

Markfield Neighbourhood Development Plan

Summary of representations submitted by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to the independent examiner following the Regulation 16 Draft Plan consultation, held between 10th February 2021 and 24th March 2021

Schedule of responses received

	Type of response	Customer	Agent (if applicable)	Date received
1	Online response form	Member of the Public 01		12.02.21
2	Online response form	Member of the Public 02		12.02.21
3	Online response form	Member of the Public 03		13.02.21
4	Email	Colt Technology	Plant Enquiry Team	14.02.21
5	Online response form	Member of the Public 04		14.02.21
6	Email	Natural England		15.02.21
7	Online response form	Member of the Public 05		16.02.21
8	Email	Member of the Public 06		16.02.21
9	Online response form	Member of the Public 07		18.02.21
10	Online response form	Member of the Public 08		19.02.21
11	Online response form	Member of the Public 09		21.02.21
12	Online response form	Member of the Public 10		21.02.21
13	Letter	Markfield Community Library		22.02.21
14	Email	Member of the Public 11		23.02.21
15	Email	Member of the Public 12		23.02.21
16	Email	Member of the Public 13		24.02.21
17	Online response form	Member of the public 14		26.02.21
18	Online response form	Member of the public 15		01.03.21
19	Letter	Highways England		03.03.21
20	Letter	Severn Trent		09.03.21

21	Email	Charnwood Borough Council		09.03.21
22	Response form	Member of the Public 16		09.03.21
23	Response form	Member of the Public 17		09.03.21
24	Response form	Member of the Public 18		09.03.21
25	Response form	Member of the Public 19		09.03.21
26	Response form	Member of the Public 20		09.03.21
27	Response form	Member of the Public 21		09.03.21
28	Response form	Member of the Public 22		09.03.21
29	Response form	Member of the Public 23		09.03.21
30	Response form	Member of the Public 24		09.03.21
31	Response form	Member of the Public 25		09.03.21
32	Response form	Member of the Public 26		09.03.21
33	Response form	Member of the Public 27		09.03.21
34	Response form	Member of the Public 28		09.03.21
35	Response form	Member of the Public 29		09.03.21
36	Response form	Member of the Public 30		09.03.21
37	Response form	Member of the Public 31		09.03.21
38	Response form	Member of the Public 32		09.03.21
39	Response form	Member of the Public 33		09.03.21
40	Response form	Member of the Public 34		09.03.21
41	Response form	Member of the Public 35		09.03.21
42	Response form	Member of the Public 36		09.03.21
43	Response form	Member of the Public 37		09.03.21
44	Response form	Member of the Public 38		09.03.21
45	Response	Member of the Public 39		09.03.21

	form			
46	Response form	Member of the Public 40		09.03.21
47	Response form	Member of the Public 41		09.03.21
48	Response form	Member of the Public 42		09.03.21
49	Response form	Member of the Public 43		09.03.21
50	Response form	Member of the Public 44		09.03.21
51	Response form	Member of the Public 45		09.03.21
52	Response form	Member of the Public 46		09.03.21
53	Response form	Member of the Public 47		09.03.21
54	Response form	Member of the Public 48		09.03.21
55	Response form	Member of the Public 49		09.03.21
56	Response form	Member of the Public 50		09.03.21
57	Response form	Member of the Public 51		09.03.21
58	Response form	Member of the Public 52		09.03.21
59	Response form	Member of the Public 53		09.03.21
60	Response form	Member of the Public 54		09.03.21
61	Response form	Member of the Public 55		09.03.21
62	Response form	Member of the Public 56		09.03.21
63	Response form	Member of the Public 57		09.03.21
64	Response form	Member of the Public 58		09.03.21
65	Response form	Member of the Public 59		09.03.21
66	Response form	Member of the Public 60		09.03.21
67	Response form	Member of the Public 61		09.03.21
68	Email	North West Leicestershire District Council		09.03.21
69	Email	The Coal Authority		09.03.21

70	Online response form	Member of the Public 62		10.03.21
71	Online response form	Member of the Public 63		12.03.21
72	Online response form	Member of the Public 64		14.03.21
73	Response form	Member of the Public 65		16.03.21
74	Response form	Member of the Public 66		16.03.21
75	Email	National Grid	Avision Young	17.03.21
76	Online response form	Member of the Public 67		17.03.21
77	Online response form	Member of the Public 68		20.03.21
78	Online response form	Member of the Public 69		20.03.21
79	Online response form	Member of the Public 70		22.03.21
80	Email	The National Forest Company (NFC)		22.03.21
81	Email	Leicestershire County Council		23.03.21
82	Email	Canal & River Trust		23.03.21
83	Email	DCS452 Ltd	Pegasus Group	24.03.21
84	Email	C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel)	Pegasus Group	24.03.21
85	Email	Owl Partnerships	Marrons Planning	24.03.21
86	Email	Member of the Public 71	Marrons Planning	24.03.21
87	Email	Penland Estates	Marrons Planning	24.03.21
88	Email	Glenalmond Developments.	Cerda Planning Limited	24.03.21
89	Online response form	Jelson Homes	Avision Young	24.03.21
90	Online Contact form	Member of the Public 72		24.03.21
91	Email	Taylor Wimpey (UK)	CC Town Planning	24.03.21
92	Email	Member of the Public 73		24.03.21
93	Email	R. Surani		24.03.21

94	Online response form	Member of the Public 75		24.03.21
95	Separate document	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council – see separate document		24.03.21
96	Email	Environment Agency		01.04.21

Markfield Neighbourhood Development Plan

Summary of representations submitted by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to the independent examiner following the Regulation 16 Draft Plan consultation, held between 10th February 2021 and 17:00 on 24th March 2021.

Rep Number	Name	Full representation
1	Member of the Public 01	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Oppose the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: No</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on: M1: Countryside, M2: Landscape character, M6: Local green spaces, M10: Design, M11: Community services and facilities, M13: Local and neighbourhood centres, M20: Affordable housing</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M1: countryside?: Oppose Please provide your reason for this view: Building 200+ houses is destroying the countryside that's already been damage by previous builds</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M2: landscape character?: Oppose Please provide your reason for this view: The landscape of the existing Jelson site doesn't fit the character of the land and the new development will stick out even worse</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M6: local green spaces?: Oppose Please provide your reason for this view: There won't be any local green space left with all these houses</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M10: design?: Oppose Please provide your reason for this view: Doesn't fit the lay of the land</p>

		<p>Do you support or oppose policy M11: community services and facilities?: Oppose Please provide your reason for this view: There simply isn't enough in Markfield to support 200+ more households</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M13: local and neighbourhood centres?: Oppose Please provide your reason for this view: Again what's in place will not be able to support the mass of more people</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M20: affordable housing?: Oppose Please provide your reason for this view: There is too much affordable housing, and to have them in prime positions is [offensive language removed] to people who work hard to buy a house.</p>
2	Member of the Public 02	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on: M1: Countryside, M2: Landscape character, M5: Trees, M6: Local green spaces, M11: Community services and facilities, M15: Housing provision</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M1: countryside?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Lived here for 43 years and am familiar with the surroundings. Do NOT want gross changes.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M2: landscape character?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: As above</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M5: trees?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: They are a valuable natural resource to be preserved and enhanced, NOT destroyed.</p>

		<p>Do you support or oppose policy M6: local green spaces?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: As above.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M11: community services and facilities?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Currently a useful mix of both. No great changes required.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M15: housing provision?: Oppose Please provide your reason for this view: Harder to support some of the proposals in the pipeline but some expansion will be necessary for LOCAL population growth. [Offensive language removed]. Some concern at possible run off pollution from groundworks for housing development south of London Road flowing into Thornton Reservoir. I used to fly fish there.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose the Markfield profile section?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Congratulate the team on their efforts to bring so much together.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose the environment and heritage section?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: This is a balanced view of the present state and possible/likely changes in the near future.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose the traffic and transport section?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Major changes likely and will cause disruption/concern for the village, especially the A50 changes and effects on Markfield village.</p> <p>Additional comments on the plans (if applicable): Overall a splendid effort to reconcile wider concerns of political/population based issues with reality in the foreseeable future.</p>
3	Member of the Public 03	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan with modifications</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the</p>

