was to ensure that there no access onto Pinewood Drive to protect the amenities of Markfield Court Retirement Village. A tree and hedgerow policy could usefully be added to the Draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan making Criterion 4 of Policy M12 unnecessary.	**Map labelling to be consistent.** **Criteria 2 and 4 of Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education be deleted.** **Criterion 3 of Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education be modified to read:** ***There is no access to Pinewood Drive for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians.***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44		M12	The Markfield Institute of Higher Education is encouraged to see that the Draft Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan supports future educational related development on the existing campus. The Institute hopes that it will be able to work proactively with the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the coming months to ensure that that Policy M12 also provides the policy support that is required to enable the Institute to deliver its long-term vision for the campus. This section therefore seeks to provide a series of constructive comments in response to the draft wording of Policy M12 to initiate these discussions. In the interests of clarity, these comments work through each element of Policy M12 in turn. *Educational related development associated with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education will be supported subject to the following:* The Institute welcomes the policy support for educational related development on the campus. As part of its long-term plans for the campus, the Institute intends to develop a number of buildings on the	Agree. However, any residential development should be restricted to occupancy by staff and students of the Markfield Institute of Higher Education.	**The opening sentence of Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education be modified to read:** ***New buildings that will be used for educational, administrative, residential and recreational/ sport purposes associated with the educational use of the Markfield Institute of Higher Education will be supported subject to the following:*** **Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education be modified by the addition of a criteria to read:**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				campus that will be designed to meet the educational, residential and recreational needs of its staff, students and research scholars. As such, it is respectfully requested that the wording of Policy M12 is amended to clarify that 'educational related development' includes new buildings that will be used for educational, administrative, residential and recreational/sport purposes associated with the educational use of the campus.		***Residential development should be restricted to occupancy by staff and students of the Markfield Institute of Higher Education.***
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44		M12	*1. Built development does not extend beyond the developable area shown on Map 10 and the Policies Maps;* The Institute notes that Map 10 seems to relate to the Potential Housing allocation on the land to the south of London Road, rather than to the Markfield Institute of Higher Education campus. It would therefore appear that part 1 of Policy M12 should refer to Map 11 on page 62, which shows the Markfield Institute of Higher Education campus, Woodrowe House and Markfield Court. In order to support the Institute's long-term ambitions for remodelling and improving the campus, it is respectfully requested that the black dashed line on	Plot A is currently the subject of a full planning application for 48 dwellings (Ref: 20/00848/FUL). The proposal is unrelated to the Markfield Institute of Higher Education and at 05/12/2020 remains undetermined. The application is not supported by Markfield Parish Council. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. Planning permission was refused for 'the use of vacant land to provide	**Map labelling to be consistent.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Map 11, which indicates the 'Developable Area' on the campus, is revised to incorporate the entire area shaded yellow on Map 11. This will enable the Institute to make a more efficient and effective use of the land on the existing campus when delivering its growth plans in the future. What is more, the campus is allocated as a community facility in the SADMP DPD and Policy 8 of the Core Strategy supports the attraction of knowledge-based services to the Markfield Institute of Higher Education. Paragraph 92a of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also requires planning policies to plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities and paragraph 92d requires planning policies to ensure that established facilities and services are able to develop and modernise and be retained for the benefit of the community. For the Institute to build on its international reputation and continue to attract knowledge-based services to the campus, the quality of the facilities on the existing campus need to be upgraded and the campus needs to undergo a programme of sustainable expansion. The Institute therefore respectfully requests that the	extension of existing conference / educational centre with the erection of two storey teaching, administration, residential and sports hall buildings' in November 1999 (99/00697/OUT). In January 2001 planning permission was refused for 'the use of vacant land to provide extension of existing conference/ educational centre with the erection of two storey library extension / residential and sports hall' (00/01087/OUT). This application was subsequently was dismissed at appeal in September 2001 (APP/K2420/A/01/ 1058646). The development of plots A and B conflicts with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education's countryside location and development here would constitute an undesirable intrusion of built	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				wording of Policy M12 is amended so that it safeguards the two parcels of land shown on Drawing No.: MPD333-PLM-01 (Appendix 1) for educational related development associated with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education. This educational development would include: • new and improved teaching facilities and educational buildings; • new administrative buildings to support the educational activities on the campus; • new residential accommodation for users of the campus including staff, students, research scholars, visitors, delegates using the conference centre and other users of the campus; and • new sports and recreational facilities. Safeguarding these two parcels of land for educational development will enable the Institute to overcome the challenges that it currently faces in relation to the capacity and quality of the existing facilities on the campus. This is because the sustainable expansion of the campus will facilitate the development the new, modern and high quality facilities the Institute requires to provide a wider range of courses and educational services. Thus,	development into the open countryside to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the landscape.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				the proposed amendments to Policy M12 will allow the Institute to make the Markfield campus its central educational hub. Ultimately, this will help to ensure that the Institute is able to continue its highly-regarded work and prosper as a Higher Education institution in the future. The proposed amendments to Policy M12 are therefore considered to be supported in principle by Policy 8 of the Core Strategy, Policy DM25 of the SADMP DPD and paragraph 92 of the NPPF. Plot A is surrounded by development or public highways on all sides. Thus, this parcel of land is well-contained within the existing cluster of development that is located to the south of Markfield. Additionally, Plot B is bound by development on three sides (north, south and west) and the road leading to Woodrowe House and Markfield Retirement Village is situated in close proximity to its eastern boundary. Given the extent and nature of the development that is situated in between the two plots of land and the wider landscape, both parcels of land are		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				deemed to be well-contained within the local setting. The existing vegetation along the boundaries of both plots also effectively screens the two parcels of land from public views and the proposed expansion of the campus would provide an opportunity to enhance the vegetation cover along these boundaries, which would help to further reduce the visibility of the plots. In light of these factors, it is considered that the masterplan for the campus could be sensitively designed so that the new areas of the campus sit comfortably with the surrounding development.		
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44		M12	*2. The layout, scale and appearance of new buildings should reflect the existing;* In order to upgrade the facilities on the campus, it will be necessary to develop new modern buildings. Additionally, given that some of the existing buildings on the campus are one-storey and one-and-a-half-storeys tall, the Institute intends to take visual cues from the height and scale of the more recent two-storey and part-two-, part-three-storey buildings that have been developed on the campus when designing the new buildings. This will	Agree. The design of new development is adequately addressed by Policy M10: Design.	**Criterion 2 of Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education be deleted.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				ultimately enable the Institute to make a more effective and efficient use of the land on the existing campus. In light of the above factors, it is respectfully requested that the wording of Policy M12 is amended to clarify that it will be acceptable for the new buildings to have a modern appearance and be of a scale that is similar to the taller buildings on the campus, rather than the lower, less efficient, older buildings.		
Michael Stevens	44		M12	Page 45: Reference in Point 1 should be Map 11 (not Map 10)	Agree	**Map labelling to be consistent.**
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44		M12	*3. There is no additional access to the site for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians; and* The Institute respectfully requests that this element of Policy M12 is worded to ensure that the policy would not prevent any alterations being made to the access arrangements for the site should the Local Highway Authority request that such improvements are made in order to enable the site to accommodate additional development in the future.	The principal purpose of criterion 3 was to ensure that there no access onto Pinewood Drive to protect the amenities of Markfield Court Retirement Village.	**Criterion 3 of Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education be modified to read:** ***There is no access to Pinewood Drive for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians.***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	44		M12	*4. A landscape scheme, including landscape management, should be implemented to provide for an improvement in biodiversity and include the retention and enhancement of trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the site.* The Institute recognises the benefits of delivering improvements for biodiversity on the site and intends to bring forward a high quality landscaping scheme on the campus as part of its future plans. Nevertheless, it is politely requested that part 4 of Policy M12 contains some flexibility to allow trees to be removed for arboricultural reasons provided that provisions are made to replace these trees as part of the landscaping scheme for the wider campus.	A tree and hedgerow policy could usefully be added to the Draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan making Criterion 4 of Policy M12 unnecessary.	**Criterion 4 of Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education be deleted.** **A new policy be added concerning the protection of trees and hedgerows throughout the Neighbourhood Area.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	48		M13	Policy M13 introduces the requirement for an impact assessment to be carried out if a proposal exceeds 200m2 of retail space outside of a neighbourhood/local centre. This is based on a proportionate approach against Policy DM21 of the SADMPDPD. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF allows for localised thresholds to be set and the NPPG provides further guidance on this. The NPPG states: 'In setting a locally appropriate threshold it will be important to consider the: · scale of proposals relative to town centres · the existing viability and vitality of town centres · cumulative effects of recent developments · whether local town centres are vulnerable · likely effects of development on any town centre strategy · impact on any other planned investment' Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 2b-015-20190722 The proportionate approach taken does not take the above into account and the LPA believe further work should be undertaken to underpin the 200m2	When assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of Hinckley Town Centre, Policy DM21 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD requires an impact assessment if the development is over 2,500m2. The Local Plan threshold for an impact assessment would therefore apply to retail provision around five times the size as the largest retail unit in the Local Centre (Co-op). Therefore, a lower threshold would be a more appropriate for Markfield given the size of the existing retail units. The Hinckley & Bosworth Town and District Centres Study does not include Markfield but does recommend an impact assessment threshold of 500 sq.m (gross) should be adopted for all applications	**Policy M13: Local and Neighbourhood Centres be modified to read:** ***The Main Street Local Centre and Chitterman Way Neighbourhood Centre are defined on Map 8 and the Policies Maps.*** ***The vitality and viability of the Local and Neighbourhood Centres should be maintained and enhanced.*** ***Within these centres, proposals for Commercial Business and Service Uses will be supported provided development proposals do not detract from the***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				threshold so that the NPPG criteria are considered and the figure can be defended. The LPA undertook a Town and District Centre Study which identified a localised threshold for these types of centres, although Markfield NP would not require this level of detail for a localised threshold it gives an idea of the type of assessment which could be undertaken. In addition, the policy makes reference to the impact assessment being required if a development falls outside a Local and Neighbourhood Centre. The NPPF (Annex 2) defines what should be considered as a town centre, it states: 'References to town centres or centres apply to city centres, town centres, district centres and local centres but exclude small parades of shops of purely neighbourhood significance'. Therefore reference to 'neighbourhood centres' should be removed from the policy as their designation is largely one of protection and not promotion for significant additional development of main town centre uses. Last paragraph cannot identify A1 as this isn't a Use Class anymore also a lot is now allowed by Permitted	for retail and other 'main town centre' uses. The Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council District, Local and Neighbourhood Centre Review identifies Chitterman way as a Neighbourhood Centre. As of 1 September 2020, the existing town centre use classes in relation to shops, financial and professional services, restaurants and cafes, offices, learning and community uses were subsumed into three new overarching use classes.	***character of the area. Except where changes of use are allowed through permitted development, Commercial, Business and Service Uses should remain the dominant use in both Centres and development leading to an over-concentration of any other one use will not be supported. Planning applications for uses other than Commercial, Business and Service Uses will not be supported unless it to occupy a premises that has remained vacant***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Development. Need to identify village centre uses and what is acceptable. There is an * but then this isn't explained anywhere		***for a period of at least six-months. A sequential test will be applied to planning applications for Commercial, Business and Service Uses1 that are not within either Centre. Proposals for Commercial, Business and Service Uses should be located in the Local Centre, then in edge of Local Centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of Local Centre sites be considered. When assessing applications for retail development outside of the***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
						Local Centre, an impact assessment will be required if the development is to provide more than 500m2 retail floor space. This should include an assessment of the impact of the proposal on both Centres' vitality and viability. Where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have an adverse impact on vitality and viability, it will not be supported.

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	52	5.41		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 requirement in ordinary daily life. All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to ultrafast broadband (of at least 100Mbps). Developers should take active steps to incorporate adequate broadband provision at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure ultrafast broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete. Where practical, developers should consider engaging several telecoms providers to encourage competition and consumer choice.	Superfast broadband (30Mbps or above) connections are available throughout most of Markfield except Copt Oak, which must rely on standard speed broadband, this is provided by Fibre To The Cabinet (FTTC) circuits, where the street cabinet is connected to the exchange via fibre-optic cable, then from the cabinet is via traditional copper lines. An ultrafast (100Mbps or above) type of connection could be provided by BT using Fibre To The Premises (FTTP) circuits, here fibre-optic cable is laid directly from the exchange to the house, however this is not yet available from the Markfield Exchange. This should be encouraged for new developments.	**Policy M16: Land South of London Road be modified by the addition of a further criterion requiring fibre to the premises circuits.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	53		M14	The infrastructure section does not provide much information regarding where there are deficiencies in infrastructure provision, nor does it identify opportunities for infrastructure gain or enhancement, particularly from seeking funding from the proposed allocation Land South of London Road - Policy M16 only addresses on-site provision. Policy M14 Infrastructure seeks developer contributions towards infrastructure provision and lists a number of facilities for which the contributions could deliver 'improvement, remodelling or enhancement'. The document refers to the range of facilities available but it does not state what improvements have been identified, for example want improvements have been identified for Copt Oak Memorial Hall? Are these related to capacity and development pressures? Another example relates to the lack of quality and quantity of open space. Para 5.30 states, 'The greatest shortfall being formal parks. There are several open spaces which fall below the appropriate quality target, so there is a pressing need for improvements to increase the supply and quality of open	The proposed scale of development raises significant infrastructure considerations: ▫ Highways England suggest there will be an impact on M1 Junction 22 and the A50 Markfield Road / A46 Leicester Western Bypass; ▫ Capacity on the A50/A511 corridor is constrained. A511 Growth Corridor Scheme is unfunded and requires developer contributions; ▫ Mercenfeld Primary School will require expansion but the NP says '…the school's now finds its restricted campus now finds itself boxed-in, with no scope for expansion. There are ongoing issues with the level and style of car parking on and around the school's main entrance…'; ▫ Markfield Medical Centre needs replacement	**Markfield Parish Council should arrange a series of discussions with Leicestershire County Council Highways/ Highways England, the Clinical Commissioning Group, National Forest Co. and Mercenfeld Primary School/ LEA to make sure there is a well-understood and consistent position on strategic infrastructure requirements.** **Markfield Parish Council to coordinate information on additional local**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				spaces'. The group could pull this information into the document or supporting infrastructure schedule. The Neighbourhood Plan is a good opportunity to undertake an audit of facilities and then consult with residents on what improvements in community facilities they would wish to see. The group may have already done this but there is no evidence of it. There are those infrastructure items which are the responsibility of infrastructure/service provides i.e. education and healthcare. The document refers to these and improvements in healthcare which is consistent with the findings of the Phase 1 infrastructure Study. I would suggest the group considers preparing an infrastructure schedule, informed by a consultation with residents and stakeholders which identifies new / improvements in infrastructure they feel is needed / wanted. Some items may become community actions and require funding that cannot be sought from development. The schedule could also set out a hierarchy or priorities. Capturing this information will also help DM negotiate S106 agreements. /ideally	and a site for a new surgery is required. The Qualifying Body will also needs to set out its own infrastructure expectations.	**infrastructure requirements.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				the schedule would be stand alone from the plan and remain a 'live' document which could be updated as and when improvements are delivered or priorities change. Regarding Policy M14 infrastructure - as discussed above, the policy lists existing facilities however this could limit what developer contributions may be sought in the future, particularly if they undertake an audit of facilities and complete an infrastructure schedule listing improvements. They could just refer to Policy DM3 Infrastructure and Delivery of the SADM otherwise I would suggest a similar overarching policy that refers to their infrastructure schedule if this is the approach they wish to progress. I also suggest that they wouldn't be able to seek developer contributions for items such as notice boards and litter bins – these may be provided on-site but not elsewhere in the settlement/parish. The infrastructure Capacity Study Baseline Assessment may just also provide them with a bit of context regarding healthcare, education and highways. See Section 5.2.12.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Jelson Limited	53		M14	The first paragraph of Policy M14 'Infrastructure' should refer to financial contributions "where appropriate in accordance with tests in CIL Regulation 122" to ensure consistency with the NPPF. Point 2 should make it clear that financial contributions towards off site provision of open space would only sought when a policy compliant level of provision (in accordance with Policy 19 of the CS) is not provided on site. Point 3 should be amended to avoid repetition of Point 2 (e.g. play equipment). It is also not clear how certain items listed at Point 3 would meet the tests set out in the CIL Regulations (i.e. be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development).	Neighbourhood Plan Policy M14: Infrastructure makes it clear that contributions are governed by the provisions of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010. To ensure the viability of housing development, the costs of the Plan's requirements may be applied flexibly where it is demonstrated that they are likely to make the development undeliverable.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	53		M14	The approach in Policy M14 towards development viability and deliverability is welcomed. However, the Institute notes that the wording of the policy only applies this approach to housing development. In line with the requirements of the NPPF and National Planning Practice Guidance, it is considered that the wording of Policy M14 should be amended so that the Plan's approach towards developer contributions and viability for housing development applies to all types of development. Amend the wording of the policy so that the Plan's approach towards developer contributions and viability for housing development applies to all types of development.	Policy M14 does not only apply to residential development.	**No change**
Tony Broughton			M14	Make them build a bigger doctors make them build more shop make them build a bigger school and then they can have their houses	The scale of development proposed does raise important infrastructure issues, though Jelsons have assured us there are no problems. Mercenfeld Primary School will require expansion but our information is '…the school's now finds its restricted campus now	**Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					finds itself boxed-in, with no scope for expansion. There are ongoing issues with the level and style of car parking on and around the school's main entrance…'; Markfield Medical Centre needs replacement and a site for a new surgery is required.	