		<p>neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Please select which section you would like to comment on: Business and employment</p> <p>Do you support or oppose the business and employment section?: Support</p> <p>Please confirm the paragraph number(s) for example, 7.1: page 72 para 7.3</p> <p>Please provide your reason for this view: Does not include Tomlinson's kennels Ratby Lane LE67 9RJ. Apart from kennels and hydrotherapy there is a championship training/show hall which is attended by people from all over the UK who use local hotels, pubs and shops.</p> <p>Additional comments on the plans (if applicable): very comprehensive and easy to understand</p>
4	Colt Technology	<p>We can confirm that Colt Technology Services do not have apparatus near the above location as presented on your submitted plan, if any development or scheme amendments fall outside the 50 metre perimeter new plans must be submitted for review.</p> <p>Search is based on Overseeing Organisation Agent data supplied; we do not accept responsibility for O.O. Agent inaccurate data.</p>
5	Member of the Public 04	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Additional comments on the plans (if applicable): Fully support the plan</p>
6	Natural England	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p>

		<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
7	Member of the Public 05	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p>
8	Member of the Public 06	<p>Have the planners taken into account the dangers to residents caused by pollution from traffic and also from speed on London Road, at the moment set at 40mph. The over use to schools, medical, and shopping, all of which are working at maximum?</p>
9	Member of the Public 07	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p>
10	Member of the Public 08	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p>
11	Member of the Public 09	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Additional comments on the plans (if applicable): I wholeheartedly support the Markfield 5-year plan. The roads, motorway and quarrying which has taken place over the years in Markfield have scarred the landscape. As a consequence the few green areas we have should be positively enhanced to encourage wildlife and open spaces to maintain a healthy environment for the</p>

		community to enjoy.
12	Member of the Public 10	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Additional comments on the plans (if applicable): With the motorway and all the quarrying that's taken place over the years in Markfield the land has become scarred and the few bits of remaining pockets of green space should be positively enhanced to improve the environment for the wildlife to return and remain. Over the years the noise and impact of the noise from the motorway and main roads has increased, further improvements are needed to reduce noise pollution particularly from the M1. For example further planting of the recently discovered 'super plant' (Cotoneaster franchetti) which can help to combat traffic pollution should be considered to support a better environment.</p>
13	Markfield Community Library	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Yes</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: The library trustees commend the efforts of the parish council and the neighbourhood planning group to put forward a plan to shape the future of Markfield. We fully support the plan and its recommendations.</p>
14	Member of the Public 11	I write to confirm my support without modification to the proposed Markfield Neighbourhood Plan, currently under Regulation 16 consultation. I fully support the plan and its recommendations, in particular in respect of future residential development.
15	Member of the Public 12	I am writing to confirm my support without modification to the proposed Markfield Neighbourhood Plan currently under Regulation 16 consultation. I commend the efforts of the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Planning Group to put forward a plan to shape the future of Markfield.

		I fully support the Plan and its recommendations, in particular in respect of future residential development.
16	Member of the Public 13	I write to confirm my support without modification to the proposed Markfield Neighbourhood Plan, currently under Regulation 16 consultation. I fully support the plan and its recommendations, in particular in respect of future residential development. I accept that houses have to be built but where the Parish wants them and in order to stop speculative planning applications on unsustainable sites in open countryside - Markfield is a rural parish.
17	Member of the Public 14	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on: M1: Countryside, M5: Trees, M9: Non-designated heritage assets, M15: Housing provision, M16: Housing allocation land south of London Road, M17: Windfall housing development, M20: Affordable housing, M21: Markfield industrial estate.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M1: countryside?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Renewable energy, re-use of existing buildings</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M2: landscape character?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Blank comment.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M5: trees?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Any old/historic trees should be kept where ever possible and if they can't be saved then replacements should be planted.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M9: non-designated heritage assets?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Blank comment.</p>

		<p>Do you support or oppose policy M15: housing provision?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: I support it in as much as I agree that the site should be south of London Road.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M16: housing allocation - land south of London Road?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: The site should be south of London Road as has already been established. I moved into Christopher Court only 2 months ago and was horrified to see a leaflet pushed through my door with a proposed housing development for 75 house right outside my back garden! I bought my house for the views out of the back garden and for the peace and quiet, not to mention the wildlife. If this housing development goes ahead, [offensive language removed] and I will be seeking vast sums in compensation for the loss in value to my house!</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M17: windfall housing development?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: As long as nobody builds anything that affects my house then I support it.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M20: affordable housing?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Blank comment.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M21: Markfield industrial estate?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Only if it doesn't become a monster. It's already busy with traffic round there.</p> <p>Please select which section you would like to comment on: Housing Do you support or oppose the housing section?: Support Please confirm the paragraph number(s) for example, 6.1: Page 58, 6.12 Please provide your reason for this view: The site should be south of London Road as has already been established. I moved into Christopher Court only 2 months ago and was horrified to see a leaflet pushed through my door with a proposed housing development for 75 house right</p>
--	--	---

		outside my back garden! I bought my house for the views out of the back garden and for the peace and quiet, not to mention the wildlife. If this housing development goes ahead, [offensive language removed] and I will be seeking vast sums in compensation for the loss in value to my house!
18	Member of the Public 15	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan with modifications</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on: M1: Countryside, M16: Housing allocation land south of London Road</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M1: countryside?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: There needs to be areas of countryside preserved within the village boundary encouraging wildlife in the village.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M16: housing allocation - land south of London Road? Support Please provide your reason for this view: This appears to be a well presented plan for the future expansion of the Village however I believe the size of the development is the maximum need in proportion with the amenities available within the neighbourhood</p> <p>Please select which section you would like to comment on: Traffic and transport Do you support or oppose the traffic and transport section?: Oppose Please confirm the paragraph number(s) for example, 8.1: 8.24 Please provide your reason for this view: The position of the proposed entrance to the new Jelson development is in a dangerous position near a brow of a hill also in the Autumn the position of the sun rising cutting visibility considerably on the top of the hill. An alternative position of the entrance should be found.</p>
19	Highways England	Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the submission version of the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan which has been produced for public consultation and covers

		<p>the period 2020 to 2039. The document provides a vision for the future of the Plan area and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is 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 principle 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.</p> <p>We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for 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 2039. However, it is recognised that, as the new Local Plan has not been finalised, there may be a need to review the Neighbourhood Plan once the Local Plan has been adopted.</p> <p>Highways England previously reviewed the pre-submission draft of the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan and provided comments in a response letter dated 4 November 2020. It was noted that, due to the scale of the proposed housing allocation for 241 dwellings on land south of London Road under draft Policy M16, there was the potential for M1 Junction 22 and A50 Markfield / A46 Leicester Western Bypass to be impacted. We therefore advised 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 management process, in order for their impacts to be appropriately assessed.</p> <p>Having reviewed the submission version of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan, we note that the end of the Neighbourhood Plan period has been updated from 2036 to 2039, to align with the</p>
--	--	---

		<p>emerging Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan (2020-2039).</p> <p>The proposed housing figures have also been amended using more up-to-date assumptions. Based on the housing requirement for Hinckley and Bosworth of 8,588 dwellings over the period 2020-2039 or 452 houses per year (previously assumed to be 9,100 dwellings over the period 2016-2036) and the latest data on population (2017 mid-year estimates), Markfield Parish should provide 3.9% of this figure (reduced from the previous assumption of 4.2% which was based on 2011 Census data), which equates to 334 dwellings for the period 2020-2039.</p> <p>We note that, as 16 dwellings are currently committed and 38 dwellings are expected to come forward as windfall sites in accordance with Policy M17, the residual requirement has been identified as 280 dwellings which have been allocated on land south of London Road under Policy M16. In December 2020, a full planning application (ref. 20/01283/FUL) has been submitted for the development of 283 dwellings on this site. Highways England issued a no objection response to the application in December 2020, as an assessment of its traffic implications demonstrated that the site is not likely to have a significant impact on the operation of the SRN in the area. However, we understand that this application is still awaiting determination by the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.</p> <p>Regarding employment land, the Neighbourhood Plan notes that several sites have been put forward in response to the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council 2016-2019 'Call for Sites' including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cliffe Slade Farm, Little Shaw Lane, Markfield (21.98 ha); • Land at Cliffe Lane, Markfield (46.80 ha); and • Cliffe Hill Farm, Markfield (10.60 ha). <p>We note that Markfield Parish Council does not support the release of such largescale greenfield employment sites, especially given their location in the Charnwood Forest and National Forest.</p> <p>In line with the draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan, the submission version contains policies to retain the existing Markfield Industrial Estate for B2 and B8 employment uses (Policy M21), support the redevelopment of Brownfield Land for employment (Policy M22) and the re-use,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>adaption or extension of rural buildings for business use (Policy M23). Furthermore, the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan also supports small-scale expansion of existing business and enterprises (Policy M24).</p> <p>Considering the limited level of growth proposed across the Neighbourhood Plan area in addition to the housing allocation at land south of London Road, we do not expect that there will be significant impacts on the operation of the SRN in the area. However, as with any development proposals with the potential to impact the SRN Transport Assessments should be prepared as part of the development management process, in order for their impacts to be appropriately assessed.</p> <p>In light of the above, we have no further comments to provide at this stage, although we note that the policies proposed in the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan might need to be revised following the adoption of the emerging Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan.</p> <p>We trust that the above is useful in the progression of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
20	Severn Trent	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation, Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles outline within the Neighbourhood Plan, there are however a few areas where it is felt that minor amendments would better support the plan objectives and support the delivery of wider benefits.</p> <p>Policy M2: Landscape Character Whilst Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to protect woodland, hedgerows and mature trees due to the environmental benefits they provide, we would also recommend that Watercourses are referenced to ensure that they are retained as open features along their original routes where possible, this helps to prevent increases in flood risk, and allows the watercourses to continue to support the natural environment and wildlife. By retaining these features sustainable surface water outfalls can also be created preventing overloading of sewers through the addition of surface water flows.</p> <p>Policy M3: Green infrastructure The creation, enhancement and protection of green infrastructure is important and Severn Trent understand why this is being highlighted within the plan we would note that blue infrastructure</p>

such as watercourses (including ditches) and ponds are also important for providing amenity and environmental enhancements, as such these assets should also be protected from harm.

Policy M5: Trees

Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to protect mature trees and encourage the planting of new trees within development, we would however recommend that policy M5 promotes the use of Tree-pits when planting trees within new development this would approach would support the growth and development of the trees, whilst also providing a level of source control mitigating the impacts of flood risk.

Policy M6: Local Green Spaces

Severn Trent understand the need for Local Green Space and the need for it to be protected, however local green spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes such as flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation schemes can result in additional benefits to the local green space in the form of Biodiversity or Amenity improvements. We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy M6 to support the delivery of flood alleviation projects where required within green spaces.

Development of flood resilience schemes within local green spaces will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the green space.

Energy Efficiency Section (4.46 – 4.47)

Whilst Severn Trent Support the delivery of low carbon energy efficient homes we would highlight that promotion of water efficiency alongside Energy Efficiency would both help to support/ deliver energy efficiency and provide additional benefits through reduced water consumption. Severn Trent strongly recommend that water efficient design and technology are utilised within new development, we would also highlight that by implementing water efficient technologies you can also have a positive impact on the energy efficiency of new build.

Water efficiency products like dishwashers, washing machines Shower Heads and Tap regulators reduce the consumption of hot water, therefore less energy is needed to heat water, reducing the amount of carbon used. This type of water usage makes up a large proportion of the energy use in

		<p>the home. One of the key findings of the Environment Agencies report ‘Greenhouse gas emissions of water supply and demand management options (SC070010)’ - link is that</p> <p><i>“89 per cent of carbon emissions in the water supply - use - disposal system is attributed to "water in the home" and includes the energy for heating water (excludes space heating), which compares with public water supply and treatment emissions of 11 per cent.”</i></p> <p>To aid in the implementation of this request we would recommend that wording to the effect of the following paragraphs are added to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><i>National Planning Policy Framework promotes the delivery of sustainable development (development that utilises resources sustainably). The Humber River Basin Management Plan recommends that local planning policy require new development of homes to meet the tighter water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day as described in Part G of schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010.</i></p> <p><i>The implementation of water efficient design has beneficial impact of water consumption, energy consumption and sewer capacity / treatment volumes. Therefore, by implementing this standard there are positive sustainability impact on multiple resource lines.</i></p> <p>Policy M10: Design</p> <p>To ensure that new development is design utilising good design principles it is important that expectations are outlined within the local plan and neighbourhood plan. Whilst Policy M10 highlight the setting and characteristics of design desired from new development, Severn Trent would recommend that the design policy also highlight key technical elements such as the use of the Drainage Hierarchy, SuDS and Water Efficiency.</p> <p>Drainage Hierarchy</p> <p>The drainage hierarchy outlined the principles of where surface water should be discharged, the hierarchy is outlined within Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 80 (Reference ID: 7-080-3 20150323). Severn Trent request evidence that the drainage hierarchy has been followed by developers in our conversations, however by raising the expectation at the Neighbourhood Plan</p>
--	--	--

		<p>stage it consideration can be incorporated into the initial a site designs resulting it better continuity of surface water through development.</p> <p>To aid in the interpretation of this request we would recommend that the following wording is incorporated into Policy M10:</p> <p><i>All applications for new development shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, in such that a discharge to the public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible.</i></p> <p>SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems)</p> <p>Severn Trent that Planning Policy already required major development to incorporate SuDS through the written Ministerial Statement for Sustainable Drainage (HCWS 161) and NPPF. However current policy is very flexible on how SuDS can be incorporated into development, by incorporating appropriate references to SuDS in Policy M10, the need for developers to deliver high quality SuDS can be secured. Current Industry Best Practice for SuDS (The SuDS Manual CIRIA C753) highlights the need to consider SuDS from the outset of the design process and not to fit SuDS to the development site post layout. To aid in the delivery of this recommendation we would recommend wording to the effect of:</p> <p><i>All major developments shall ensure that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off are put in place unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.</i></p> <p><i>All schemes for the inclusions of SuDS should demonstrate they have considered all four aspects of good SuDS design, Quantity, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity, and the SuDS and development will fit into the existing landscape.</i></p> <p><i>The completed SuDS schemes should be accompanied by a maintenance schedule detailing maintenance boundaries, responsible parties and arrangements to ensure that the SuDS are maintained in perpetuity.</i></p> <p><i>Where possible, all non-major development should look to incorporate these same SuDS principles into their designs.</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p>The supporting text for the policy should also include: <i>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be designed in accordance with current industry best practice, The SuDS Manual, CIRIA (C753), to ensure that the systems deliver both the surface water quantity and the wider benefits, without significantly increasing costs. Good SuDS design can be key for creating a strong sense of place and pride in the community for where they live, work and visit, making the surface water management features as much a part of the development as the buildings and roads.</i></p> <p>We would also note that as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are the statutory consultee for the planning process in relation to surface water management that they should also be consulted on any wording regarding SuDS.</p> <p>Water Efficiency As highlighted in relation to the Energy Efficiency section of the Neighbourhood Plan the delivery of water efficient design and technology is important for ensuring the sustainability of the water supply system for the future both supporting existing customers, and future development. NPPF supports the delivery of sustainable development and the Humber River Basin Management Plan promotes the use of the tighter Water efficiency target within Building Regulations. We would recommend that 4</p> <p>This detailed with Policy M10 so that developers are aware of what is expected of them from the outset of the design process.</p> <p>To aid with the implementation for the recommendation we have provided some example wording below: <i>All development should demonstrate that they are water efficiency, where possible incorporating innovative water efficiency and water re-use measures, demonstrating that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day.</i></p> <p>Policy M16: housing Allocation – Land South of London Road</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The development of 280 dwellings to the south of London Road has the potential to impact of the performance of the sewerage system, it is therefore important that developers contact Severn Trent to discuss their proposal so that any necessary capacity improvements can be assessed and where required implemented. To ensure that these assessment and improvements do not unnecessarily hold up development would recommend that these discussions are held at the earliest opportunity with our Asset Protection department. net.dev.east@severntrent.co.uk Severn Trent would also note that there are existing sewers indication to be within the site boundary, it is vital that conversations are held between the developer and asset protection to understand the impact development will have on these assets, and the restrictions it will place on the layout.</p> <p>Severn Trent are supportive of the approach outlined in bullet point (e) to incorporate a green corridor around the watercourse, we would also recommend that SuDS are incorporated into this space in a way that they enhance the biodiversity and amenity of the space.</p> <p>Severn Trent are supportive of the approach outlined in bullet point f) to deliver an appropriately designed Sustainable drainage system and surface water and foul system. It is therefore important the SuDS Scheme is developed at the outset of the design process incorporating natural flow routes, Source control SuDS and integrates into the wider development.</p> <p>Please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice.</p> <p>For your information we have set out some general guidelines that may be useful to you.</p> <p>Position Statement As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular</p>
--	--	--

issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills. 5

Sewage Strategy

Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works.

Surface Water and Sewer Flooding

We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer.

We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers.

To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. More details can be found on our website.