Leicestershire County Council	53	5.44		Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and 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 HWRC 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 relevant Legislation Regulations.	The nearest Recycling and Household Waste Site is in Coalville. It is over 8km from Markfield and outside the Neighbourhood Area.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Owl Partnerships	55	6.1		Paragraph 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) says that Neighbourhood Plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in Local Plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies. Paragraph 14 NPPF provides guidance on how the presumption in favour of sustainable development (at paragraph 11d) should be engaged and, in essence, reduces the supply of land required for a plan to be considered up to date from five years down to three where the Neighbourhood Plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement. The National Planning Practice Guidance says that 'where strategic policies do not already set out a requirement figure, the National Planning Policy Framework expects an indicative figure to be provided to neighbourhood planning bodies on request. However, if a local planning authority is unable to do this, then the neighbourhood planning body may exceptionally need to determine a housing requirement figure themselves, taking account of relevant policies, [including] the	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				existing and emerging spatial strategy' (paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 41-105-20190509 – emphasis added). The amount of housing required in an area is a strategic matter (paragraph 20 NPPF) although non-strategic policies can be used by communities through Neighbourhood Plans to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development and also for allocating sites (Paragraph 28 NPPF). Importantly, neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies (Paragraph 29 NPPF). Once a Neighbourhood Plan has been brought into force, the policies it contains take precedence over the existing non-strategic policies set out in a local plan covering the area (Paragraph 30). Paragraph 31 NPPF confirms that the preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Paragraph 33 says that policies in local plans and spatial development strategies should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years and that relevant strategic policies will need updating at least once every five years if their applicable local housing need figure has changed significantly. Paragraph 59 NPPF recognises the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes and paragraph 60 says to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance.		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	55	6.3		The LPA issued advice to all neighbourhood plans during the Markfield NDP Regulation 14 consultation that the Borough Council Local Plan now uses the timeframe 2020-2039 rather than 2016-2036. The recently published Local Development Scheme (LDS) states that the draft Local Plan will be consulted on in Spring 2021. It is advised that the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Group reconsider their Plan timeframe to align with the Local Plan.	Noted.	**The Neighbourhood Plan period be amended to align with the emerging Local Plan 2020-2039.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Jelson Limited	55	6.4		In an ideal world, national policy and guidance confirms that the MNP should be prepared on the basis of a housing requirement figure set out in an up to date adopted Local Plan. However, the emerging MNP is being prepared in the context of an 'out of date' Development Plan (i.e. Core Strategy ('CS') and Site Allocations and Development Management DPD ('SADMDPD')). The Parish had, therefore, sought confirmation of an indicative housing requirement figure from the Borough Council ('HBBC) in accordance with guidance in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). HBBC is in the process of undertaking its 'Local Plan Review' which will confirm the scale of housing needed in the Borough to 2039, taking into consideration the 'local housing need' of the Borough using the 'standard method', as the minimum starting point, plus any contribution required towards unmet needs from adjoining authorities (e.g. those arising from Leicester City). We understand that a Draft Local Plan is likely to be published in Spring 2021. As part of the Local Plan Review HBBC is undertaking a comprehensive review	The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and it should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. The Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy makes provision for the development of a minimum of 80 new homes in Markfield over the period 2006 - 2026. This was met with the granting of planning permission for the redevelopment of The George Inn on Main Street the Hopwood Drive development south of London Road and Markfield Court, Ratby Lane. Preparation of the new Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan began in 2017. We have now been advised that the new Local Plan	**Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.10 and Policy M15 to be modified to reflect a revised housing provision of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				of the 'spatial strategy' for the distribution of housing and employment growth in the Borough. Indeed the Council's most recent 'New Directions for Growth' Consultation contemplated alternative options for the spatial distribution of growth due to concerns about the capacity of the urban areas of the Borough (around Hinckley, Burbage, Earl Shilton and Barwell) to accommodate further growth beyond that already allocated. One option contemplated was a broad direction of growth in north east of the Borough in areas with good access to Leicester (e.g. Groby, Ratby and Markfield). On this basis, the starting point should, in our view, be for HBBC to provide the NPSG with a housing requirement figure. However, as HBBC is yet to consult on its 'Draft Local Plan', which will set out its proposed housing requirement and spatial strategy, we understand that HBBC has not been able to provide the NPSG with this figure. As a result, the NPSG seeks to identify its own proposed housing requirement for the Parish of 241 dwellings in the period to 2036 by:	will set out the overall development strategy for Hinckley & Bosworth Borough for the period 2020 to 2039. The new Local Plan will not be finalised until 2022 at the earliest, but in the meantime the Borough Council is encouraging qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans to plan for the period 2020 to 2039 to align with the new Local Plan. We have been advised that the housing figures set out in the adopted Core Strategy are out of date and can no longer be relied upon for neighbourhood plan purposes. The emerging Local Plan will set out new figures for parishes however the Local Plan is not sufficiently advanced to do this yet. In the meantime, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council has encouraged	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				1) calculating the 'local housing need' for the Borough using the current standard method; 2) calculating the proportion of the Borough's population living in the Parish and applying that to the Borough-wide figure; and 3) discounting dwellings constructed/ under construction in the period 2016-2020. An additional complicating factor is that, alongside potentially comprehensive re-forms to the planning system, set out in its 'Planning for the Future' White Paper the Government has recently consulted on a new 'standard method' for calculating local housing need. Whilst the methodology and resulting figures may change, the figures emerging from the consultation suggest that the scale of housing need in the Borough could increase substantially. The Government's ambition to boost significantly housing delivery to at least 300,000 homes per year remains clear. As a result, a change to the 'standard method' could have potentially significant implications for scale of housing needed in Borough. Paragraph 84 of the NPPG confirms that policies in a neighbourhood plan may	groups to explore options to set their own figures. One option is a simple approach of apportioning the overall borough housing need to parishes based on the share of population in those parishes. This is the approach set out in the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 6.5. The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				become “out of date” and require review if a new Local Plan is adopted after the making of the Neighbourhood Plan which, for example, identifies a higher housing requirement for the settlement. Markfield is, in our view, a sustainable settlement with the capacity to accommodate additional housing growth. It has a good range of services and facilities and good connections via public transport and by road to Leicester City and Coalville. Indeed, new development could support investment in and the expansion of existing facilities (e.g. Mercenfeld Primary School and the local GP surgery) and additional population would support the vitality and viability of existing services (e.g. the local bus service). As a result, in deciding where additional growth is to be located it is likely that HBBC will need to look to settlements like Markfield. On this basis, whilst we welcome the pro-active approach of NPSG in seeking to identify a housing requirement figure for the Parish, to ensure consistency with national policy any figure calculated using the standard method		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				should be treated as a "minimum". It is also important that the MNP is not rendered 'out of date' in the short term, for example, when the 'standard method' is updated and/ or if the emerging Local Plan progresses and identifies a higher housing requirement for the settlement. Therefore, in order for Parish to retain control over the location of any future housing growth in settlement in the future, in line with recommendation from the Inspector who recently examined the Desford Neighbourhood Plan, the MNP should identify additional 'reserve site(s)' as the future direction for growth in the village, which could come forward should additional need be identified in the Local Plan Review. The approach of identifying 'reserve sites' is also supported by Paragraph 9 of the PPG as a way of ensuring that emerging evidence of housing need is addressed, helping to minimise potential conflicts and ensuring that policies in the neighbourhood plan are not overridden by a new local plan. Jelson's view is that its wider land would be the most appropriate location for future growth in the village and		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				should be identified as a 'reserve site' (i.e. the future direction for growth for Markfield) with an appropriate 'reserve sites' policies which would allow reserve sites to come forward should additional housing needs be identified through the Local Plan Review process. This would allow the Parish to protect itself from further speculative development in the short-term whilst ensuring that any future growth in the settlement is directed to a suitable location which reflects and would support the delivery of the aspirations of the NPSG and MNP.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Owl Partnerships	55	6.4		The Housing Requirement for the area is set out in the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy December 2009. That plan provided for the level of housing identified in the East Midlands Regional Plan published in 2009 – 9,000 homes between 2006 and 2026 or 450 homes a year. The Core Strategy recognised Markfield as a Key Rural Centre (paragraph 4.31) where Core Strategy Policy 7 states that housing will be provided within settlement boundaries to provide for a mix of housing. Policy 8 of the Core Strategy states that through the plan period land will be allocated for a minimum of 80 dwellings to be provided within Markfield in order to support the local services in Markfield and ensure local people have access to a range of housing. The Hinckley and Bosworth Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (July 2016) recognised that sufficient development was committed (as of 1 September 2015 - Table 3: Page 13) to meet Core Strategy Policy 8 and that the residual need for allocations at Markfield was 0 homes. The Core Strategy in excess of 5 years	The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and it should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. The Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy makes provision for the development of a minimum of 80 new homes in Markfield over the period 2006 - 2026. This was met with the granting of planning permission for the redevelopment of The George Inn on Main Street the Hopwood Drive development south of London Road and Markfield Court, Ratby Lane. Preparation of the new Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan began in 2017. We have now been advised that the new Local Plan	**Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.10 and Policy M15 to be modified to reflect a revised housing provision of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				old and the housing requirement for Hinckley is consequently out of date. The assessment of residual need undertaken in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD was also undertaken in excess of five years ago and is consequently out of date. The up to date housing requirement for Hinckley would now be established through the Standard Housing Methodology and has been estimated at around 452 homes a year. However, the Government has published an emerging standard methodology which results in a figure of 889 homes a year and this figure is expected to be published in the New Year and any transitional arrangements for new plans to end by April 2021; meaning for plan making purposes the figure of 889 homes a year is likely to apply. The context for a housing requirement for Hinckley and Bosworth is further complicated by the Strategic Growth Plan for Leicester and Leicestershire (December 2018) which sets a housing requirement of 531 homes a year for the longer period to 2050 to support the delivery of strategic growth and infrastructure to the south of Leicester.	will set out the overall development strategy for Hinckley & Bosworth Borough for the period 2020 to 2039. The new Local Plan will not be finalised until 2022 at the earliest, but in the meantime the Borough Council is encouraging qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans to plan for the period 2020 to 2039 to align with the new Local Plan. We have been advised that the housing figures set out in the adopted Core Strategy are out of date and can no longer be relied upon for neighbourhood plan purposes. The emerging Local Plan will set out new figures for parishes however the Local Plan is not sufficiently advanced to do this yet. In the meantime, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council has encouraged	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				What is clear is that the housing requirement set by the Core Strategy cannot be relied upon for plan making and that a figure of c.450 homes a year for Hinckley and Bosworth is too low.	groups to explore options to set their own figures. One option is a simple approach of apportioning the overall borough housing need to parishes based on the share of population in those parishes. This is the approach set out in the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 6.5. The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	55	6.5		As a consequence of the alignment with the Local Plan the housing figure should be updated to reflect this date (2020-2039). It is recommended that the standard methodology is referenced as this is the origin of the initial figure. It is recommended the wording is amended to: 'The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 335 dwellings between 2020 and 2039. The borough have recommended that neighbourhood plans build in flexibility to their housing policies to allow for changes to the housing requirement once the local plan has progressed sufficiently to provide housing requirement figures at parish level. We have therefore incorporated flexibility by…….' It should be noted that by making this amendment any completions prior to April 2020 cannot be included, however	The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and it should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. The Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy makes provision for the development of a minimum of 80 new homes in Markfield over the period 2006 - 2026. This was met with the granting of planning permission for the redevelopment of The George Inn on Main Street the Hopwood Drive development south of London Road and Markfield Court, Ratby Lane. Preparation of the new Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan began in 2017. We have now been advised that the new Local Plan	**Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.10 and Policy M15 to be modified to reflect a revised housing provision of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				it does mean that there is a lower starting figure of 335 compared to 382. If the Group wish to continue with a 2016-2036 timescale the Group need to provide justification for this and there is a risk the plan could be out of date quicker once the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan is adopted with a different time frame. If the period 2016-2036 is used the housing figure is slightly bigger at 352 as there is an extra year in that time period.	will set out the overall development strategy for Hinckley & Bosworth Borough for the period 2020 to 2039. The new Local Plan will not be finalised until 2022 at the earliest, but in the meantime the Borough Council is encouraging qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans to plan for the period 2020 to 2039 to align with the new Local Plan. We have been advised that the housing figures set out in the adopted Core Strategy are out of date and can no longer be relied upon for neighbourhood plan purposes. The emerging Local Plan will set out new figures for parishes however the Local Plan is not sufficiently advanced to do this yet. In the meantime, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council has encouraged	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					groups to explore options to set their own figures. One option is a simple approach of apportioning the overall borough housing need to parishes based on the share of population in those parishes. This is the approach set out in the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 6.5. The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	55	6.5		"We have assumed that the minimum housing requirement for the Borough for the period 2016-2036 will be around 9,100 dwellings. Based on the parish population (2011 Census), Markfield should provide for 4.2% of this- a housing provision of 382 dwellings for the period 2016-2036." We are aware of current pre-app enquiries which total in excess of this. Do we have a view on this calculation method or is it purely an LPA matter?	