<https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/>

		<p>Water Quality Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of good quality drinking water. We work closely with the Environment Agency and local farmers to ensure that water quality of supplies are not impacted by our or others operations. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit as prepared by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Water Supply When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts. We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands.</p> <p>Water Efficiency Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day. We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing 6 specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations.</p> <p>We recommend that in all cases you consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• • Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres.• • Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute.• • Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres per minute or less.• • Water butts for external use in properties with gardens.
--	--	--

		<p>To further encourage developers to act sustainably Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. More details can be found on our website https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</p> <p>We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day. We would also encourage the use of rainwater harvesting on larger developments, either residential or commercial. This helps to reduce the demand on public supply, associated carbon impact of supply and also reduced site run off and sewer flows. Rainwater Harvesting as a development rather than on a property by property basis is more cost efficient and can produce greater benefits.</p> <p>Both the River Severn River Basin Management Plan (Page 52) and the Humber River Basin Management Plan (page 46) recommend that Local Plan set out policies requiring homes to meet the tighter water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day <i>as described in Part G of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010</i>. As such Severn Trent's recommendation is consistent with wider objectives within our water supply regions.</p>
21	Charnwood Borough Council	<p>Map 3 / Policy M3 / Policies Map – large areas of land that are outside of the designated neighbourhood area and within Charnwood Borough are identified as Green Infrastructure. It is requested that these designations are removed as the plan and its policies do not apply outside of the designated neighbourhood area.</p> <p>Map 7, designation H / Policy M9 – Designation H impacts a site that is cross-boundary. It is noted that the whilst this designation and Policy M9 would not apply within Charnwood Borough, the site is protected by a Conservation Area.</p>
22	Member of the Public 16	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth</p>

		<p>Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: All areas balanced approach for 15 years.</p>
23	Member of the Public 17	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
24	Member of the Public 18	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Oppose</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Very much of increase motor vehicle traffic and noise. 2) Pollution increase. 3) Lose of nature (areas) i.e. wildlife, nesting areas for birds. 4) Moved here at MRV (Markfield Community Retirement Village).for quietness and piece and quite !!! 5) Increase in of doctor appointments, struggle now to get appointments. 6) Construction & traffic, site noise levels increased 7) Lose of green belt areas, around our area. 8) Get planning officers to come and visit our beautiful village. 9) They say money makes the world go round, but not here at MCRV. Please say NO – NO – NO.

25	Member of the Public 19	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
26	Member of the Public 20	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
27	Member of the Public 21	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
28	Member of the Public 22	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt</p>

		<p>the Neighbourhood Plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
29	Member of the Public 23	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
30	Member of the Public 24	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Oppose</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
31	Member of the Public 25	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Overall, I consider it to be a good neighbourhood plan. If everything is carried out for the good of the area. We desperately need cycle paths and good footpaths for the safety of residents. We have to tolerate enormous</p>

		juggernauts speeding along which is very frightening when you are elderly and the same for the children.
32	Member of the Public 26	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: I find this to be a well-reasoned and practical plan to meet the current and future needs of our area.</p>
33	Member of the Public 27	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Well thought-out for a rural area moving into the future. Well done.</p>
34	Member of the Public 28	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? N/A</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: I understand that Markfield needs more housing but they need to be near schools & shops and doctors, not along country lanes, where there are not even a good bus service, or built in isolated areas.</p>
35	Member of the	Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or

	Public 29	<p>oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
36	Member of the Public 30	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Providing the infrastructure is expanded to accommodate the influx of families. This plan is much preferable to piecemeal small developments spoiling the more rural areas.</p>
37	Member of the Public 31	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
38	Member of the Public 32	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p>

		Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.
39	Member of the Public 33	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
40	Member of the Public 34	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support, and support with modifications.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
41	Member of the Public 35	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
42	Member of the Public 36	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p>

		Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.
43	Member of the Public 37	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
44	Member of the Public 38	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
45	Member of the Public 39	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Ensure that the medical centre benefits from the Jelson development.</p>
46	Member of the Public 40	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p>

		Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Concerned about extra traffic on already busy rd.
47	Member of the Public 41	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
48	Member of the Public 42	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
49	Member of the Public 43	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: There is a need for more housing in suitable locations.</p>
50	Member of the Public 44	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth</p>

		<p>Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Agree to the need of more housing in the village.</p>
51	Member of the Public 45	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Please note: as a member of the Markfield Parish Council, I have worked on this plan since it was first produced.</p>
52	Member of the Public 46	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
53	Member of the Public 47	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
54	Member of the Public 48	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p>

		<p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
55	Member of the Public 49	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: We support the plan, it meets our expectations.</p>
56	Member of the Public 50	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
57	Member of the Public 51	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Oppose</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: We do not want any more houses in Markfield. We have surely had our quota, there's supposed to be a new surgery, but we haven't</p>

		seen one yet, as the existing one is well overstretched. Greedy developers, and greedy councils, do not have to live here with it. They make sure they can get an appointment with their doctor, or a place for their children at school.
58	Member of the Public 52	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Oppose</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
59	Member of the Public 53	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
60	Member of the Public 54	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: I support the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan as it allows Markfield to remain rural but also fall into government plans for building houses.</p>
61	Member of the Public 55	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p>

		<p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
62	Member of the Public 56	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Limited bus service as it is. 2) Too much traffic as it is including super-size “pound stretcher” lorries. 3) Infrastructure overstretched now even without extra “development” 4) [Offensive language removed]. 5) Already with present development – very difficult to get a doctors appointment at the best of times – why not develop everything and call it Markfield City not Markfield village. 6) Why not respect the ‘covenant’ designed for the ‘Retirement Home Village’ – if not why such a covenant made at all – the reasons for the covenant remain the same surely???? Does it follow that with time all such covenants become redundant ?? etc. etc.
63	Member of the Public 57	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>

64	Member of the Public 58	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
65	Member of the Public 59	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? No, I do not wish to be informed of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
66	Member of the Public 60	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
67	Member of the Public 61	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the</p>

		<p>neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
68	North West Leicestershire District Council	Thank you for consulting North West Leicestershire District Council on the draft Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. We have reviewed the content of the plan and have no comments to make.
69	The Coal Authority	<p>Thank you for the notification of the 9 February 2021 consulting The Coal Authority on the above Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas.</p> <p>Our records indicate that there are no recorded risks from past coal mining activity at surface or 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 Neighbourhood Plan proposed.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss this further.</p>
70	Member of the Public 62	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on: M1: Countryside, M2: Landscape character, M3: Green infrastructure, M4: Ecology and biodiversity, M5: Trees, M6: Local green spaces, M7: Renewable energy, M8: Electric vehicle charge points, M9: Non-designated heritage assets, M10: Design, M11: Community services and facilities, M12: Markfield institute of higher education, M13: Local and neighbourhood centres, M14: Infrastructure, M15: Housing provision, M16: Housing allocation land south of London Road, M18: Housing mix, M19: Markfield Court Retirement Village and Woodrowe House, M20: Affordable housing, M21:</p>

		<p>Markfield industrial estate, M22: Brownfield land, M23: Business conversion of rural buildings, M24: Business expansion</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M1: countryside?: Support Please provide your reason for this view:: The countryside is important for the village residents and we need to keep all countryside available to support positive mental health and maintain wildlife</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M2: landscape character?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M3: green infrastructure?: Oppose</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M4: ecology and biodiversity?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M5: trees?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Markfield is part of the Charnwood forest and the trees need to be protected To retain the nature in the village</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M6: local green spaces?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Again these areas need to remain to enable residents to have safe spaces to play, walk etc.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M7: renewable energy?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M8: electric vehicle charge points?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M9: non-designated heritage assets?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: The plan supports the history of the village being Protected.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M10: design?: Support</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Do you support or oppose policy M11: community services and facilities?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Development of the village must not overload service's available for the village</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M12: Markfield institute of higher education?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M13: local and neighbourhood centres?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M14: infrastructure?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M15: housing provision?: Support Please provide your reason for this view:: This is extremely important to ensure the village remains a village and the natural beauty of the surrounding area is not diminished by continued housing development.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M16: housing allocation - land south of London Road? Support Please provide your reason for this view: The safest place for new housing to be developed.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M18: housing mix?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M19: Markfield Court Retirement Village and Woodrowe House?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M20: affordable housing?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M21: Markfield industrial estate?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M22: brownfield land?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M23: business conversion of rural buildings?: Support</p> <p>Do you support or oppose M24: business expansion?: Support</p>
--	--	---

71	Member of the Public 63	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p>
72	Member of the Public 64	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Please select which section you would like to comment on: Housing Do you support or oppose the housing section?: Oppose Please confirm the paragraph number(s) for example, 6.1: M16 Please provide your reason for this view: In my opinion the best site for new housing in Markfield would be the expansion of the Jelson 'London Rd' site, as this has only been recently developed and would not have much visual impact on the village. I appose all other proposed sites.</p>
73	Member of the Public 65	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Does not specify Amendment: Thank you [Personal details removed]. Apologies, the box showing support for the plan should have been ticked and I am very happy for you to amend the form to show that. [Personal details removed].</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan or refuse to adopt the Neighbourhood Plan: Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
74	Member of the Public 66	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, support the plan with modifications, or oppose the plan? Support the plan</p>

		<p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan or refuse to adopt the Neighbourhood Plan: Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
75	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	<p>Dear Sir / Madam</p> <p>Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Submission Consultation Representations on behalf of National Grid</p> <p>National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.</p> <p>About National Grid: National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators across England, Wales and Scotland. National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.</p> <p>National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.</p> <p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>

	<p>National Grid provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ <p>Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure.</p> <p>Distribution Networks: Information regarding the electricity distribution network is available at the website below: www.energynetworks.org.uk</p> <p>Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting: plantprotection@cadentgas.com</p> <p>Further Advice: Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database, if not already included: [personal details removed].</p> <p>If you require any further information in respect of this letter, then please contact us.</p> <p>Guidance on development near National Grid assets: National Grid is able to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks and encourages high quality and well-planned development in the vicinity of its assets.</p> <p>Electricity assets: Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance.</p> <p>National Grid's 'Guidelines for Development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines' promote the successful development of sites crossed by existing overhead lines and the creation of well-designed places. The guidelines demonstrate that a creative design approach can</p>
--	---

		<p>minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: https://www.nationalgridet.com/document/130626/download</p> <p>The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site.</p> <p>National Grid's statutory safety clearances are detailed in their 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets', which can be downloaded here: www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</p> <p>Gas assets: High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid's approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid have land rights for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/ temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally, written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid's 12.2m building proximity distance, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement. National Grid's 'Guidelines when working near National Grid Gas assets' can be downloaded here: www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets How to contact National Grid</p> <p>If you require any further information in relation to the above and/or if you would like to check if National Grid's transmission networks may be affected by a proposed development, please contact:</p> <p>National Grid's Plant Protection team: plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Cadent Plant Protection Team</p> <p>Block 1 Brick Kiln Street Hinckley LE10 0NA 0800 688 588</p> <p>or visit the website: https://www.beforeyoudig.cadentgas.com/login.aspx</p>
76	Member of the Public 67	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: No</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on: M15: Housing Provision</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M1: countryside?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: ok</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M15: housing provision?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Additional housing should be limited to that proposed in the plan. Further developments such as those proposed for Hill Lane and Ashby Road should be resisted.</p> <p>Please select which section you would like to comment on: Traffic and transport Do you support or oppose the traffic and transport section?: Support Please confirm the paragraph number(s) for example, 8.1: not known Please provide your reason for this view: Traffic levels at the Field Head Roundabout are becoming intolerable making vehicular exit from Markfield and the pedestrian crossing of Launde Road very hazardous. Further increase in traffic levels should be resisted.</p>

77	Member of the Public 68	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on: M15: Housing Provision</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M1: countryside?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: I support this on the basis that it limits the extension of the village, by controlling the amount of development allowed to that mentioned in the policies referred to.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M15: housing provision?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: I support the policy M15 on the basis that based on Markfield accounting for 3.9% of the borough's population. A fair share of the 8588 houses required in Hinckley and Bosworth is therefore 334 houses. Allowing for the windfall houses and existing planning permission, a further 280 dwellings will be required. The proposed Jelson development of 283 houses off London road meets this allocation and as such no further developments within Markfield or the immediate vicinity should be allowed within the plan period of 2020-2039.</p>
78	Member of the Public 69	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on: M15: Housing provision</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M1: countryside?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: I am in support of the details therein.</p>

		<p>Do you support or oppose policy M15: housing provision?: Support</p> <p>Please provide your reason for this view: I support this housing provision plan on the basis that this will be the ONLY housing allocation for Markfield up to 2039, therefore the Jelson application off London Road for 283 houses should be the only planning application granted to that date.</p>
79	Member of the Public 70	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Oppose. I oppose the plan, the box will not accept an electronic tick.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decisions by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition: I am opposed to the plan based on the following points.</p> <p>Use of open countryside for the development of 400+ houses. Too much open countryside is being built on across HBBC not just Markfield. The developments of housing, commercial, distribution centres and solar farms are having a great impact on the reduction of open countryside, effecting aesthetically and reducing the open footpaths.</p> <p>EAs you drive around every village is being extended.</p> <p>Requirements are said to be 80no new houses, why has land for 400+ being allocated and other developers are submitting planning applications around to village on other sites.</p> <p>Markfield is a village of approximately 4,500 and to increase this to approximately 5,300+ (based on only 2 people per household). This is a 18% increase.</p> <p>The effect on local amenities will be massive, doctors, chemists, shops, schools, roads, and car parking will not cope with this level of increase. All these amenities are landlocked, therefore very difficult to increase. It would be good to see plans on how these amenities can be enlarged.</p> <p>Development plans for the priority traffic flow of the A50/A511. More housing means more vehicles making more journeys has the development of the A50/A51 1 taken into consideration. The</p>

		<p>proposed traffic light system on the Field Head roundabout giving priority to the main road traffic will be a nightmare for the villages.</p> <p>The most recent development in the village by Jelson Homes has very basic house types, all very similar, using basic materials with no real use of local materials, only brick and render, which are showing signs already on deteriorating. There is very little public open spaces. Large developments of 400+ properties needs more interesting designs, more use of local materials, such as local stone etc and certainly more open spaces. The footpaths need careful thought to avoid the development replacing the open countryside walks with 'walking through a sea of houses.</p> <p>I agree with Matthew Lays concerns as he wrote in The Herald (mid-March 21 addition) in which he was very concerned that if the development of 400+ houses, the redevelopment of the A50/A511 corridor, and other developments around Markfield could result in an uncoordinated disaster. The £4m to mitigate these impacts is not what we should be looking at, we should be focused on the loss of open countryside and the impact on the amenities of our village. Walking though a very large housing development is not the same as walking in open countryside.</p>
80	The National Forest Company (NFC)	<p>Dear Planning Policy,</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the National Forest Company (NFC) in relation to the submission version of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Overall, the NFC welcomes that the Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals that contribute to the delivery of the National Forest Strategy. In the interests of clarity, it would be useful to refence the National Forest Strategy in an Appendix.</p> <p>Similarly, policy M2 in relation to Landscape Character is supported given that it includes provision for the retention and, where possible, enhancement of features of landscape importance such as woodland, hedgerows, mature trees and stone walls.</p> <p>In respect of Green Infrastructure, policy M3 states that states that new development should</p>

		<p>maintain and enhance the local Green Infrastructure network (as defined on Map 3 and the Policies Maps). It sets out priorities for Green Infrastructure enhancement including the creation of a new footway, cycle and bridleway route between Markfield and Groby and opportunities to mitigate traffic impacts arising along the A50/A511/M1 road corridors. The NFC supports the principle of improved accessibility between Markfield and Groby and the attendant benefits of access to parts of the National Forest. However, it is unclear within the policy or the supporting text the mechanism by which new development could secure this important objective. Would it be delivered through developer contributions for example? Would the approach be similar to the delivery of Biodiversity Enhancement outlined in Policy M4? Policy M14 refers to infrastructure contributions with a long list of priority issues and notably national forest planting contribution has been cited. However, improvements/provision of cycleways are not included within this list.</p> <p>In respect of Policy M14, the NFC would want the provision of woodland and green infrastructure to be provided on site as a priority and a contribution sought where there are compelling reasons why provision cannot be made on site. This needs to be made clearer in the above policy or elsewhere in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The NFC would support the principles set out in Policy M5 in relation to the retention of existing trees within new development and the conservation of ancient trees and all trees of good amenity value. The NFC also supports the principle of native species replacement for any trees or hedgerows of lower amenity value which are lost as a result of new development. The concept of replacement planting in locations where the trees would have the opportunity to grow to maturity, increase canopy cover and contribute to the local ecosystem are broadly supported. The issue may arise for example in smaller development sites, below the 0.5ha threshold for National Forest Planting (on or off site) and there may be limited capacity on the site to facilitate replacement planting where the trees have sufficient space to grow to maturity.</p> <p>In respect of Policy M10 (Design) the NFC would support the approach although it should also require the design of new development to reflect the location of Markfield within the National Forest and Charnwood Forest through the use of wooden materials for play areas and the incorporation of wooden features into the design of new housing for example. This is reflective of policy 21 of the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy. Similarly, policy M16 (Housing Allocation-</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Land south of London Road) makes welcome provision for allotments and woodland planting but should also require the design of the new housing development to reflect the location within the National Forest.</p> <p>The NFC would support the principle of renewable energy generation and Electric Vehicle Charge Points, policy M8 should be worded more clearly in respect of the latter.</p> <p>I trust that the above comments are of assistance to you,</p>
81	Leicestershire County Council	<p>Leicestershire County Council is supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process and welcome being included in this consultation.</p> <p>Highways Specific Comments</p> <p>General Comments The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth.</p> <p>Like very many Local Authorities, the County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding.</p> <p>To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development</p>