The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and it should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. The Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy makes provision for the development of a minimum of 80 new homes in Markfield over the period 2006 - 2026. This was met with the granting of planning permission for the redevelopment of The George Inn on Main Street the Hopwood Drive development south of London Road and Markfield Court, Ratby Lane. Preparation of the new Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan began in 2017. We have now been advised that the new Local Plan	**Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.10 and Policy M15 to be modified to reflect a revised housing provision of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					will set out the overall development strategy for Hinckley & Bosworth Borough for the period 2020 to 2039. The new Local Plan will not be finalised until 2022 at the earliest, but in the meantime the Borough Council is encouraging qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans to plan for the period 2020 to 2039 to align with the new Local Plan. We have been advised that the housing figures set out in the adopted Core Strategy are out of date and can no longer be relied upon for neighbourhood plan purposes. The emerging Local Plan will set out new figures for parishes however the Local Plan is not sufficiently advanced to do this yet. In the meantime, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council has encouraged	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					groups to explore options to set their own figures. One option is a simple approach of apportioning the overall borough housing need to parishes based on the share of population in those parishes. This is the approach set out in the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 6.5. The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Owl Partnerships	55	6.5		The Neighbourhood Plan attempts to understand the housing requirement for Hinckley and the impact that might have on Markfield. It assumes that the minimum housing requirement for the Borough for the period 2016-2036 will be around 9,100 dwellings (paragraph 6.4). This amounts to just over 758 homes a year. We have not seen any evidence to justify this as a housing requirement for Hinckley. We note that the latest published minutes for the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group date from 10th March 2020 and refer to the production of a 'Markfield Housing Provision' report. The report has not been published in the evidence base. The Neighbourhood Plan goes onto say (paragraph 6.5) that 'based on the parish population (2011 Census), Markfield should provide for 4.2% of this - a housing provision of 382 dwellings for the period 2016-2036.' As mentioned at paragraph 12 of this representation, a neighbourhood planning body may exceptionally need to determine a housing requirement figure themselves. In doing so they are required to take account of relevant policies, [including] the existing and emerging spatial strategy' (paragraph:	The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and it should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. The Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy makes provision for the development of a minimum of 80 new homes in Markfield over the period 2006 - 2026. This was met with the granting of planning permission for the redevelopment of The George Inn on Main Street the Hopwood Drive development south of London Road and Markfield Court, Ratby Lane. Preparation of the new Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan began in 2017. We have now been advised that the new Local Plan	**Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.10 and Policy M15 to be modified to reflect a revised housing provision of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				105 Reference ID: 41-105- 20190509 – emphasis added). We have not had sight of any report or assessment which considers why the proportionate population figure of 4.2% from the Census should be applied to the housing requirement of 9,100 homes to arrive at a proposed Markfield housing requirement for 382 homes. That figure has no relationship with any understanding of the spatial circumstances of the Borough or of Markfield, its role as a Key Rural Centre and the part it can play in a strategic distribution of growth or the availability of services, facilities and infrastructure to support growth and the capacity of the environment. Markfield is widely anticipated to be a location for growth and there is every possibility that this will not be limited to a proportionate uplift. Whilst the pre-amble in the Neighbourhood Plan notes the housing requirement from the existing development plan, no regard has been had to the emerging strategy as far as we can tell. Indeed, the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report August 2020 simply reiterates	will set out the overall development strategy for Hinckley & Bosworth Borough for the period 2020 to 2039. The new Local Plan will not be finalised until 2022 at the earliest, but in the meantime the Borough Council is encouraging qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans to plan for the period 2020 to 2039 to align with the new Local Plan. We have been advised that the housing figures set out in the adopted Core Strategy are out of date and can no longer be relied upon for neighbourhood plan purposes. The emerging Local Plan will set out new figures for parishes however the Local Plan is not sufficiently advanced to do this yet. In the meantime, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council has encouraged	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				the approach described in the Neighbourhood Plan (paragraph 3.5). Hinckley and Bosworth have commenced a local plan review. To date the Issues and Options consultation (January to February 2018) and 'New Directions for Growth' consultation (January to March 2019) have been completed, setting out strategic options for growth (outside the urban areas, urban extensions, new settlements etc). The Borough Council are actively working towards a Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan for publication in March 2021. It is highly likely that additional growth will be directed to Markfield. Indeed, the Borough Council has been systematically confirming to Neighbourhood Plan Groups that they should plan for growth (see HBBC letter to the Neighbourhood Plan examiner in response to the initial comments and questions on the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan). It is highly unlikely that a preferred strategy would limit development at Markfield to proportionate growth in the way promoted by the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. In any event, the amount of housing	groups to explore options to set their own figures. One option is a simple approach of apportioning the overall borough housing need to parishes based on the share of population in those parishes. This is the approach set out in the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 6.5. The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				required in an area is a strategic matter (paragraph 20 NPPF) although non-strategic policies can be used by communities through Neighbourhood Plans to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development and also for allocating sites (Paragraph 28 NPPF). The Neighbourhood Plan claims (paragraph 1.17) that it 'has been aligned with the emerging Local Plan to cover the period up to 2036.' Unfortunately, there is no exploration of these strategic matters in the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan or its evidence base. It appears to be the case that the single act of alignment by the Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Plan review is in the selection of a plan period to 2036. With one eye on the significant potential for the Neighbourhood Plan to be out of alignment with the emerging strategy, paragraph 1.17 admits that 'once the new Local Plan is adopted there may be value in a review of the Neighbourhood Plan.' A 2015 Ministerial letter to the Planning Inspectorate suggests that 'early review may be used as a way of ensuring that a Local Plan is not unnecessarily delayed by seeking to		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				resolve matters which are not critical to the plan's soundness or legal compliance as a whole' (emphasis added). Housing requirements and delivery are critical matters for Hinckley and Bosworth and Markfield plays a central role for the wider local planning authority area. For this reason, they are critical matters for the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan and the Plan should not rely on Review. Whilst this examination does not test the soundness of the Neighbourhood Plan it does need to ensure legal compliance and that the basic conditions are met as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This includes 'having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order (or neighbourhood plan).' In developing a plan which attempts to tackle the strategic issue of housing requirements, without considering the need to significantly boosted housing supply or take account of existing and		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				emerging spatial strategies, the Neighbourhood Plan has not had regard to paragraphs 20 and 59 NPPF and paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 41-105-20190509 of the PPG. These failings are beyond the circumstances whereby a plan can be found sound conditional upon a review.		
Tony & Nicky Dunsbee	55			Housing - We agree with the local assessment of future housing need and certainly would not wish to see any additional increase in housing development, because of its adverse impact on our local infrastructure, especially on our doctors' practice, our local pharmacy and school, as well as its generation of significant additional road traffic.	Noted	**No change**
Danielle Sculthorpe	55			Property developers must not be allowed to carve up the countryside in the name of profit. Markfield does not need an extra 240 homes never mind 800! What is needed are more shops and a larger better school. This is a lovely area surrounded by beautiful countryside. Which would be ruined by more new build estates. Jelsons did not complete the estate on London as per their plans and promises or within the given time. Also I personally saw the builders burn plastic and other	The Government has an ambition to be delivering 300,000 new homes per year by the mid-2020s. Markfield must play its part in meeting this requirement. The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the	**Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.10 and Policy M15 to be modified to reflect a revised housing provision of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				materials in the field behind the estate. On top of that I witnessed baby cows eating (and then being sick) the rubbish left in the fields.	period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039. A planning permission will normally include a condition stating that development must commence within three years of the date it was granted. Once the development has commenced, the permission remains in place unless the local authority serves a completion notice. Burning is not an acceptable way of disposing of commercial waste. Burning waste produces smoke that contains a range of pollutants which can	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					pollute the environment and have damaging health effects. It also increases background levels of air pollution. Laws exist to protect people and the environment. Please alert Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council to the illegal burning and dumping of construction waste.	
Richard Hartley	55			Having looked at the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (2020), while we are fundamentally against any major new building development(s) in the village, we understand that in order to prevent the grossly excessive developments which have been proposed, we would support the reduced plan for 241 dwellings by 2036 in keeping with the plan recommendations. When we first moved to Markfield 38 years ago, it felt like a proper village with a community spirit and a Main Street with wondaful and appropriate shops, now largely lost. We have become increasingly concerned with what seems to have been the indiscriminate and thoughtless erosion	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				of the character of the village by the inconsiderate actions of the developers, allowed to intrude onto land without due attention to the ethos if the local area.		
Highways England	56		M15	We understand that, as the housing requirement for the Borough to 2036 has not yet been determined, the proposed housing requirement for the Parish has been determined by the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group assuming a minimum housing requirement for Hinckley and Bosworth of 9,100 dwellings. Based on the Parish population, Markfield should provide 4.2% of this figure, which equates to 382 dwellings for the period 2016-2036. We note that, as a total of 141 houses have been built or committed up to May 2020, the residual requirement has been identified as 241 dwellings. This is reflected in Policy M15 which allocates 241 dwellings over the Plan period.	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	56		M15	It is important to build flexibility into the housing numbers as Neighbourhood Plan sets out the long term housing provision within the area; this hasn't been provided in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. The housing figure should be expressed as a minimum as it enables greater variance to react to any changes such as if the Borough Council are required to plan for higher numbers than those in the current Local Plan, and with the new planning reforms outlined in the recent White Paper, and changes to the Standard Methodology. Flexibility could be incorporated into the Plan by identifying a reserve housing site or a second phase of the preferred allocation given the potential for a larger scheme on this site submission. Reserve sites allow you to have a say in what sites may be allocated in the future if a larger housing need is determined. Reserve sites give the Local Authority a good idea of what sites the NDP have assessed as good alternative sites, and this would come into consideration when/if allocating through the Local Plan process if a higher need is determined. What are your thoughts on identifying reserve	The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039. At 31 March 2020, there were existing commitments for 15 dwellings (5 dwellings at 20 Shaw Lane (17/00857/REM) and 10 bungalows as an extension to Markfield Court Retirement Village (19/01013/FUL)). The proposed Jelson development will accommodate 283 dwellings. Neighbourhood Plan Policy M17 also	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size. Map labelling to be consistent.** **Policy M15 (Housing Provision) be replaced as follows:** ***This Plan makes provision for a minimum of 334 additional dwellings. This will be met by:*** ***A. Existing commitments;*** ***B. The allocation of a housing site south of London Road in accordance with Policy M16;*** ***C. Residential development in accordance***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				sites or a second phase of the allocation to help cater for potential future growth, and help in the instance of a future review of the NDP? Map 10 needs to be updated to show the changes to the site having access from London Road	provides for infill development which in the past has provided for around 2 dwellings per annum (an estimated 38dw over the period 2020 to 2039). Therefore, existing commitments, windfall development and the proposed Jelson development would exceed the proposed housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039 without the need to identify a housing reserve site.	***with Policy M19: Markfield Court Retirement Village and Woodrowe House and Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education; and*** **D.** ***Windfall development in accordance with Policy M17.***
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	56	6.10		Bullet point 2 – 'see paragraph???' this should be amended to the correct reference.	Agree	**Paragraph 6.10 be amended to include appropriate referencing.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Michael Stevens	56	6.12		This states that 24 sites were considered for possible development and that London Road site was 'the best'. Without knowing the other sites, it is not possible to determine on what grounds London Road was considered 'best'. Having said that, the site per se does appear very appropriate given your defined parameters. I assume that one of the sites was the land 'east of Ratby Lane' referring to 48 properties as this incorrectly appeared in an earlier draft. As you are probably aware, there is currently a very recent planning application for 48 houses (coincidence?) for this site. There are numerous reasons why this site falls outwith your stated Policy M1, but it has recently come to light that there is a restrictive legal covenant placed on the land by the then Secretary of State for Social Services in 1984 (LT158036 - Land to the south east side of Ratby Lane Markfield - Conveyance dated 16 November 1984). The covenant states that:- The land cannot be used or occupied by any other purpose other than those of agriculture, horticulture or forestry AT ANY TIME HEREAFTER. The intention behind the covenant was	Land East of Ratby Lane is currently the subject of a full planning application for a residential development of 48 dwellings with associated infrastructure, access and areas of open space (20/00848/FUL). The site was one of 24 potential housing sites were put forward by landowners and developers. Most were identified by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council in its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). Basic information was gathered for each site and we appraised each option for its suitability, availability and achievability using clearly defined sustainability criteria. Factors such as access to services and facilities, heritage, nature conservation and landscape have been considered.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				to protect Markfield Court, a retirement village, from disturbance from any future potential development. Both the Islamic Centre and Village were allowed in open countryside with a protected frontage along Ratby Lane that did not lead to urbanisation and harm the character and appearance of the open countryside. Whilst accepting that a covenant is not a material planning consideration, it brings into question the deliverability of any development on the site. The County Councillor and the MP for Markfield have made representations to the Secretary of State on behalf of residents, that the covenant will not be released. I do not know whether this restrictive covenant formed part of the discussions when considering competing sites but it is clearly an important consideration. This could usefully be alluded to on Page 63 and gives added support to Point 4 in Policy M19.	The site east of Ratby Lane is not the Qualifying Body's preferred site. The terms of the covenant are noted.	
Leicestershire County Council	56	6.9		Paragraph 6.9 As above, is a 241 residual requirement realistic?	The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per	**Paragraphs 6.3 to 6.10 and Policy M15 to be modified to reflect a revised**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039. At 31 March 2020, there were existing commitments for 15 dwellings (5 dwellings at 20 Shaw Lane (17/00857/REM) and 10 bungalows as an extension to Markfield Court Retirement Village (19/01013/FUL)). The proposed Jelson development will accommodate 283 dwellings. Neighbourhood Plan Policy M17 also provides for infill development which in the past has provided for around 2 dwellings per annum (an estimated 38dw	**housing provision of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					over the period 2020 to 2039). Therefore, existing commitments, windfall development and the proposed Jelson development would exceed the proposed housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039 without the need to identify a housing reserve site.	