		<p>does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems.</p> <p>Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provided as a commuted sum.</p> <p>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 i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p> <p>The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third-party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third-party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.</p> <p>Flood Risk Management</p> <p>The County Council are fully aware of flooding that has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding, review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a statutory consultee on major planning applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure</p>
--	--	---

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

		<p>Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.</p> <p>LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies.</p> <p>For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning Practice Guidance webpage.</p> <p>Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals.</p> <p>Risk of flooding from surface water map: https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p> <p>Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</p> <p>Planning Developer Contributions If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Adopted North Kilworth NP and the Adopted Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances of your community. This would in general be consistent with the relevant District Council's Local Plan or its policy on planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of new development and</p>
--	--	--

		<p>enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations, where applicable.</p> <p>North Kilworth Adopted Plan (Leicestershirecommunitites.co.uk) Great Glen Adopted Plan (Leicestershirecommunities.co.uk)</p> <p>Mineral & Waste Planning The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development.</p> <p>Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood.</p> <p>You should also be aware of Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan (Leicestershire.gov.uk). 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 allocating development in these areas or if any proposed neighbourhood plan policies may impact on minerals and waste provision.</p> <p>Property Education 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.</p> <p>It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.</p> <p>Strategic Property Services No comment at this time.</p> <p>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 choice are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.</p> <p>Environment Specific Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.42 - Policy M10: Design. 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 roosting techniques, bird nesting boxes and hedgehog friendly fencing). • The Prime Minister has recently stated new cars and vans powered wholly by petrol and diesel will not be sold in the UK from 2030. The planning group should be mindful of this revised date. <p>General Comments 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.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Climate Change</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Landscape</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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-andcommunity/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record)</p> <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	--

		<p>biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly outlines the importance of MOPsustainable 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 such as the design of street lighting, roads, noise, obstructions in water, exposure of species to predation and arrangement of land-uses.</p> <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of protected and priority Biodiversity Action Plan species.</p> <p>These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme.</p> <p>Contact: planningecology@leics.gov.uk, or phone 0116 305 4108</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Green infrastructure (GI) is a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities, (NPPF definition). As a network, GI includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/churchyards allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls.</p>
--	--	--

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

		<p>large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification.</p> <p>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 compulsory to provide when submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of reasons as to why SEA was not required • An environmental report (a key output of the SEA process). <p>As the UK has now left the EU, Neighbourhood Planning groups should remain mindful of any future changes which may occur to the above guidance.</p> <p>Impact of Development on Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) 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 (2019) and the relevant Legislation Regulations.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Communities</p> <p>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;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carry out and report on a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. 2. Set out policies that seek to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>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.</p> <p>Economic Development</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Fibre Broadband</p> <p>High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a fast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life.</p> <p>All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to ultrafast broadband (of at least 100Mbps) and allow mechanisms for securing a full fibre broadband provision for each</p>
--	--	---

		<p>premise and business from at least one network operator, provided on an open access basis. Such provider must deploy a Fibre to the Premise (FTTP) access network structure in which optical fibre runs from a local exchange to each premise.</p> <p>Developers should take active steps to incorporate adequate broadband provision at the preplanning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure fibre 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.</p> <p>The Council supports a ‘dig once’ approach for the deployment of communications infrastructure and a build which is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Council encourages telecommunications build which does not significantly impact on the appearance of any building or space on which equipment is located and which minimises street clutter.</p> <p>Equalities While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council’s Equality Strategy 2016-2020 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work. A copy of the strategy can be view at: www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality-strategy2016-2020.pdf</p> <p>County Councillor A good plan for the area. Initial thoughts are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flying Horse roundabout (A511) retaining the ability to turn right down to Stanton and Markfield. • Traffic speeds on London Road/Forest Road/Leicester Road/Ashby Road. • Safe crossing point(s) on London Road for school children. • The absence of a pavement along Hill Lane- has implications for links to South Charnwood school. • Possible planning application for the expansion of Cliffe Hill quarry – it’s been rumoured for
--	--	--

		<p>ages, but no application has appeared.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The possible reclassification of some rights of way from footpaths to bridleways to provide a wider range of recreational activities. <p>NIK GREEN (MRS) Policy Officer E: [personal details removed].</p>
82	Canal & River Trust	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Canal & River Trust on the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Markfield.</p> <p>The Trust does not own or operate any inland waterways or associated infrastructure within the Plan area and accordingly I can confirm that we have no comments to make.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>[Personal details removed].</p>
83	Pegasus on behalf of DCS452 Ltd	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Submission of representation to the Markfield Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>These representations are made on behalf of DCS452 Ltd in respect of the Submission Draft of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As a general comment, we are concerned that the Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan does not support the economic growth of Markfield, failing to meet more than two of the standard conditions required of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Meeting the Basic Conditions</p> <p>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</p>

		<p>contained in the development plan for the area of the authority'.</p> <p>National planning policy is 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 (SADMP DPD) (adopted 2016). Paragraph 1.8 of the Markfield Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan recognises these requirements.</p> <p>The Framework Chapter 6 encourages planning 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 both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. Particularly at paragraph 82, the Framework states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors.</p> <p>Whilst Draft Policy M21 achieves this for the Markfield Industrial Estate, the Submission 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. Whilst the introduction of Draft Policy M24: Business Expansion following the Pre-Submission Consultation supports the expansion of existing businesses and enterprise, this is limited to 'small scale expansion'. The restrictive nature of Draft Policy M24 is therefore inconsistent with the approach set out in the Framework, which encourages the creation of conditions for businesses to expand. Draft Policy M24 subsequently fails to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy DM4 of the SADMP 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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	---

		<p>follow the same approach. Draft Policy M1 states that only the expansion of existing businesses in accordance with Draft Policy M24 (Business Expansion) can be considered sustainable development in the countryside, and as discussed above, Draft Policy M24 only allows for 'small scale expansion'. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan and its policies are therefore inconsistent with the approach taken by Policy DM4 and the SADMP DPD, subsequently failing to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Supporting the Local Economy The Local Enterprise Partnership for the area, the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP), seeks to drive economic prosperity across Leicestershire. They have published a Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) (2014), which sets out the key, overarching growth strategy for Leicestershire.</p> <p>The SEP establishes five growth areas, where investment will be focused to deliver infrastructure that will unlock the potential of the key strategic economic growth locations as well as the specific major development opportunities they contain. The investment will accelerate the delivery of, and tackle barriers to, the planned growth, providing funding and greater certainty for infrastructure delivery and stimulating private sector investment.</p> <p>One of the five growth areas is the Coalville Growth Corridor (A511) between Ashby, Coalville and Bardon. The Growth Corridor is recognised as one of two key east-west links in Leicestershire, where improvements along the A511 can unlock significant housing and commercial developments. The A511 between Bardon and the M1 lies within Markfield Parish, as such, the Neighbourhood Plan should pay regard to the ambitions of the Growth Corridor and the SEP, but it does not.</p> <p>The SEP highlights that the logistics sector is vitally important to the Growth Corridor, with infrastructure improvements such as to Junction 22 of the M1 being essential to ensure the corridor continues to provide the easy accessibility from key sites to the motorway network that the sector requires. Leicestershire County Council also acknowledge the Growth Area, with funding being sought to deliver the highways improvements. As part of the Coalville Growth Corridor (A511), the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan should support the ambitions of the LLEP through supporting the development and expansion of businesses and enterprises within the Parish. This</p>
--	--	--

		<p>can be achieved by amending Policy M24 to reflect the position set down in Policy DM4 of the SADMP.</p> <p>Overall, it has been demonstrated that the Markfield 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.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>[Personal details removed]</p>
84	Pegasus on behalf of C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel)	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Submission of representation to the Markfield Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan These representations are made on behalf of C.J. Upton & Sons Limited (Upton Steel) in respect of the Submission Draft of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>It is welcomed that our previous representation (dated 11th November 2020) to the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan has been considered, and that the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan now acknowledges Upton Steel's presence in Markfield.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that the Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan is too restrictive on expanding businesses within Markfield. Set out below is our response to the draft policies and supporting text contained within the Submission Draft of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Draft Policy M24: Business Expansion</p> <p>It is positive to see that following the consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan, the Submission Draft has introduced Draft Policy M24: Business Expansion which supports the expansion of existing businesses and enterprises within Markfield. However, it is overly restrictive in that the policy only supports 'small scale expansion' which is contrary to national and</p>