Owl Partnerships	56	6.9		The Neighbourhood Plan goes on to note (paragraph 6.9) that 'In all 141 houses have been built in the parish since 2016 or otherwise committed (May 2020). Taking account of the housing provision of 382 dwellings, this leaves a residual requirement of some 241 dwellings to be allocated in the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan.' The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report August 2020 recognise that Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) specifies 'urban development projects' to include development of more than 150	Some plans require a Strategic Environmental Assessment and/or a Habitat Regulations Assessment. A screening assessment of the Draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has been undertaken which concludes that a full SEA is not required to comply with this basic condition. A Basic Conditions Statement will be prepared to accompany the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. It will explain how the proposed Markfield	**The Parish Council's website be amended to include the Neighbourhood Plan evidence base to include a Basic Conditions Statement.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				dwellings and that the proposed housing allocation is for a minimum of 240 dwellings and therefore is above this threshold. The Screening Report concludes that this level of growth does not require an SEA on the basis that the proposed housing allocation is unlikely to result in significant adverse effects due to its proximity to environmental and historical assets and the intervening land uses and lack of pathway for effects arising from development of the site (paragraph 6.4). In having regard to the potential for geographical or locational impacts only it completely fails to have regard to the strategic or spatial effects of this growth. Housing requirements and delivery are strategic matters (see paragraphs 25 to 27 of this representation) and as the Neighbourhood Plan is providing for such matters a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required. The plan goes on to allocate a 10 Ha site south of London Road for 241 homes noting that a total of 24 sites had been assessed (paragraph 6.13). We have not seen any evidence of such a site assessment. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group minutes from 10th	Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning General Regulations 2012 (as amended) (The Regulations) and how the basic conditions of neighbourhood planning and other considerations as prescribed by Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 have been met.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				March 2020 refer to a 'Site Assessment Framework covering 24 different sustainability objectives, which, when worked through on a site by site basis would form a sustainability appraisal for each. That would then allow judgements to be made as to the relative development merits of each site'. The assessment has not been published in the evidence base. As a consequence we are unable to tell how the site at London Road has been judged and, importantly, completely unaware of whether our client's interests at Ratby Lane have been assessed and, if so, how the site has been judged. We have not had sight of the criteria or had the opportunity to engage in the process of site selection; a process which appears to have taken place behind closed doors with no right of reply. PPG Paragraph: 048 Reference ID: 41-048-20140306 notes that a qualifying body must consult any of the consultation bodies whose interest it considers may be affected by the draft neighbourhood plan as set out in Schedule 1 to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended). Schedule 1(p) identifies		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				'bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area' as one such consultation body. Owl Partnerships are actively pursuing planning permission at the Land at Ratby Lane and in this respect are carrying on business in the area. PPG Paragraph: 048 Reference ID: 41-048-20140306 goes on to note that 'other public bodies, landowners and the development industry should, as necessary and appropriate be involved in preparing a draft neighbourhood plan or Order.' Whilst a general consultation invitation has been placed on the Parish Council's website no engagement has taken place on the process to arrive at the strategy or to identify and assess sites. Specifically, with the lack of any published material in the form of the Housing Provision report or the site assessments, even at this late stage, it is clearly the case that meaningful consultation is not being undertaken. It goes without saying that this prejudices our client's interests as they relate to the plan making process and the future development potential at Ratby Lane. At the very last, our client should have an opportunity to consider the		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				assessment and provide any comment and evidence they consider pertinent to the site selection process, particularly in the event that the site selection process may not be robust or reliant on objectionable or un-evidenced claims. For these reasons, the Neighbourhood Plan process has failed to meet the requirements for consultation set out in Schedule 1 to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended). The SEA Screening Report August 2020 states only that the 'MNP will need to be prepared having regard to the NPPF and in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan' (p.28 – 1a and 1b). This statement makes clear within the plan making evidence base that no regard has been had for emerging strategies as required by the PPG. The SEA Screening Report August 2020 goes on to say that the 'Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to influence other plans or programmes' (p.28 – Q1a and Q1b). The PPG says that where a neighbourhood plan has been brought into force, the local planning authority should take its policies and proposals into account when preparing the local		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				plan (Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 61-006-20190723). If made, the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan would restrict the delivery of growth at Markfield in the period prior to the adoption of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and, given the advice in the PPG, restrict options for allocations being considered in the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan review. Whilst there is a technical argument to say the local plan authority could ignore a Made Markfield Neighbourhood Plan which restricts growth when considering whether to direct growth to Markfield, this would risk ignoring the advice in the PPG, may not be politically palatable and would undermine public confidence in the Neighbourhood Plan making process. Furthermore, the SEA Screening Report August 2020 goes on to state that 'One of the Basic Conditions which need to be met by the MNP is that it contributes towards the delivery of sustainable development. Policies and proposals need to be prepared having regard to national policy which, as referred to in Chapter 3 of the draft plan, is underpinned by the three overarching objectives of sustainable development		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				(social, economic and environmental). These are reflected in the vision and its supporting statements referred to under 1a above. The plan should also be prepared in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. For Markfield, proposals should have regard to Policies 7 (Key Rural Centres) and 8 (Key Rural Centres Relating to Leicester) of the Core Strategy which provide the overarching development framework for Key Rural Centres and Markfield' (p.29 - Q1c). The SEA Screening Report August 2020 makes clear that any consideration of the policy framework has been restricted to the adopted local plan only; again without regard to the PPG. Importantly, the appropriate recognition that the Neighbourhood Plan has to meet the basic condition of contributing to sustainable development has not extended to any appropriate assessment of the sustainability credentials of the selected strategy or site having regard to the alternatives.		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	57	6.13		The site selection material has not been made publically available during this consultation and respondents have not been provided the opportunity to	Agree	**The Parish Council's website be amended to include the**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				comment on this. The site selection documents should be made available for consultation so that the assessments are open and transparent.		**Neighbourhood Plan evidence base including site selection documentation.**
Leicestershire County Council	57	6.13		Soils are an essential finite resource on which important ecosystem services such as food production, are dependent on. They 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. 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	Agricultural land quality was an important consideration in the identification of housing sites.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				provide further information and Agricultural Land classification.		
Jelson Limited	57	6.13		Whilst Jelson considers that the boundary to the proposed allocation should be amended to reflect amendments made to the proposals following engagement with the local community between September and October 2020 we fully support the principle of allocating the land to the south of Markfield for housing. Paragraph 67 of the NPPF confirms that "planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, To ensure that the NPSG can demonstrate that its site selection process is robust at the examination stage and complies with the basic conditions, at the next stage of consultation on the draft MNP, the NPSG should publish its site selection evidence. This should show how it has assessed the site options, including what criteria it has applied, in reaching the conclusion that Jelson's land should be allocated in accordance with para 42 of the PPG. Availability The land is controlled by Jelson an experienced housebuilder with a track record of delivery. It is actively	The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039. At 31 March 2020, there were existing commitments for 15 dwellings (5 dwellings at 20 Shaw Lane (17/00857/REM) and 10 bungalows as an extension to Markfield Court Retirement Village (19/01013/FUL)). The proposed Jelson development will	**The Parish Council's website be amended to include the Neighbourhood Plan evidence base including site selection documentation.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				promoting the land for residential development and there are no constraints to delivery in terms of landownership. Therefore, the land is available immediately for development. Jelson intends to submit a planning application later this month in relation to part of its land for c. 280 dwellings and assuming that permission is granted it could be on site quickly and be delivering housing by early 2022. Suitability Sustainability The site is in a sustainable location, immediately adjacent and very well-related to the existing built-up area of Markfield. The site is located is within walking distance of a range of amenities in the centre of Markfield and is accessible to public transport including regular bus services to Leicester City Centre and Coalville. It is located in particularly close proximity to Mercenfeld Primary School and other facilities towards the south of the village which are only a short walk away. The adopted Plan identifies Markfield as a 'Key Rural Centre' which is one of the more sustainable locations for	accommodate 283 dwellings. Neighbourhood Plan Policy M17 also provides for infill development which in the past has provided for around 2 dwellings per annum (an estimated 38dw over the period 2020 to 2039). Therefore, existing commitments, windfall development and the proposed Jelson development would exceed the proposed housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039 without the need to identify a housing reserve site.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				housing, employment and service provision in the Borough after the urban area. The scale of development contemplated would support improvements to and/ or the expansion of infrastructure in the village, including Mercenfeld Primary School, South Charnwood High School and Markfield GP Surgery, to provide increased capacity through Section 106 contributions. New housing development would also deliver new open spaces, play facilities, allotments and improvements to pedestrian infrastructure for new and existing residents of Markfield. The delivery of a mix of family housing of different sizes and tenures would also provide additional spending capacity and creation of a more balanced age profile in the village to support the viability of local businesses and services. Technical Matters Ecology and Trees FPCR has undertaken a detailed Tree Survey and Ecological Assessment of the site, including a comprehensive suite of surveys for protected species. This has concluded that much of the site is		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				agricultural land which has limited ecological value. Any ecological interest the site does hold is confined to existing trees, hedgerows and the watercourse within the site. The vast majority of these features would be retained as an integrated part of any new development. There is also an opportunity, through the development of the site, to enhance the ecological value of the area including through the provision of the network of open spaces as part of the development, the planting of significant new trees and landscaping and the creation of new habitats to greatly enhance the biodiversity of the locality. This will also take account of and help to deliver the ambitions of the National Forest. Landscape and Visual Impact The character of the site displays suburban influences due to its location on the edge of the settlement and is visually contained from the majority of the surrounding landscape owing to intervening landform, vegetation and built form. There is an opportunity to strengthen		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				landscape character through the provision of new Green Infrastructure and landscaping. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is being undertaken by FPCR and will be submitted as part of the planning application. The scheme has been designed with input from FPCR to ensure that it incorporates appropriate landscape mitigation and would not have any unacceptable adverse landscape and visual impacts. Highways and Access As set out above, the site is well connected to local services and facilities and is accessible by sustainable modes of transport, with the surrounding area having good public transport, pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. Three public rights of way cross the site and would be integrated and improved as part of the development. It is proposed that the site would be accessed via a new priority T-junction, with a ghost island right turn lane, appropriate visibility splays and new pedestrian crossing on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close, to comply with LCC Standards. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage the majority of new residents to use the new access on London Road. The scheme would deliver a number of improvements to existing pedestrian and cycle infrastructure in the vicinity of the site and to existing bus stops. WYG has been appointed to consider the traffic and transport impacts associated with the development. It has prepared a detailed transport assessment, in accordance with a scope agreed with LCC Highways, which considers detail of vehicular access, highway safety, accessibility by sustainable modes of travel, transport planning policy, the number of trips generated by the proposals and the impact on key junctions in the vicinity of the site. The Transport Assessment will be submitted with the application for consideration by the local highway authority and confirm whether any improvements are required to local roads and junctions in order to mitigate the impact of the proposed		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				development. WYG has also conducted sensitivity tests for a larger scheme of c. 450 dwellings to confirm that there would be sufficient capacity on the local highway network to accommodate the additional trips, subject to any necessary improvements. The application will also be supported by a Travel Plan which will assist in promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport and reduce reliance on the car. Flood Risk and Drainage The site is located within Flood Zone 1 on the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning. It is, therefore, at low risk of fluvial flooding. A small watercourse runs through the site. The flood risk from this brook has been assessed through a flood modelling exercise undertaken by JBA consulting and Avison Young in 2020. This shows that flood water is predominantly contained within the channel of the watercourse and would not constrain development on the site. A drainage strategy is being prepared which will incorporate a range of Sustainable Urban Drainage System		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				(SUDS) including attenuation features and swales which would be integrated with the landscape proposals and assist in enhancing amenity and biodiversity on the site. Noise The site is located in relatively close proximity to the M1 which is a potential source of noise. The natural topography of the site provides some degree of shielding of the proposed development from noise. However, a detailed survey of the noise climate has been undertaken by Hoare Lea in 2019. The results of this survey indicate that noise is only a potential issue for properties proposed closest to the M1 but even in those parts of the site, the effects of road noise are capable of being mitigated satisfactorily through detailed design. Archaeology and Heritage There are no designated heritage assets within the vicinity of the site. The MNP proposes to identify 'Lower Grange Farm' and 'Ridge and Furrow' features as 'non-designated heritage assets'. University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS) has been appointed to undertake a Desk Based Archaeological Assessment and Geophysical Survey of		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				the site. ULAS' Assessment concludes that there is low potential for prehistoric, medieval and post-medieval archaeological remains and low to moderate potential for Roman archaeological remains within the proposed development area. ULAS conclude that appropriate mitigation for below ground archaeology (i.e. any additional field investigation) could be secured by way of planning conditions. ULAS conclude that the ridge and furrow within the site is of low significance because it has mostly been ploughed out and extant earthworks are truncated. As a result, the impacts of development are unlikely to be significant. It also concludes that development would not have any significant impact on the setting of Lower Grange Farm which is largely contained by modern residential development. Economic Viability As set out above, there are no known significant site constraints that might prevent development or make the development unviable. Therefore, the development of the site for 280 dwellings and a wider scheme		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				for c. 170 dwellings should be economically viable. For the reasons set out above, the site is available, suitable, likely to be viable. It is, therefore, a sustainable and appropriate site for the delivery of housing in Markfield. Taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability." The site is 'available', 'suitable' and 'likely to be viable', for the reasons set out under the headings below, and should, in our view, allocated in the MNP with Jelson's wider land identified as a 'reserve site'.		
Julie Grace	58		M16	Page 57. I disagree with access to Jelsons proposed 241 new development being through Croft Way and Doctor Wright Close. These routes are untenable.	Agree. The proposed site should be extended to allow for access via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close, to comply with LCC Standards. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new	**Policy M16 be modified to provide for the development of approximately 18.3 hectares. The principal access should be via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.	**A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.**
John Bowler	58		M16	Thorough and comprehensive document. I support the proposal to allocate required housing allocation to land to the south of the village behind the present new Jelson estate. This is a sensible and realistic approach, although traffic arrangements are flawed in seeking to use Croftway for access- a new access at the opposite end of the estate would be much more sensible in terms of safety and avoidance of congestion. I would not support an alternative strategy of	The scale of development proposed does raise important infrastructure issues, though Jelsons have assured us there are no problems. Highways England suggest there will be an impact on M1 Junction 22 and the A50 Markfield Road / A46 Leicester Western Bypass. Capacity on the A50/A511 corridor is constrained. A511 Growth Corridor	**Policy M16 be modified to provide for the development of approximately 18.3 hectares. The principal access should be via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				allowing multiple speculative and unsustainable developments on the outskirts of the village beyond the building line. However, any increase in housing on the scale envisaged will require attention to infrastructure, particularly in respect of available public parking and enforcement of on road parking restrictions in the centre of the village.	Scheme is unfunded and requires developer contributions. Mercenfeld Primary School will require expansion but our information is '…the school's now finds its restricted campus now finds itself boxed-in, with no scope for expansion. There are ongoing issues with the level and style of car parking on and around the school's main entrance…'; Markfield Medical Centre needs replacement and a site for a new surgery is required. The proposed development site should be extended to allow for access via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close, to comply with LCC Standards. This would be designed to incorporate	**A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only. Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.	
Duncan Horton	58		M16	Being a fairly new neighbour and living in the recent Jelson site I have had a few years to study the comes and goings of the village, and from what I have observed is that surgery, schools, and shops are working at the limit of there capacity. Not only that the access required is on to London Road which at the moment now is 40mph and used as a cut through from outside traffic and can be very busy at peak times, also can be very dangerous as not all drivers respect the correct speed limit. Taking into account that most homes require at least two vehicles that would add 400 more cars which would be a disaster for the area.	Vehicular trip rates for the proposed development should be derived from traffic surveys undertaken at the existing Farmlands development (London Road/Hopwood Drive junction). Am and pm trip rates are expected to be less than 1 per dwelling. The proposal is for 283 dwellings. Mercenfeld Primary School will require expansion but our information is '…the school's now finds its restricted campus now finds itself boxed-in, with no scope for expansion. There are ongoing issues with the level and style of car parking on and around	**Policy M16 be modified to provide for the development of approximately 18.3 hectares (283 dwellings). The principal access should be via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					the school's main entrance…'; Markfield Medical Centre needs replacement and a site for a new surgery is required.	**most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only. Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified.**
Barry Mingay	58		M16	I recognise the pressure that is to be exerted on our school accommodation perhaps a house to house survey might give a 5/6 year guide on expectation for need. Then a developer might be persuaded to exchange the school site for another new parcel of land for the Education authorities. If a projected population was known, planning would be easier.	Mercenfeld Primary School will require expansion but our information is '…the school's now finds its restricted campus now finds itself boxed-in, with no scope for expansion. There are ongoing issues with the level and style of car parking on and around the school's main entrance…';	**Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Liz Bowler	58		M16	Whilst no large scale development is clearly preferable, I recognise Markfield has to take its share of development to meet housing needs. With this in mind, I support the proposed, controlled extension to the current Jelson development rather than any unsustainable development on the outskirts of the village (such as the Owl Developments consultation for Ratby Lane). Specifically in relation to the Jelson development, access down Croft Way is not a suitable route in/out and is not fair on the residents. Jelson should also consider the parking provisions with each house proposed to be built. Realistically, including a garage in the parking spaces available per house is immaterial because generally garages are not used for cars, and this pushes cars onto the roads on the estate, with a knock on effect on roads off the estate. For example, vehicles connected with the current Jelson housing park (illegally) on the grass verges on London Road which make a particular mess of the verges. This illegal parking is not enforced. With approximately double the amount of cars per houses proposed, the safety	The proposed development site should be extended to allow for access via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only. Better enforcement of vehicle parking gained clear support, with 58% rating it a high priority and 23% a medium priority. Parking enforcement is primarily undertaken by Leicestershire County Council which is responsible for enforcing all on-street parking restrictions. Mercenfeld Primary School will require expansion but our information is '…the school's now finds its restricted campus now finds itself boxed-in, with no scope for expansion. There are ongoing issues with the level and style of car parking on and around	**Policy M16 be modified to provide for the development of approximately 18.3 hectares (283 dwellings). The principal access should be via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				of increased traffic in the village should be considered with particular regard to the current pattern of parking in the centre of the village. Again, illegal parking on double yellow lines (not enforced) causes a nuisance and is dangerous when line of sight is obstructed, particularly near junctions and where passing park cars is difficult. I have concerns about the impact of a large scale development on the availability of doctors appointments and increased capacity affecting the quality of performance of the primary school. Overall, I support the controlled development of a limited area in the village and do not believe development should take over all the green and open space in Markfield. Markfield is a village and should remain as such.	the school's main entrance…'; Markfield Medical Centre needs replacement and a site for a new surgery is required.	**Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified. Paragraph 8.29 be modified to clarify parking enforcement responsibility.**
B J Wardle	58		M16	Still cannot see London Road upgrade or lay by for rear entrance to school (planned when school planning was first proposed)	Established on a greenfield site, to replacement the old village school by Saw Pits Green in the late 1970s, the school's now finds its restricted campus now finds itself boxed-in, with no scope for expansion. There are ongoing issues with the	**Required infrastructure improvements to Mercenfeld Primary School be clarified.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					level and style of car parking on and around the school's main entrance on Oakfield Avenue at the start and finish of each school day. To try and ease problems with road parking, parents are able to use the community centre car park, when dropping-off or collecting children. The children can then enter the school site via a pedestrian gate set at one corner of the Community Park.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Claire McWilliams	58		M16	I would like to put forward my comments on the proposals as a resident of Croftway backing on to the fields proposed for building. Is it possible to have an indication as to how near the boundaries will be to our gardens. We are extremely fortunate to have uninterrupted views of beautiful countryside. I am opposed to the development however I am realistic that this project is likely to go ahead regardless. Residents are more likely to be supportive if assurances can be made that the development will be sympathetic and in keeping with the countywide with a reasonable distance being maintained between the new development and existing garden boundaries. I am concerned about the increased traffic entering Croft way which is already congested with parked cars and visitors to the Bulls Head pub, how do Jelson plan to minimise this and consider alternative access via London road? Overall size of the development will have a significant impact on local resources such as school and doctors surgery. Mercenfeld is already full and I can not see how the capacity can be	Loss of view is not a material consideration while detailed considerations like back-to-back distances will be addressed through the development management process. The proposed development site should be extended to allow for access via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only. Mercenfeld Primary School will require expansion but our information is '…the school's now finds its restricted campus now finds itself boxed-in, with no scope for expansion. There are ongoing issues with the level and style of car parking on and around the school's main entrance…'; Markfield Medical Centre needs replacement and a	**Policy M16 be modified to provide for the development of approximately 18.3 hectares (283 dwellings). The principal access should be via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				increased, the same principle for the doctors surgery. There is no mention of the impact on social care resources which are already bursting at the seams with high waiting lists, vacant social work positions and continual funding cuts. How will this be addressed with additional housing in the area? Will there be a quota of social housing within the development and if so where is it proposed these properties will be situated. It is common for anti social behaviour to be reported at a higher rate within social housing, what will Jelson be doing to support the community to tackle this should problems arise.	site for a new surgery is required. 40% of dwellings will be affordable housing (including affordable rent and shared ownership).	**Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified.**
Margaret Bowler	58		M16	I support the controlled housing growth and site outlined in the plan. Markfield has been fortunate so far not to have had the numbers of houses that other surrounding Parishes have had and in other parts of the Borough. The lack of 5 year land supply by HBBC has been the catalyst. I applaud the MNPSG for leading on this and producing a thorough plan which is so much more than residential allocation. I do not agree that Croft Way is a suitable access for part of the Jelson	The proposed site should be extended to allow for access via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close, to comply with LCC Standards. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new	**Policy M16 be modified to provide for the development of approximately 18.3 hectares. The principal access should be via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				development and have responded as such in their consultation.	residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.	**A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.**
John Severn	58		M16	I am concerned with the requirement to allow for the building of 241 dwellings in the next fifteen years, especially as a developer is already pushing for this, in apparently the near future. This will surely lead to more over the fifteen years. My concern is with the ability of the village to cope with further residents in it's current format and the strain this will put on village facilities e.g. school, GP surgery, roads and shops. I do not consider that these are any longer adequate for the current number of residents, never mind for an	The national standard method for determining housing need gives a housing need for the borough of 452 houses per year or 8,588 over the period 2020-2039. Based on the latest data on population (2017 midyear estimates) Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population. Based on this share Markfield would have a	**Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				increase in population. For example the school has been using six mobile classrooms for many years. These should be a temporary solution only and are not a suitable way to educate children on a permanent basis. This plan, by increasing the number of children attending the school, will exacerbate the problem. The GP surgery always seems busy and appointments are not easy to get. The current development proposed by Jelson Homes will increase traffic around the village but particularly along London Road. Access on to the A50 is already very poor at peak times, additional residents will further stress this both on Launde Road and Leicester Road. I understand this may be the minimum the parish is allowed to have, but that doesn't mean it is not problematic for the village. Any rise in this number is going to exponentially increase these problems.	housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039. At 31 March 2020, there were existing commitments for 15 dwellings (5 dwellings at 20 Shaw Lane (17/00857/REM) and 10 bungalows as an extension to Markfield Court Retirement Village (19/01013/FUL)). The proposed Jelson development will accommodate 283 dwellings. Neighbourhood Plan Policy M17 also provides for infill development which in the past has provided for around 2 dwellings per annum (an estimated 38dw over the period 2020 to 2039). Therefore, existing commitments, windfall development and the proposed Jelson development would exceed the proposed housing requirement of 334	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					dwellings between 2020 and 2039 without the need to identify additional sites. The scale of development proposed does raise important infrastructure issues, though Jelsons have assured us there are no problems. Highways England suggest there will be an impact on M1 Junction 22 and the A50 Markfield Road / A46 Leicester Western Bypass. Capacity on the A50/A511 corridor is constrained. A511 Growth Corridor Scheme is unfunded and requires developer contributions. Mercenfeld Primary School will require expansion but our information is '…the school's now finds its restricted campus now finds itself boxed-in, with no scope for expansion. There are ongoing issues with the level and style of car parking on and around	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					the school's main entrance…'; Markfield Medical Centre needs replacement and a site for a new surgery is required. The proposed development site should be extended to allow for access via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close, to comply with LCC Standards. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.	
Allan Chapman	58		M16	I am concerned that parts of the questionnaire lacked clarity. I have spoken to a number of people who voted for South of London road adjacent to the new Jelson estate. Most people viewed that location as next to	National planning practice advises that parish councils should carry out an appraisal of options and an assessment of individual sites against clearly	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				the estate following London Road up to the top of the Hill. I feel the description was highly misleading when the recommended area now is to the south west of Doctor Wright Close. I feel that far fewer would have voted for that opinion if the true location of the purposed development had been clear. Only a small percentage of people voted for land South of Croftway. I strongly feel that the same result would have occurred if there had been greater transparency to the exact location to development to the south of London Road. I have concerns why areas have been chosen which actually have far fewer percentage votes than other options. I would like clarity on how those decisions where actually made. As both the Parish Council and the Steering Group are public bodies I would request under the 2000 freedom of information Act the minutes of those meetings where those decisions have been made.	identified criteria. The Qualifying Body has prepared a Site Selection Framework which sets out how it assessed sites for the allocation of land for housing development.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
John Hales	58		M16	I think this plan is acceptable since it meets the housing needs determined by central government formula in a way that is the least invasive to the existing community. I also think that managing this one major development from a builder whom HBBC already know and have worked with is a much better use of HBBC Building Department resources than trying to manage multiple smaller developments at different locations. I therefore support this proposed development.	Noted	**No change**
Highways England	58		M16	A housing site for all 241 dwellings has been allocated on land south of London Road under Policy M16. We note that Highways England is currently engaging in informal pre-application discussions regarding a proposal for 420 dwellings on land encompassing the allocated site. Depending on how this site is brought forward, there is the potential for the M1 Junction 22 and the A50 Markfield Road / A46 Leicester Western Bypass to be impacted.	The scale of development proposed does raise important infrastructure issues, though Jelsons have assured us there are no problems. Highways England suggest there will be an impact on M1 Junction 22 and the A50 Markfield Road / A46 Leicester Western Bypass. Capacity on the A50/A511 corridor is constrained. A511 Growth Corridor Scheme is unfunded and requires developer contributions.	**Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	58		M16	Criteria 4 and 6 – These criteria are repetitive. Have the Highway Authority been consulted to establish whether these are acceptable access points? If they have not been provided the opportunity to comment on this element they should be as a priority as the access points may not be viable and are set out in policy. Primary access should be from London Road, as agreed through discussions with Parish and Development Management officers at the LPA – this will need to be reflected in the policy (points 4 and 6) Criteria 7 b) incomplete reference to right of way. Criteria 7 e) incomplete reference to the number of parking spaces to be provided. If a parking figure were identified, the LPA would have concerns that a reference to provision of 'parking for xx cars' for all new dwellings is included. The policy does not have proportionate regard for the types of dwellings being proposed, and no clear consideration has been given to consideration of Leicestershire County Council's 'Leicestershire Highways Design Guide' (which has superseded the 6Cs Design Guide). A recent appeal decision	The proposed development site should be extended to allow for access via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close, to comply with LCC Standards. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.	**Policy M16 be modified to provide for the development of approximately 18.3 hectares. The principal access should be via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				(APP/Y2430/W/18/3196456) has overruled a similar NP policy specifying two parking spaces. The Inspector noted that the NP parking standards are at odds with those contained within the 6C's Design Guide used by the Highway Authority, although acknowledging that, amongst other things, the policy seeks to ensure that adequate off-road parking is provided. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2018) states: "If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account: a) the accessibility of the development; b) the type, mix and use of development; c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport; d) local car ownership levels; and e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles." For example, terrace houses should still have parking the design needs to reflect this and therefore parking courts could be used. Have the Highways Authority been consulted in relation to this?		**Criterion 7e be modified to remove parking specific parking requirement.** **All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size. Map labelling to be consistent.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Figure for housing number and size of site should be amended to reflect the changes that have been made to the allocation following discussion with the Parish and DM officers. This can be discussed further during the preparation of the Submission Version Document. Map 9 is labelled shopping need a clear map to identify the limits to development/settlement boundary. Need a large insert map, at least A3 size.		