		<p>local planning policy.</p> <p>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'.</p> <p>National planning policy is 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 (SADMP DPD) (adopted 2016). Paragraph 1.8 of the Markfield Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan recognises these requirements.</p> <p>The Framework at paragraph 80 encourages planning 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 both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. Whilst Draft Policy 24 to some extent encourages the expansion of existing businesses and enterprises, it restricts support to only 'small scale expansion'. The restrictive nature of Draft Policy M24 is therefore inconsistent with the approach set out in the Framework, which encourages the creation of conditions for businesses to expand. Draft Policy M24 subsequently fails to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>At paragraph 5.32 of the SADMP DPD it is stated that additional employment provision in Markfield will be supported in line with Policy DM20. Policy DM20: Provision of Employment Sites accepts employment proposals outside of settlement boundaries on greenfield sites where it can be demonstrated that there are no suitable alternative sites available. Policy DM20 does not seek to restrict the size of new employment proposals. Therefore, Draft Policy M24 of the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan is inconsistent with the approach set out in the adopted SADMP DPD, subsequently failing to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Constraints to Development</p>
--	--	--

		<p>At paragraph 7.7 of the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan it is stated that several employment sites have been put forward in response to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council's 2016-2019 'Call for Sites', listing three examples. At paragraph 7.8 of the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan, it is stated that Markfield Parish Council does not support the release of large scale greenfield employment sites, especially given their location in the Charnwood Forest and National Forest.</p> <p>The Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan's lack of support towards the release of large scale greenfield employment sites is in contrast to the support provided by Policy DM20 of the SADMP DPD, which accepts employment proposals outside of settlement boundaries on greenfield sites where it can be demonstrated that there are no suitable alternative sites available. The Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan is subsequently inconsistent with the approach set out in the adopted SADMP DPD, therefore failing to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In addition to this, the National Forest and Charnwood Forest should not be referenced as a constraint to development. Neither Policy 21: National Forest nor Policy 22: Charnwood Forest of the Core Strategy DPD seek to constrain development, instead seeking to guide development form. The Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan is subsequently inconsistent with the approach set out in the adopted Core Strategy DPD, therefore failing to achieve one of the required basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Overall, it has been demonstrated that the Markfield 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.</p> <p>To remedy this, we suggest that Draft Policy 24 is amended to encourage the business and enterprise expansion of all sizes to support the economic growth of Markfield, to be consistent with Policy DM20 of the SADMP DPD and the Framework. In addition, the National Forest and Charnwood Forest should not be referenced as a constraint to development to be consistent with</p>
--	--	--

		<p>the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>[personal details removed]</p>
85	Marrons Planning on behalf of Owl Partnerships	<p>Introduction</p> <p>1. 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.</p> <p>2. Owl Partnerships has an interest in land at Ratby Lane, Markfield and has made a planning application for 48 affordable homes to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (20/00848/FUL. That wholly affordable scheme is being delivered in partnership with East Midlands Housing Association and is currently progressing to determination. Midland Heart has grant funding from Homes England to deliver the scheme immediately upon receipt of planning permission.</p> <p>3. 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).</p> <p>4. 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • having regard 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). <p>5. Owl Partnerships position is that the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet all three basic conditions by:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 with regard to wider planning objective and in particular the delivery of affordable homes. <p>National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>6. 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.</p> <p>7. 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.</p> <p>8. 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).</p> <p>9. 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).</p> <p>10. 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,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals.</p> <p>11. 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.</p> <p>12. 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.</p> <p>13. Paragraph 67 of the NPPF says that strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area and that planning policies should identify a supply of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period b) Specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan. <p>14. Paragraph 70 of the NPPF says that where an allowance is to be made for windfall sites as part of anticipated supply, there should be compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends.</p> <p>15. 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 existing and emerging spatial strategy’ (paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 41-105-20190509 – emphasis added).</p>
--	--	---

		<p>16. Where a neighbourhood planning body needs to determine a housing requirement figure themselves (in accordance with the above) the national planning practice guidance signposts them to the neighbourhood planning toolkit on housing needs assessment, noting that the neighbourhood planning body will need to work proactively with the local planning authority through this process, and the figure will need to be tested at examination of the neighbourhood plan, as neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with strategic policies of the development plan to meet the 'basic conditions' (Paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 41-105-20190509).</p> <p>Duty to Cooperate</p> <p>17. Local planning authorities and other prescribed bodies are under a duty to cooperate with each other, and with other prescribed bodies, on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries under the provisions of section 33 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2011. The duty requires constructive, active and ongoing engagement in any process by means of which the preparation of development plan documents and other local development documents (and any activities that support those activities) are undertaken.</p> <p>Housing Requirement</p> <p>18. The Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy December 2009 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.</p> <p>19. 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.</p> <p>20. The Hinckley and Bosworth Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (July 2016) recognised that sufficient development was committed (as of 1 September 2015 –</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Table 3: Page 13) to meet Core Strategy Policy 8 and that the residual need for allocations at Markfield was 0 homes.</p> <p>21. The Core Strategy in excess of 5 years 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.</p> <p>22. The up to date housing requirement for Hinckley is now established through the Standard Housing Methodology and has been estimated at around 452 homes a year. However, 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.</p> <p>23. In turn, the requirement for the Housing Market Area overall has been further complicated by the revised standard method boosting the City of Leicester's housing need by 35%. The City had already declared an unmet need of 7,800 homes to 2036 and local plan committee papers issued to North West Leicestershire and Blaby District Council members confirm the City's admission that this figure has risen by another 10,000 homes due to the 35% uplift. In total, around 17,800 homes will need to be re-distributed from the City to the HMA. Growth has previously been re-distributed to Hinckley and Bosworth by the Strategic Growth Plan. The figure of 531 homes a year across the longer period to 2050 is not likely to reduce and in fact it would be sensible, indeed important to recognise, that Hinckley and Bosworth will almost certainly be a location for a proportion of the newly arising unmet need.</p> <p>24. 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.</p> <p>25. 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 2020-2029 will be 452 houses per year or 8,588 homes. The plan then</p>
--	--	--

		<p>arrives at a Markfield housing requirement of 334 dwellings between 2020 and 2039 based upon data from the 2017 mid-year population estimates which suggest Markfield parish accounts for 3.9% of the total borough population.</p> <p>26. In our view a Markfield housing requirement for 334 homes 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.</p> <p>27. We have not had sight of any report or assessment which considers the existing and emerging strategies and justifies the base housing requirement of 8,588 homes for Hinckley and Bosworth as the starting point for identifying the figure. Furthermore, we have not seen any evidence or assessment which justifies the use of a proportionate population figure for Markfield equivalent to 3.9% from the mid-year population estimate. It might be noted that 3.9% of 8,588 homes is 334.932 – which sensibly rounded equates to 335 homes.</p> <p>28. The neighbourhood planning toolkit on housing needs assessment (signposted by the PPG at Paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 41-105-20190509) says the ‘most logical, sensible and robust way to calculate a housing need figure for your neighbourhood plan is to follow an approach which reflects the Government’s standard method for calculating housing need. It goes on to recommend a four step approach on the basis that it aligns to the greatest extent with the NPPF and PPG. The neighbourhood plan group has not undertaken step 2 which seeks to understand the existing and emerging spatial strategy.</p> <p>29. 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 the approach described in the Neighbourhood Plan (paragraph 3.5).</p>
--	--	--

		<p>30. 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 and we understand this will be published in Summer 2021 (post the pre-election period).</p> <p>31. 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.</p> <p>32. In any event, 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). The Neighbourhood Plan provides for the period to 2039; some 13 years beyond the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy plan period and well into the period of higher growth in Hinckley and Bosworth signalled by the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan. Despite this the neighbourhood plan claims (paragraph 1.17) that it has been aligned with the emerging Local Plan to cover the period 2020 to 2039. Unfortunately, there is no exploration of these strategic matters in the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan or its evidence base.</p> <p>33. 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 2039. With one eye on the significant potential for the Neighbourhood Plan to be out of alignment with the emerging strategy, paragraph 1.17 goes on to admit 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 resolve matters which are not critical to the plan's soundness</p>
--	--	---