Leicestershire County Council	58		M16	Is access achievable off Hopwood Drive and Croft Way? The Policy doesn't appear to reference any requirement for highway mitigation unless this is covered more generally elsewhere in the NP. "The routes of footpaths R29 and R4 shall remain substantially unaltered and a link provided to public footpath R2." Are improvements not envisaged?	The proposed development site should be extended to allow for access via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close, to comply with LCC Standards. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle	**Policy M16 be modified to provide for the development of approximately 18.3 hectares. The principal access should be via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close. This would**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					access only.The scale of development proposed does raise important infrastructure issues, though Jelsons have assured us there are no problems. Highways England suggest there will be an impact on M1 Junction 22 and the A50 Markfield Road / A46 Leicester Western Bypass. Capacity on the A50/A511 corridor is constrained. A511 Growth Corridor Scheme is unfunded and requires developer contributions.	**be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only. Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified.**

Jelson Limited	58		M16	The purpose of these representations is to provide more information in relation to Jelson's vision for the land that it owns on the southern edge of Markfield and helpful, constructive feedback on the provisions of the emerging MNP having regard to the 'basic conditions' against which Neighbourhood Plans are assessed, the planning policy framework and Jelson's aspirations for its land. Attached to this letter at Appendix 1 is a Site Location Plan which shows the full extent of the land owned by Jelson to the south of Markfield. The land lies to the immediate south of London Road, the 'Farmlands' Estate, Birchfield Avenue and Croftway. It abuts the existing settlement boundary and extends to the south west towards in the M1. The land owned by Jelson extends to approximately 42.5 hectares. However, it is not promoting all of this land for development. Jelson's land is irregularly shaped and comprises a series of fields and a single residential property known as Vine Cottage. The land is within walking distance of the vast majority of the facilities and services in the centre of Markfield and is within 400 metres bus stops on	Noted	**No change**

				London Road which provide regular services to Leicester, to the east, and Coalville, to the west. A narrow brook runs through the site from north to south but the vast majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1 and at low risk of flooding. A series of public rights of way pass through the site in north-south and east-west directions. There are a number of mature trees and hedgerows along the site boundaries and internal field boundaries. The site not subject to any particular ecological designations, other than a short section of hedgerow along the north western boundary with Jelson's existing development which is identified as a Local Wildlife Site. There are no designated heritage assets within the site or within its immediate vicinity. Development on this site would, in our view, make for a logical extension to Markfield. Following pre-application consultation with the Borough Council (HBBC), Parish Council (MPC), Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) and a comprehensive public consultation with the local community, Jelson is preparing to submit a full		

				planning application for detailed planning permission the development of c. 280 dwellings on approximately 18.3 hectares of its land later this month. The extent of this land and proposed development is shown at Appendix 2. Jelson's overall vision is to deliver a high-quality residential development that is sustainable, well-designed and set within extensive new landscaping and quality public open space. The scheme seeks to reflect the characteristics of the site and its surroundings, with particular attention paid to the relationship with the wider village and landscape whilst encouraging future residents to live more sustainable lives. It is proposed that the scheme would deliver: • approximately 280 dwellings of a variety of sizes (including 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom properties) on a developable area of c. 10 hectares; • 40% of dwellings as affordable housing (including affordable rent and shared ownership); • most homes would be 2 storeys in height; • a new main vehicular and pedestrian access from London Road, to the east		

				of Chitterman Way; • a secondary access via Doctor Wright Close; • a pedestrian and cycle access only from Croftway; • a new uncontrolled pedestrian crossing on London Road, adjacent to the proposed access, and an extension to the footpath along the southern side of London Road to connect the proposed new access to the existing footway provision; • new uncontrolled pedestrian crossings at the London Road/Croftway/Main Street junction; • improvements to existing bus stops within close proximity of the site; • a network of green infrastructure (c. 8.2 hectares) interspersed through the site including a large park towards the east of the site, adjacent to the existing brook, which would provide play areas, footpaths, amenity spaces, habitat enhancements and opportunities for tree and hedgerow planting; • space for allotment provision in the east of the site; • improvements to existing public rights of way within the site and the creation of new footpath		

				linkages through the development and proposed open space, towards the wider village and countryside beyond; and • new sensitively designed sustainable drainage systems. In terms of appearance, cues would be taken from the local vernacular with road layouts and house designs carefully selected with a materials palette chosen to reflect the character of this part of Leicestershire. A series of character areas would be created including: • 'The Greens and Squares' which reflect traditional greens found within Markfield historic centre and provide a focal point at key locations within the development; • 'Green Corridors' which provide attractive and well-connected green routes through the site; and • 'Green Edge' a lower density edge fronting onto the proposed open spaces. All homes will have an appropriate amount of car parking. Parking is generally provided to the side of properties, where possible, to avoid car dominated streets. Jelson has been engaging with HBBC, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) and		

				local service providers (e.g. schools and healthcare) to consider the needs of future residents. Substantial financial contributions towards the enhancement and increasing the capacity of local infrastructure (e.g. education, healthcare, the local library and the local transport network) would be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement. On the basis of our discussions with consultees to date financial contributions sought are likely to be in the region of £2 million. Jelson is also promoting approximately 9.4 hectares of additional land further to the south and west through the plan-making process for something in the order of 170 dwellings and approximately 4 hectares of public open space should need be identified for additional housing in the emerging Local Plan. The extent of this additional land and development contemplated is shown at Appendix 3. It is envisaged that a wider scheme would reflect and build upon the vision and key design principles set out above. It would provide additional areas of open space and support significant additional investment in services and facilities in Markfield.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Jelson Limited	58		M16	The principle of the proposed allocation of part of Jelson's land to the South of Markfield for housing is welcomed and fully supported. As MPC and the NPSG is aware, following the publication of the draft MNP, Jelson undertook its own public consultation in relation to its emerging proposals for the land south of Markfield. Through the consultation process it became apparent that the principal concern from local residents in relation to the proposed development of the site was in relation to the proposed access arrangements, in particular, use of Croftway as vehicular access for new residents. Having reviewed the feedback and following further discussion with MPC and NPSG, Jelson has revisited its proposals for the site and it is now proposed that: • development would be accessed from a new priority T-junction, with a ghost island right turn lane, and new pedestrian crossing on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way; • a secondary point of access would be required from Doctor Wright Close, to comply with LCC Highway Standards, but would be designed to incorporate	The proposed development site should be extended to allow for access via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close, to comply with LCC Standards. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.The scale of development proposed does raise important infrastructure issues, though Jelsons have assured us there are no problems.	**Policy M16 be modified to provide for the development of approximately 18.3 hectares. The principal access should be via a new priority T-junction on London Road, to the east of Chitterman Way. A secondary point of access would be required via Doctor Wright Close. This would be designed to incorporate traffic calming measures to encourage most new residents to use the new access on London Road. Croftway should provide for pedestrian and cycle access only.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				traffic calming measures to encourage the majority of traffic to use the new access on London Road; • access via Croftway would be for pedestrian and cycle access only. It is proposed that construction traffic would be routed via the new access from London Road, wherever possible and avoid Doctor Wright Close and Croftway. A new point of access further to the east along London Road, requires a link road to be constructed to connect over the existing brook. In order to ensure that this is not an isolated road and to promote a coherent and sensible overall masterplan, additional parcels of development are needed land to the east along London Road. The inclusion of these additional parcels of land would increase the scale of development slightly from the approximately 240 dwellings previously contemplated to 283 dwellings. In the light of the NPPF's aim to significantly boost the supply of new homes and its emphasis that 'local housing need' is a 'minimum' Jelson's view is that it would be entirely appropriate for the MNP to allocate a site for at least 280 dwellings. Indeed,		**Required infrastructure improvements to be clarified.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				given the objectives of national policy paragraph 103 of the PPG encourages Neighbourhood Plans to exceed their local housing requirement. Indeed, allocating Jelson's site for c. 280 dwellings would: • not have any detrimental impact on the strategic spatial strategy for the Borough which recognises Markfield as a 'Key Rural Centre' with good access to Leicester; • be supported by sufficient infrastructure (e.g. on-site open space and financial S106 contributions towards the expansion of local facilities including Mercenfeld Primary School, South Charnwood High School and Markfield GP surgery, bus stop and any necessary highway improvements); and • have a realistic prospect of being delivered, as Jelson has a proven track record of delivering new housing in Borough and Leicestershire more widely, whilst achieving a policy complaint level of affordable housing and making significant investment in local community infrastructure. On this basis, Jelson consider that Policy M16 should be amended to reflect the amended scheme of c. 280 dwellings and the associated boundary		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				/ site area shown at Appendix 2. Part 7 of Policy M16 talks about development securing an "improvement in biodiversity". For consistency with the NPPF it is considered that this should be amended to refer to "biodiversity enhancements". Part 7 b) & c) also talk about retaining trees and hedgerows. Whilst tree and hedgerow removal will be kept to a minimum, it is likely that some trees and small sections of hedgerow would require removal to facilitate development. The loss of trees and hedgerows would be mitigated through appropriate landscaping and tree planting. On this basis, this part of the policy should be amended to include the words "where possible". Part 8 of Policy M16 states that the routes of footpaths R29 and R4 should remain substantially unaltered. Whilst the intention is to retain all public rights of way within the site the Development Framework Plan included at Appendix 3 would require the slight re-alignment of PRoW 4 through the site so that it could travel through a new Green Corridor through the development between a central green corridor and new park in the south east. This is not in our view a		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				'substantial alteration' but are keen to ensure that the Policy is sufficiently flexible to allow logical alterations to Public Rights of Way which would ensure that these are incorporated positively within the development.		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	59		M17	The settlement boundary is not demarcated on Map 9 it is on Map 2. Should this policy be called Housing development? It is suggested the word infill is removed as it covers more than infill development Criteria 3), Criteria 5) and Criteria 6): In the recent Burbage Examiner's Report it was recommended that where the NDP makes reference to adopted Borough Council Local Plan policies these should remove as they repeat policy. This recommendation was agreed and taken forward. The Borough Council believes that criteria 1 of policy M1 is unnecessary as it repeats existing policy and does not provide any additional detail. If the Group would like to keep a reference to DM5, DM14 and DM15, this could be included in the supporting text as an alternative. Criteria 4) This criteria is incomplete as it refers to Policy ? There isn't a SADMP policy to accord with so it needs to be	The references to relevant Local Plan Policies do not duplicate existing policy but provide useful cross-referencing.	**Map on page 57 to be replaced by map showing housing allocation and settlement boundary.** **Title of Policy M17 (Infill Housing Development) be replaced by:** ***M17: Windfall Housing Development*** **Criterion 4 of Policy M17 (Infill Housing Development) be amended to include appropriate policy reference.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				one within the Markfield NDP. Should it be Policy M19?		
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	59		M17	Policy M17 seeks to direct housing development towards sites that are located within the Markfield Settlement Boundary. The Institute supports this approach for conventional open market housing and affordable housing developments in the village (Use Class C3). It is however important to recognise that the type of residential accommodation the Institute plans to develop on the campus and the two adjacent parcels of land will be specialist purpose built accommodation for its staff, students, research scholars and other users of the campus. As such, the residential development that the Institute intends to bring forward in the future will fall within the definition of Use Class C2, rather than Use Class C3. Given the close relationship between the educational facilities on the campus and the proposed purpose-built accommodation, it is considered to be beneficial for the new residential buildings to be located on the campus, rather than within the Settlement Boundary of Markfield, because this will	Agree. However, any residential development at the Markfield Institute should be restricted to occupancy by staff and students of the Markfield Institute of Higher Education.	**Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education be modified by the addition of a criteria to read:** ***Residential development should be restricted to occupancy by staff and students of the Markfield Institute of Higher Education.*** **Policy M15 (Housing Provision) be replaced as follows:** **This Plan makes provision for a minimum of 334 additional**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				enable staff, students, and research scholars to easily access the facilities on the campus. What is more, locating purpose-built residential buildings on the campus will enable a greater number of people to live on the campus and thus will reduce the need for users to travel to and from the campus on a regular basis. Ultimately, this will help to encourage residents to adopt more sustainable travel practices. Clarify that residential development associated with the Markfield Institute of Higher Education will be permitted outside the Markfield Settlement Boundary on both the existing campus and on the two adjoining parcels of land (Plot A and Plot B).		**dwellings. This will be met by: A. Existing commitments; B. The allocation of a housing site south of London Road in accordance with Policy M16; C. Residential development in accordance with Policy M19: Markfield Court Retirement Village and Woodrowe House and Policy M12: Markfield Institute of Higher Education; and D. Windfall development in accordance with Policy M17.**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	59	6.18		Map 9 does not show the settlement boundary, this is contained on map 2. Please see comments in relation to Map 2.	Agreed.	**All maps to be replaced with maps at a recognisable scale at A4 or A3 size.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
						Map labelling to be consistent.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	61		M18	Should say reflect the most up to date housing needs rather than give set figures as this becomes out of date quickly. Also smaller family homes are not defined.	Policy M18 requires new housing development to provide for a mix of housing types that will be informed by the stated evidence of housing need unless more up-to-date housing need evidence indicates otherwise.	**No change**
Jelson Limited	61		M18	Policy M18 'Housing Mix' would appear to largely repeat the requirements of Policy 15 and 16 of the CS. It is not clear from the draft wording of the policy or the supporting text whether the policy expectations in terms of housing mix differ from those of the rest of the Borough where there is already an emphasis on the need for smaller family dwellings (i.e. 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings).	The Core Strategy pre-dates the 2017 Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Development Need Assessment and is therefore Policies 15 and 16 are out of date.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	61		M18	Paragraph 61 of the NPPF establishes that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community, including students, should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. The residential development that will come forward on the campus in the future will be designed to meet the needs and requirements of staff, students, research scholars and other users of the campus. The type of housing that is required to meet their needs differs to the type of housing that is required to meet the needs of other groups of residents in Markfield. For example, the Institute has found that its students prefer to live in en-suite study bedrooms; whereas, the 2019 Questionnaire Survey identified that the greatest need for housing in the village was for one- and two-bedroom bungalows and family homes of two or more bedrooms. This clearly demonstrates the distinct difference between the type of accommodation that needs to be delivered on the campus and the type of housing that needs to be delivered in other parts of Markfield to meet the housing needs of the village as a whole.	Agree	**The last sentence of Policy M18 (Housing Mix) be modified to read:** ***Other than at Markfield Court Retirement Village and Markfield Institute of Higher Education, development proposals for 10 or more dwellings should reflect the need for smaller family homes.***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				The supporting text to Policy M18 does not seem to take account of the specific housing needs and requirements of the Institute's staff, students and research scholars. As such, whilst the overall ambition of Policy M18 to deliver an appropriate mix of housing is supported in principle, the Institute respectfully requests that the residential development which comes forward on the campus in the future will not be required to provide the housing mix that is set out in paragraph 6.21 and Policy M18. Clarify that the residential development which comes forward on the campus will not be required to comply with the housing mix that is set out in the policy and paragraph 6.21 given the distinct differences between the accommodation that needs to be provided on the campus and the type of housing that needs to be delivered in other parts of Markfield to meet the housing needs of the village as a whole.		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	61	6.24		Adult Social Care 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.	The 2011 Census shows that 26% of the parish's residents were aged 65 and over. This compared with 18% in Hinckley and Bosworth and 16% in England. The older person population of Leicestershire is projected to increase significantly. The Health and Wellbeing Board of Leicestershire's Leicestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment forecasts that by 2041 there will be an additional 74,300 older people in Leicestershire. The greatest actual change is projected to occur in the 75-79 age band, increasing by 20,200 people, while the greatest percentage change is projected to occur in the 90+ age band, increasing by 172 percent. This will obviously pose significant challenges in terms of providing support for the very oldest	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					residents in the county. It is particularly challenging for Markfield, which already has a high proportion of elderly residents. Markfield Court Retirement Village is detached from Markfield village on its south-eastern side. The Retirement Village was built on the brownfield site of the former Markfield Hospital. There are 89 bungalows and 34 flats with occupation restricted to the over 55's. The Nurses' Home at the former Markfield Hospital became the Markfield Court Nursing and Residential Home, which itself closed in 2017. In late 2019 it reopened as Woodrowe House, providing specialist care and rehabilitation.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Michael Stevens	63	6.27		Page 63: the 125 bus also services Castle Donington.	Agree	**First sentence of paragraph 6.27 be amended to read:** ***The site is served by the 125 bus route through the village to Markfield, Leicester, Coalville, Loughborough and Castle Donington.***
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	63		M19	Criteria 2) incorrect reference to map, a better plan is required to support this policy. Point 3 – the buildings on site aren't of high quality and we don't want new buildings to reflect the existing, a more modern design would help enhance the character of this site. Recommend that this is changed this should be changes to be in accordance with the design policy and SPD. Point 5 – This should be re-worded to read additional access should be avoided Point 6 – This is not justified as a landscaping scheme would not necessarily be needed unless a redevelopment of the site is proposed.	The cross-reference to Map 10 is incorrect. The design of new development is adequately addressed by Policy M10: Design. The principal purpose of criterion 5 is to protect the amenities of Markfield Court Retirement Village from additional disturbance caused by new traffic access. A tree and hedgerow policy could usefully be added to the Draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan making	**Map labelling to be consistent.** **Criteria 3 and 6 of Policy M12: Markfield Court Retirement Village and Woodrowe House be deleted.** **A new policy be added concerning the protection of trees and hedgerows throughout the**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Suggest change to landscaping on site should provide an improvement in biodiversity….	Criterion 4 of Policy M12 unnecessary.	**Neighbourhood Area.**
Barry Mingay	63	M19		Besides our interest in the neighbourhood development I declare that we may have to register a particular interest in the area on the South Side of Ratby Lane some of which the retirement village occupies. We are 156 residents of Markfield and are preparing to display and present opportunities for our residents, in the Retirement Village (all over 55) to examine and discuss the proposals during the consultation process. With the hope of them supporting the Plan.	Noted	**No change**
Mike Stevens	65	6.38		In Section 6.38, it states 'The survey identified a need for 78 affordable properties in the next 5 years for those with a connection to Markfield. 24 were assessed as needing affordable housing.' What is the difference between 'affordable properties' and 'affordable housing'? Is the 78 correct or should this refer to any properties, not just affordable?	Agree	**The first part of paragraph 6.38 be modified to read:** ***The survey identified a need for 24 affordable houses (for rent or shared ownership) in the next five years for those with a connection to Markfield:***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Mike Stevens	65	6.39		In Section 6.39, it states that a further 54 households were identified from the HBBC Register. I assume these are affordable housing needs. Adding this to the 24 in Section 6.38 gives 78 as appears as obtained from the survey in Section 6.38.	Further clarification is required.	**The first part of paragraph 6.38 be modified to read:** ***The survey identified a need for 24 affordable houses (for rent or shared ownership) in the next five years for those with a connection to Markfield:***
Michael Stevens	65	6.38		Sections 6.38-6.40 I have previously commented on the need for clarification in Sections 6.38-6.40. I note that 6.40 has been corrected and updated, but still feel some clarity is required in 6.38 and 6.39.	Noted	**The first part of paragraph 6.38 be modified to read:** ***The survey identified a need for 24 affordable houses (for rent or shared ownership) in the next five years for those with a connection to Markfield:***

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Mike Stevens	65	6.40		In Section 6.40, it states that the 'allocated site east of Ratby Lane will contribute to a healthy supply of affordable housing'. As you may be aware there is a current planning application submitted for 48 affordable houses on land east of Ratby Lane. Is this what is being referred to or should the reference be to the proposed development off London Road? Note the statement references Policy M16 which relates to London Road. If the reference should relate to London Road, then that development is for 240 properties and if a minimum of 40% are affordable then this would be 96 and not the 48 quoted in the plan.	Paragraph 6.40 no longer refers to land east of Ratby Lane. The site to the south of London Road proposes a total of 283 new residential dwellings, of which 113 dwellings (40%) will be affordable and 170 dwellings (or 60%) will be for open market sale.	**No change**
Jelson Limited	66		M20	Policy M20 'Affordable Housing' does not, in our view, need to repeat the requirements set out in CS Policy 15 in terms of amount of affordable housing expected on new developments.	Local Plan Core Strategy Policy 15 is out-of-date as it does not comply with NPPF para 63.	**No change**
Markfield Institute of Higher Education	66		M20	Policy M20 seeks to secure a minimum affordable housing provision of 40% on all residential developments of 10 or more homes or on sites with an area of 0.5 hectares or more. The purpose-built accommodation that the Institute intends to construct on the site will not be open market housing.	Student housing can count towards housing delivery targets, on the basis that it frees up existing housing elsewhere. It is accepted that on-site affordable housing provision within new	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Instead, it will be designed to provide suitable accommodation for its staff, students, research scholars and other users of the campus. Given that the Institute intends to make this high quality and specialist accommodation available at an affordable price and on terms that are tailored to suit the living patterns and requirements of its staff, students and research scholars, the Institute respectfully requests that any accommodation that is developed on the campus in the future is not required to make an affordable housing contribution. Clarify that any new residential development on the campus will not be required to make an affordable housing contribution given that the accommodation on the campus will be made available at an affordable price and on terms that are tailored to suit the specific living patterns and requirements of the Institute's staff, students, research scholars and other users of the campus.	Purpose-Built Student Accommodation is not practical. Purpose-Built Student Accommodation schemes are by their very nature high density and it is not considered appropriate to promote mixed communities in very close proximity due to the potential for conflict with residents with different housing needs and lifestyles. Contributions towards off-site affordable housing is therefore likely to be the preferred approach and Policy M20 provides for this. If the Markfield Institute of Higher Education considers there to be issues of viability due to the level of contributions being sought, which render a proposal undeliverable, it will be required to submit a robust viability assessment.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	67			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.	The Neighbourhood Plan seeks a prosperous local economy. Policies M21 to M23 support the local economy, sustaining existing businesses and providing opportunities for business diversification and new businesses to become established on suitable sites in the Parish.	**No change**
DCS452	67			Overall, it has been demonstrated that the Markfield Pre Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan fails to pay regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and fails to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted Development Plan. Therefore, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan does not meet two of the seven basic conditions a Neighbourhood Plan needs to fulfil in order to progress to a referendum. Notwithstanding this, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is also contrary to its own Vision Statement. To remedy this, Pegasus Group suggests the Draft Neighbourhood Plan includes a policy that is consistent with adopted Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD which		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				balances economic benefits with landscape impact.		
Highways England	68		M21	Markfield Industrial Estate will be safeguarded for employment development of B1, B2 or B8 land uses under Policy M21.	Noted	**No change**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	68		M21	Incorrect map referenced in policy, better quality map required. Use classes have changed this is Class E and there are a lot more things you can do with Permitted Development No reference to Policy DM19 and DM20 – this is a stronger policy, don't want to weaken the position.	Many of the maps included in the Draft Plan have become stretched or altered so that they are no longer to scale or at the correct proportions. Under the use class order changes 2020, many of the existing classes have vanished altogether. Instead, a huge number of different types of businesses – including many of those currently labelled A1, A2, A3, B1, B2, D1 and D2 are being brought together in the new Use Class E. The 2020 Employment Land and Premises Study identified Markfield Industrial Estate as a category A site- a key rural	**All of the maps in the Neighbourhood Plan be inserted at a recognised scale at A4 or A3 size.** **Map labelling to be consistent.** **Policy M21 (Markfield Industrial Estate) be modified to read:** **Markfield Industrial Estate will be retained for B2 and B8 employment uses. The development of non B class uses sites will only be allowed in**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					employment area for retention. Policy DM20 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD addresses the provision of new employment development which cannot be accommodated within allocated employment areas, particularly those located within settlement boundaries or on suitable previously developed land.	**exceptional circumstances. Proposals must demonstrate that they would not have a significant adverse impact on surrounding employment uses.** **A new policy and supporting text be added which addresses strategic employment growth and Policies DM4 and DM20 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. Policy M1 (Countryside) be amended accordingly.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
DCS452	68		M21	The NPPF at Chapter 6 encourages policies to create conditions where businesses can invest, expand and adapt, placing significant weight on the need to support economic growth and productivity taking into account local business needs. Whilst Draft Policy M21 achieves this for the Markfield Industrial Estate, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan does not ensure support for all businesses within Markfield, nor does it contain any policy direction or support for a business to invest in the area outside of the Markfield Industrial Estate. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan and its policies are therefore inconsistent with the NPPF, subsequently failing to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan. Chapter 7 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan sets out the draft policies and supporting text for Business and Employment. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan at Policy M21 seeks to safeguard Markfield Industrial Estate for employment development and supports new employment within the site subject to compliance with other policies within the Plan. However, no other policy in the Draft Neighbourhood	The Qualifying Body is aware of several proposals for large-scale employment sites close to junction 22 of the M1. These have been considered by the 2020 Employment Land and Premises Review. The allocation of such large employment sites needs to be made in the context of the broader strategic priorities of the Borough while addressing cross-boundary issues and the need for major improvements in infrastructure. Such strategic matters are beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Neighbourhood Plan needs to explain and facilitate the allocation of strategic employment land. Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD seeks to safeguard the countryside from	**A new policy and supporting text be added which addresses strategic employment growth and Policies DM4 and DM20 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. Policy M1 (Countryside) be amended accordingly.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Plan seeks to safeguard existing employment sites. Whilst the Vision Statement set out in the Draft Neighbourhood Plans suggests that existing businesses will be sustained, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan goes on to support only one existing employment area at Draft Policy M21. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan therefore fails to achieve the Busines and Employment objective as set out in Chapter 3, thus being contradictory to its Vision Statement.	unsustainable development and identifies several criteria outlining where development in the countryside can be considered to be sustainable. The policy identifies that development in the countryside can be considered sustainable where proposed development would significantly contribute to economic growth, job creation; involves the extension of an existing buildings, subject to it meeting further detailed criteria; namely that the development would not have a significant adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside; and it does not undermine the physical and perceived separation and open character between settlements; and	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					it does not create or exacerbate ribbon development. Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD	
C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel)	68		M21	Chapter 7 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan sets out the draft policies and supporting text for Business and Employment. At paragraph 7.3, C.J Upton & Sons Ltd is listed as one of a few named businesses home to Markfield. C.J Upton & Sons Ltd welcomes the recognition the Draft Neighbourhood Plan affords to the company. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan at Policy M21 seeks to safeguard Markfield Industrial Estate for employment development and supports new employment within the site subject to compliance with other policies within the Plan. However, no other policy in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan seeks to safeguard existing employment sites, such as C.J Upton & Sons Ltd. C.J Upton & Sons Limited has had a presence in Markfield for many decades, with expansion and	The Qualifying Body is aware of several proposals for large-scale employment sites close to junction 22 of the M1. These have been considered by the 2020 Employment Land and Premises Review. The allocation of such large employment sites needs to be made in the context of the broader strategic priorities of the Borough while addressing cross-boundary issues and the need for major improvements in infrastructure. Such strategic matters are beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Neighbourhood Plan needs	**A new policy and supporting text be added which addresses strategic employment growth and Policies DM4 and DM20 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. Policy M1 (Countryside) be amended accordingly.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				development occurring over that time to its site at Shaw Lane, with further expansion planned for the future. Their recent planning application for expansion to their facilities reinforces the successful and very unique nature of their business and the great importance that they place on their geographical location (at junction 22 of the M1). The company are a long-term employer in Markfield Parish and the Borough of Hinckley and Bosworth and seek to continue this role. Whilst the Vision Statement set out in the Draft Neighbourhood Plans suggests that existing businesses will be sustained, recognising C.J Upton & Sons Ltd as an existing employer in Markfield at paragraph 7.3, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan goes on to support only one existing employment area at Draft Policy M21. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan therefore fails to achieve the Business and Employment objective as set out in Chapter 3, thus being contradictory to its Vision Statement.	to explain and facilitate the allocation of strategic employment land. Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD seeks to safeguard the countryside from unsustainable development and identifies several criteria outlining where development in the countryside can be considered to be sustainable. The policy identifies that development in the countryside can be considered sustainable where proposed development would significantly contribute to economic growth, job creation; involves the extension of an existing buildings, subject to it meeting further detailed criteria; namely that the development would not have a significant adverse effect on the intrinsic	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					value, beauty, open character and landscape character of the countryside; and it does not undermine the physical and perceived separation and open character between settlements; and it does not create or exacerbate ribbon development.	
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	68	7.7		The Borough Council published an Employment Land and Premises Study in 2020 and this paragraph should be updated to reflect this change.	Agreed	**The first sentence of paragraph 7.7 be modified to read:** ***Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council's 2020 Employment Land and Premises Review identified Markfield Industrial Estate as a key rural employment area for retention.***
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	69			This map has been stretched and lost clarity and scale. The legend is incomplete as it falls off the page. The	Many of the maps included in the Draft Plan have become stretched or altered so that they are no	**All of the maps in the Neighbourhood Plan be inserted**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				map should be inserted and not stretched so that it is not distorted.	longer to scale or at the correct proportions.	**at a recognised scale at A4 or A3 size.**
Highways England	70		M22	Policy M22 supports the redevelopment of brownfield land for employment uses of B1, B2 or B8 land uses.	Noted	**No change**
Leicestershire County Council	70		M22	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.	There are several brownfield sites in the Neighbourhood Area that could be suitable for business development. Probably the best of these is the former Little Chef/Burger King unit at Shaw Lane Services, which has been unused and boarded-up for many years. It occupies a 0.6Ha site, between a petrol station and a “Travel Lodge", and has easy access onto M1 junction 22. Policy M22 concerns the redevelopment of Previously Developed Land.	**No change**
Highways England	70		M23	The re-use, adaption or extension of rural buildings for business use will be supported under Policy M23.	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	70	7.10		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. 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 draft NP correctly identifies that two of Leicestershire's four igneous rock quarries lie within the NP area. The NP also correctly identifies that much of the land to the north, south and west of Markfield village is located with a Mineral Consultation Area (MCA). There are two Igneous MCAs located in the NP area. One is located within the western area of Markfield and expands to the north west whilst the second is located just to the south east of Markfield and expands to the east. These safeguarding areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect minerals resources or waste operations. The County Council can provide guidance on this if your neighbourhood plan is	Minerals Consultation Areas (MCA) covering the resources within Mineral Safeguarding Areas have been defined. The MCA also covers the safeguarding of mineral sites and associated infrastructure. Much of the land to the north, south and west of Markfield village is in Safeguarding Area. This has been considered in the allocation of potential housing sites and Leicestershire County Council has been consulted.	**Paragraph 1.22 be modified by replacing '2013' with '2031'.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				allocating development in these areas or if any proposed neighbourhood plan policies may impact on minerals and waste provision. It is also noted that there is a typo in Paragraph 1.22. The Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan was adopted in 2019 and runs until 2031 not 2013.		
Tony & Nicky Dunsbee	71			Extension of quarrying - We would wish to see greater controls on any further expansion of the Cliffe Hill Quarry. Even though we live in the heart of the village, at some considerable distance from Old Cliffe Hill, we have been disturbed by the noticeable increase in blasting, particularly in the last two years. This now means that our house is subject to being shaken by vibrations from blasting almost daily, which is unacceptable and would only increase in intensity if the area quarried as further extended.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot deal with excluded development such as county matters (mineral extraction and waste development), nationally significant infrastructure (for example major transportation and energy projects) or any other matters set out in Section 61K of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. So, while quarries are an important feature of the local landscape, the Neighbourhood Plan cannot address mineral extraction, or the restoration and aftercare of mineral sites. However, the	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Neighbourhood Plan should have regard to Leicestershire County Councils Minerals and Waste Local Plan (runs to 2013) when identifying suitable areas for non-mineral development. Nonetheless, our Neighbourhood Plan does refer to concern in terms of noise, dust and vibration from blasting at paragraph 7.12.	
Margaret Bowler	73	8.3		The transport links of North/South and East/West make the village attractive to commuters and warehouse distribution and employment - a fact of life going forward. It is no longer possible to NIMBY. However, it is possible to influence but it requires some effort on the part of residents to engage all through the year to shape the community they live in, not just when a housing developer comes along.	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Dr Edward Hugh Mackay	73	8.3		I share concerns about the Field Head roundabout which seems to give priority to traffic on the A50 heading to / from the motorway (M1). That roundabout is a main exit and entry to Markfield and can get severely congested in the early morning and returning home time.	Noted	**No change**
Anne-Marie Mingay	73	8.3		The biggest concern is the A50 and M1 changes that are coming. If we could pressure the departments to use the new surfacing that gives reduced tyre noise we might be well served. More tree screening for the new housing would also be welcome.	Many traffic and transport matters fall outside the scope of planning, including road surface treatments. Policy M16: Land south of London Road includes provision for a landscaping scheme to include woodland planting along the southern and western boundaries of the site to strengthen screening of Markfield village from the M1.	**No change**
Newtown Linford Parish Council	73	8.3		Parish Councillors are in support of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan for Markfield, in particular the A511 Growth Corridor Scheme which will see part-time signals at the Field Head roundabout. This will have a direct	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				impact on residents of our Parish and will increase the safety of road users.		
Highways England	73	8.4		The plan identifies that although the M1 Junction 22 was recently improved, there may not be sufficient spare capacity to accommodate significant growth, and therefore detailed assessment of the junction will be required. We consider this to be suitable. It has also been stated that the A50/A46 junction, which forms part of the SRN, is currently operating close to capacity at peak times. As such, we consider that detailed assessments should also be undertaken at this junction when assessing growth proposals within Markfield.	Noted	**Policy M16 (Land south of London Road) be modified to include a requirement for Transport Assessment concerning the operation of the A50, the A511, M1 J22 and the A46/A50.**
Highways England	73	8.4		We support the policies proposed in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and note that, due to the scale of the housing allocation, there could be some impacts on the operation of the SRN as a result of additional vehicular demand. We would therefore expect that any development with the potential to impact on the SRN, including allocated sites, will need to be subject to Transport Assessments to be prepared as part of the development	Noted	**Policy M16 (Land south of London Road) be modified to include a requirement for Transport Assessment concerning the operation of the A50, the A511, M1 J22 and the A46/A50.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				management process, in order for their impacts to be appropriately assessed.		
Leicestershire County Council	73	8.8		Plans for the A511 growth corridor could see… is funding committed etc? Does the NP need to consider a 'plan B' if unsuccessful?	If funding is approved, construction is due to commence in 2022/2023 and expected to be completed by 2025. Without an intervention, localised congestion along the A511 will remain and continue to worsen, limiting future capacity on this vital east-west link, discouraging new development and economic growth.	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leicestershire County Council	73			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. 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. To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly	Noted	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				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. 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 provided as a commuted sum. In 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 ie they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding. The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there		

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				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 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.		
Margaret Bowler	79	8.29		Parking is a major problem in the village, particularly at school times and evenings and weekends.	Better enforcement of vehicle parking gained clear support, with 58% rating it a high priority and 23% a medium priority.	**No change**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	79			This map has lost its clarity, it has no scale or copyright. It is not possible to read the legend. All other maps are referred to as such, whereas this map is referred to as a figure. All maps should	Many of the maps included in the Draft Plan have become stretched or altered so that they are no	**All of the maps in the Neighbourhood Plan be inserted at a recognised**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				be consistently referenced, this was something that was highlighted through the recent Burbage Examination Report. It is recommended that the group repopulate the mapping data on Parish Online so that users of the document can interpret the map effectively.	longer to scale or at the correct proportions.	**scale at A4 or A3 size.**
Deanna Tugcu	84	8.47		Being an Equestrian and the next 2 generations of my family are also we have nowhere safe to ride our horses We need bridleways and paths accessible to horses as there is nothing at all in our area and riding on the roads is hair raising to say the least with drivers having no consideration to us at all often speeding past and far to close Be great to see some in the future	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Deanna Tugcu	84	8.47		Would you consider including R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). Either if these would link the ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders,	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous roadGreat. Can you also add..??	There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals	**diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Deanna Tugcu	84	8.47		Would you consider including R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). Either if these would link the ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous roadGreat. Can you also add..??	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Jodie Sapphire	84	8.47		We have no bridleways... Please ask for horse riders/bridleways be added to points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Sophie keeble	84	8.47		Bridle says added to points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan and please add following to point 8.51,R29 and R4 footpath as key paths for upgrade to bridleway linking Ratby lane/ Thornton lane to village to get horse riders , cyclists and walkers off of the dangerous road	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Vicky Allen	84	8.47		I respond as a member of Leicestershire's Local Access Forum, which covers access for all types of user, and an Access Officer for the British Horse Society. We are pleased to see specific mention of bridleways within the Draft as Markfield, with Bardon, Stanton-under-Bardon and Ulverscroft makes up a group of parishes with only footpaths; no bridleways or byways for horse riders. Cyclists are not legally allowed on footpaths, so they too are at a considerable disadvantage in this group of parishes.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Vicky Allen	84	8.47		Para 8.47 notes Markfield's lack of bridleways and cycleways. There therefore needs to be a commitment to using the planning process to create multi-user routes (for the non-motorised) that will accommodate walkers, cyclists, riders and the disabled, so that these Vulnerable Road Users can have some routes that are pleasant to use without the threat of traffic. My search did not reveal that this would be the baseline policy	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				to be applied to any application to change land use. The Plan would be improved by this as it would support the Government's efforts to encourage healthy exercise.	public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford,	**route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Markfield Access for All Vulnerable Road User Group	84	8.47		Thank you for acknowledging the comments and feelings of horse owners in Markfield. We have 0% bridleways in our parishes and large numbers of horse owners and equine establishments within the parish. We desperately need some off road multi-user routes due to the ever increasing traffic levels, Poundstretcher HGVs and housing developments. Cyclists are not legally allowed on footpaths and struggle to get off road access, so they too are at a considerable disadvantage in this group of parishes.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Markfield Access for All Vulnerable Road User Group	84	8.47		Para 8.47 notes Markfield's lack of bridleways and cycleways. There therefore needs to be a commitment to using the planning process to create multi-user routes (for the non-motorised) that will accommodate walkers, cyclists, riders and the disabled, so that these Vulnerable Road Users can have some routes that are pleasant to use without	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				the threat of traffic. My search did not reveal that this would be the baseline policy to be applied to any application to change land use. The Plan would be improved by this as it would support the Government's efforts to encourage healthy exercise.	The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry.	**opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Jodie Sapphire	85	8.51		Please can the following be added to point 8.51. Pls add R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). Either of these would link the ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous road.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Leigh Mason	85	8.51		As a new horse rider I would like to see a section for Bridleways. Horse riders need a potential footpath upgrade to the cycle way at Cliffe hill Quary to include horses. As we have 0% bridleways in parish. Also can the following be added to point 8.51. Pls add R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). Either of these would link the ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous road.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Hannah Sharpe	85	8.51		I keep my horses at Markfield and we have very limited off road riding and with the increase in traffic and lorries on the road it would be safer for everyone.We have 0% bridleways in the parish. Please can riders/bridleways be added to points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan. Ref point 8.51. Please add R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). These were identified previously by questionnaire responders. Either of these would link	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				the ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous roads.	case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Vicky Allen	85	8.51		Para 8.51 Does mention the need for more bridleways, in particular the need for an upgrade of Footpath R27. This is welcomed, and the above comments re multi-user routes (which bridleways are) would support the upgrade.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Caroline Brocklebank	85	8.51		Horse riders need bridle ways there are 0% in the parish Horse riders/ bridle ways needs to be added to points 8.56 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan We need to get horse riders off the busy and dangerous roads	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford,	**route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Mandy Glover	85	8.51		The need for bridle paths, cycling and walking is urgently needed in this village, the number of mishaps and near misses, will end up with a tradgedy if not taken seriously enough, action must b taken to prevent this.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Katherine Eccles	85	8.51		Horse riders/bridleways be added to points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan. Please add the following to point 8.51. Add R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). These were identified previously by questionnaire responders. Either of these would link the ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read: The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous road.	The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry.	**opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Carole Earl	85	8.51		We have 0% bridleways in the parish. Please ask for horse riders/bridleways be added to points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan. Please add the following to point 8.51. Add R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). These were identified previously by questionnaire responders. Either of these would link the ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous road.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read: The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Teresa Taylor	85	8.51		As we have very few bridleways in the parish. Could I please ask for horse riders/bridleways be added to points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan. Could the following be added to point 8.51. Add R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). These were identified previously by questionnaire responders. Either of these would link the Ratby Lane/Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous road.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Steve Garrod	85	8.51		As we have very few bridleways in the parish. Could I please ask for horse riders/bridleways be added to points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan. Could the following be added to point 8.51. Add R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). These were identified previously by questionnaire responders. Either of these would link the Ratby Lane/Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous road.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
R Chetwynd	85	8.51		We have 0% bridleways in the parish. We ask for horse riders/bridleways be added to points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan. Please can the following be added to point 8.51. Pls add R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). Either of these would link the ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous road.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read: The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
C T Aspinall	85	8.51		Please add bridlepaths to points 8.56, 9.5, 9.6 in the plan. Also to 8.51 please add R26 and R4 footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleways. Either of these would link Ratby Lane/Thornton Lane to the village and would get horse riders,cyclists,dog walkers and ramblers off the busy dangerous roads. I think we should consider the younger generation and plan to improve their quality of life as well our own.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford,	**route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Katie Munday	85	8.51		We have 0% bridleways in the parish. Please ask for horse riders/bridleways be added to points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan. Thanks, the bigger voice we have the better. Very easy to do simply click link and comment. Please can the following be added to point 8.51. Pls add R29 and R4 Footpaths as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish). Either of these would link the ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous road.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read: The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Markfield Access for All Vulnerable Road User Group	85	8.51		Point 8.51 Does mention the need for more bridleways, in particular the need for an upgrade of Footpath R27 but explains it is outside the Parish. R29 and R4 Footpaths need to be added as key paths for upgrade to bridleway (these do fall within the parish) along side R27. These were identified previously by questionnaire responders. Either of these paths would link the	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read: The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Ratby lane /Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists, walkers off of the dangerous road used by the Pound Stretcher HGVs. As stated in Section 6.6 The housing development is proposed along these footpaths so there maybe opportunity to upgrade either of these paths - or part of a path even. Please can reference to footpaths R4 and R29 be highlighted as possible 'multi user routes' as part of the development?	The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry.	**opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
John Hall	85	8.51		Could you add to 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 for horses/Bridleways or perhaps multi user routes to the existing wording.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Sharon Hall	85	8.51		Please will you address the lack of bridleways in and around Markfield Village. In fact there are no Bridleways at all here. There are many horse riders in the area and the roads are getting busier and more dangerous as traffic levels increase as more and more houses are built. Cyclists also suffer due to busier roads and in many other areas the development of multiuser tracks works very well, so horse riders, cyclists and walkers can all benefit. Please add this request for bridleways to your points 8.56, 9.5 and 9.6 in the plan. Regarding point 8.51 the R29 and R4 footpaths are key paths for upgrade to bridleway. Either of these would link the Ratby Lane/Thornton Lane to the village and get horse riders, cyclists and walkers off the dangerous road.	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Vicky Allen	85	8.52		Para 8.52 on Cycling, notes that this is mainly for leisure as local roads are unsafe. I note that both cyclists and riders are cited, at different places, as considering the Ratby and Thornton lanes as being particularly dangerous. This supports the need for a positive policy as suggested re para 8.47	Horses can be ridden on bridleways, byways, roads used as public paths, and unclassified roads, but not on footpaths. There are no bridleways in Markfield Parish as stated in Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 8.47. The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					case is Leicestershire County Council. It is unlikely that new bridleways will be funded by Leicestershire county Council. The conversion of footpaths to bridleway status it outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, though footpath R29 might have the potential to become a bridleway. Footpath R4 is unlikely to be suitable. It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry. The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by	

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Vicky Allen	85	8.56		Para 8.56 re Cliffe Hill Quarry. The diverted Cliffe Hill Lane should be required to have a pavement (or 'verge') wide enough to be a multi-user facility as suggested re para 8.47, And the Quarry should be asked to dedicate path "Rxxx" round the edge of the Quarry as a bridleway so that it is usable by riders as well as cyclists.	It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**
Markfield Access for All Vulnerable Road User Group	85	8.56		Para 8.56 re Cliffe Hill Quarry. The diverted Cliffe Hill Lane should be required to have a pavement (or 'verge') wide enough to be a multi-user facility as suggested re para 8.47. The Quarry should be asked to dedicate path "Rxxx" round the edge of the Quarry as a bridleway so that it is usable by riders as well as cyclists.	It might be possible to seek a horse track/footpath to be constructed alongside the rerouted road and for R100 to be reclassified as part of expected proposals to secure additional rock reserves at Old Cliffe Hill Quarry.	**Additional text be added to paragraph 7.16 to read:** **The proposals will require the diversion of public footpath R100 which could provide an opportunity to reclassify the route as a bridleway.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Vicky Allen	86	8.57		Para 8.57 If the proposed cycle links to Interlink Industrial Estate are achieved, these too should be bridleways/multi-user routes. Most riders, and the leisure cyclists, will be riding and cycling out of working hours when Industrial Estates are quiet and there is little danger of 'confrontation'.	Interlink Business Park lies outside the Neighbourhood Area.	**No change**
Vicky Allen	88	9.10		Paras 9.10 to 9.13 Support for the various junction and roundabout improvements but these should include provision for riders, which usually requires a rather higher button at traffic lights and adequate waiting room. I hope you find these changes acceptable and thank you for your consideration for the needs of cyclists and horse riders.	Many traffic and transport matters fall outside the scope of planning, including detailed traffic management issues.	**No change**
Markfield Access for All Vulnerable Road User Group	88	9.10		Point 9.10 to 9.13 We support for the various junction and roundabout improvements but these should include provision for riders, which usually requires a rather higher button at traffic lights and adequate waiting room.	Many traffic and transport matters fall outside the scope of planning, including detailed traffic management issues.	**No change**
Markfield Access for All Vulnerable Road User Group	88	9.5		Consider, where appropriate, the improvement and where possible the creation of footpaths and cycleways to key village services.	The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
				Suggest 'multi user routes' to include horse riders and disabled /prams etc.	supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Vicky Allen	88	9.6		Para 9.6 Support for the creation of an off-road cycleway between Markfield and Groby but again the aspiration should be for a multi-user link.	The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	**No change**
Markfield Access for All Vulnerable Road User Group	88	9.6		Point 9.6 Support for the creation of an off-road cycleway between Markfield and Groby but again the aspiration should be for a multi-user link.	The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	**No change**
Vicky Allen	88	9.8		Para 9.8 should be altered to "creation of multi-user links to accommodate walkers, cyclists, disable and horse riders	The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby, Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	**No change**
Markfield Access for All Vulnerable	88	9.8		Point 9.8 should be altered to "creation of multi-user links to accommodate	The creation of multi-user greenway linking important GI sites in Ratby, Groby,	**No change**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
Road User Group				walkers, cyclists, disable and horse riders".	Newtown Linford, Markfield and Thornton is supported by Neighbourhood Plan Policy M4.	
Barry Mingay	88			Lack of attention to pathway and footpath clearances and poor response to the increased traffic volumes along Laund Way Ratby Lane with danger to pedestrians, especially at night, and cyclists together with increased pollution levels from the higher volume of commercial trucks now using the road all leave me a touch numb. With 25%+ older citizens in the village a proportional amount of response is expected. Bring pressure with the sister organisations!	The responsibility for recording, managing, protecting and changing public rights of way lies with the highway authority, which in this case is Leicestershire County Council.	**No change**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	88			It is not clear what the purpose of this chapter is. Is this a policy for highways it is not clear? A lot of these are aspirations and shouldn't be a policy	The process of preparing the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has highlighted non-planning issues or the need for community projects. This includes things like highways management. These matters will be considered by the Parish Council. They do not form part of the statutory Plan,	**Ensure that non-planning issues or the need for community projects are not expressed as planning policies.**

Representor	Page	Paragraph	Policy	Representation	Response	Recommendation
					so are not subject to the independent examination nor referendum.	
Jelson Limited	88			Section 9 of the draft MNP includes a list of 'policies' which relate to highways matters. In some cases the 'policies' identified are already dealt with and duplicate the requirements of existing local and national policy (e.g. the need for safe access and appropriate car parking provision). Other 'policies' listed do not appear to relate to land use planning and instead appear to be aspirations that the NPSG support or would like to deliver. The PPG (Paragraph 4) is clear that NDPs should make a clear distinction between policies relating to the use of land and 'aspirations' which the NPSG would like to deliver and which will not form part of the statutory development plan.	The process of preparing the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has highlighted non-planning issues or the need for community projects. This includes things like highways management. These matters will be considered by the Parish Council. They do not form part of the statutory Plan, so are not subject to the independent examination nor referendum.	**Ensure that non-planning issues or the need for community projects are not expressed as planning policies.**
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	89			These maps have information missing as they do not fit on the page. It is recommended that the maps are inserted onto an A3 page in landscape so all information can be viewed.	Many of the maps included in the Draft Plan have become stretched or altered so that they are no longer to scale or at the correct proportions.	**All of the maps in the Neighbourhood Plan be inserted at a recognised scale at A4 or A3 size.**