		<p>or legal compliance as a whole' (emphasis added).</p> <p>34. 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).'</p> <p>35. 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 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.</p> <p>36. It might also be noted that cooperation is required on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries under the provisions of section 33 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2011. Whilst the planning practice guidance notes that Neighbourhood Planning bodies are not bound by the duty to cooperate, nor are they required to produce or be involved in a statement of common ground [Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 61- 009-20190315] the planning practice guidance is just that; guidance, and the Act is legislation that must be met.</p> <p>37. Not only has the neighbourhood plan engaged in strategic policies in respect of housing requirements, it has also assessed sites that are in Charnwood Borough Council and Newtown Linford Parish. In doing so, the neighbourhood plan has further engaged in cross boundary matters and sought to influence matters at a scale beyond its area.</p> <p>38. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to show that cooperation has taken place at all, let alone</p>
--	--	--

		<p>has been active and ongoing. It might also be noted that in doing so, the neighbourhood plan is also required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</p> <p>Site Allocations</p> <p>39. The Neighbourhood Plan notes (paragraph 6.6) that 16 homes have planning permission at 31 March 2020. It also expects 38 homes to come forward from windfall sites (two homes per year across the plan period). The neighbourhood plan considers that this leaves a residual requirement of 280 dwellings to be allocated in the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>40. We have not seen any compelling evidence to support the windfall allowance. Certainly for the first five years of the plan the supply should be specific and deliverable and windfalls are acknowledged to be more aligned to the broad locations for growth capable of being identified for years 6-10 of the plan. If compelling evidence does justify a figure of two windfall completions a year they should only apply to the period 2026 to 2039; and whilst this is wholly dependent on compelling evidence it would amount to 26 homes.</p> <p>41. Notwithstanding the above, the neighbourhood plan allocates land south of London Road for 280 homes through policies M16 and M15.</p> <p>42. The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report August 2020 recognises 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 dwellings and that the proposed housing allocation is for a minimum of 280 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 paragraph 30 of this representation) and as the Neighbourhood Plan is providing</p>
--	--	--

		<p>for such matters a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required.</p> <p>43. The neighbourhood plan group has undertaken a site assessment and the results published with the submission plan. The neighbourhood plan says that 24 potential sites had been put forward through the Borough Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, but that 3 of these were outside of the designated neighbourhood area. Whilst that suggests that 21 sites would be assessed the Site Assessment results (published as document 6.12 on the neighbourhood plan website) includes assessment commentary for 23 sites. The sites are scored against a 20 criteria, each of which is underpinned by a number of sub-criteria. A Site Assessment Framework (also published as document 6.12 on the neighbourhood plan website) sets out a series of tests for RAG scoring the sites against each sub-criteria.</p> <p>44. The Site Assessment Framework does not include a methodology to describe how those judgements will be made. A review of the Site Assessment Results suggests that a ‘poorest score prevails’ approach is taken rather than a balanced judgement being taken across the set of sub-criteria. So for example, a score of three greens and a single red against four sub-criteria will result in an overall score of red against the parent criterion. This binary approach not only prevents a balanced judgement from being made, it also has the effect of skewing the overall site scores so that it is possible for a site with a greater number of reds against sub-criteria that are concentrated under a small number of criteria to rank higher than a site with fewer reds which are scattered or distributed through the criteria. In essence, the framework prevents a proportional representation. It also fails to have regard to mitigations; a central tenet of the planning system.</p> <p>45. Overall, the approach is overtly scientific and does not sit well with the NPPF which adopts balancing clauses and encourages judgements with issues weighed in that balancing exercise. Indeed, the neighbourhood plan group are aware of the need to do this as evidenced by their own minutes from 10th March 2020 which 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’ [emphasis added].</p> <p>Site Assessment: Land at Ratby Lane</p>
--	--	---

		<p>46. The Site Assessment Framework employs 20 criteria each of which is supported by a number of sub criteria. Each of the sub criteria has a description of factors which are used to arrive at a RAG score. No methodology has been published to explain how those sub-criteria RAG scores are then used to arrive at a single RAG score for the 'parent' criteria but it is clear that a lowest score prevails approach is taken; so for example, a score of 4 greens and 1 red would result in a red score overall. This is wholly at odds with the approach promoted by the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development to consider benefits and disadvantages in a balanced manner. Indeed, for criteria 20 (access to services) which includes some 14 sub criteria a balanced approach is taken; presumably on the basis that to do otherwise would result in a red score for every site. In our view a balanced approach is necessary and a requirement of national policy.</p> <p>47. Owl Homes' site appears in the site assessment as LPR125 Land East of Ratby Lane Markfield. There are a number of areas where we consider the site to perform more highly than the assessment undertaken. These are set out below with specific reference to the relevant criteria and scoring.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>3. To provide better opportunities for local people and tourists to access and understand local heritage, including our natural history.</i></p> <p>48. The assessment records a Green score for access to the countryside (3a) and a Red score for access to public transport (3b). The criteria supports a Green score where the walking distance to the nearest bus stop providing a regular service is less than 300m. There is a bus stop directly opposite the site providing services to Leicester and Castle Donington throughout the day and hourly at peak times. 3b should be scored Green and the overall score for Criteria 3 should be Green.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>6. To promote and support the empowerment of local communities in creating and implementing solutions that meet their needs focusing particularly on young, elderly and deprived people</i></p> <p>49. The assessment records an Amber score for 'links' (6a), a Green score for 'Neighbourliness'</p>
--	--	---

		<p>(6b) and a Red score for Access to Markfield Community Centre (6c). Criteria 6 is scored Red overall on the basis that the lowest score proves dominant rather than a balanced judgement being taken.</p> <p>50. Notwithstanding the above, criteria 6c only mentions Markfield Community Centre but the threshold notes that a green score would be attributed for access to a community hall. Of course, Markfield Conference Centre is within a 200m walk and as a result the score for 6c should be Green.</p> <p>51. Even without any changing to the scoring our view is that a balanced judgement would score 1xRed, 1xAmber and 1xGreen as an Amber overall. However, taking account of the Markfield Conference Centre would result in 2x Green and 1x Amber and in our view this is sufficient to score Green overall or at the very worst Green/Amber.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>7. To protect and enhance the natural environment (species and habitats) and green infrastructure whilst contributing to the achievement of Biodiversity Action Plan targets</i></p> <p>52. The assessment records a Green score for 'Site of Specific Scientific Interest' (7a), a Green score for 'Billa Barra Hill Nature Reserve' (7b), a Green score for 'Tree Preservation Order' (7c), a Red score for 'Important Hedgerow' (7d), a Green score for 'Local Wildlife Site' and a Green score for 'Regionally Important Geological Site' (7f). Criteria 7 is scored Red overall on the basis that the lowest score proves dominant rather than a balanced judgement being taken.</p> <p>53. To be classed as Red in criteria 7d, all or most of an important hedgerow would have to be removed. However, the design of any development on this site would take the hedgerows into account. Some removal of hedgerows for access may be required but there is wide scope for retention. Therefore, at the very least 7d should be attributed an Amber score.</p> <p>54. Even without any changing to the scoring our view is that a balanced judgement would score 1xRed and 5xGreen as a Green overall. However, taking into account retention of hedgerows would result in 5x Green and 1x Amber and in our view this is sufficient to score Green overall or at the very worst Green/Amber for Criteria 7.</p>
--	--	--

8. To conserve and enhance the built and natural character, diversity and local distinctiveness of towns and villages in Hinckley and Bosworth district

55. The assessment records a Red score for 'Enhance the vitality and viability of Markfield village centre/ Chitterman Way' (8a) and a Green score for 'Impact of traffic on village centre' (8b). 800m is given as the maximum preferred walking distance to the centre for criteria 8a. Residents of a new scheme here would be approximately 1,000m from Chitterman Way, a walking time of just over 10 minutes and with access via the bus service opposite the site. The Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT) 'Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot' (2000) suggests an acceptable distance for a community to access local facilities on foot is 1,000m and the preferred maximum is 2000m. These thresholds are a sensible industry standard provided by the Institute and based upon their technical experience and expertise. It is clearly the case that the site offers good pedestrian access to the centre. Therefore, 8a should be scored as Amber.

56. Even without any changing to the scoring our view is that a balanced judgement would score 1xRed and 1xGreen as an Amber overall. However, taking account criteria 8a being scored as Amber would give 1x Green and 1x Amber which, in our view, is sufficient to score Green overall or at the very worst Green/Amber for Criteria 8.

9. To preserve and enhance the character and appearance and setting of archaeological sites, historic buildings, conservation sites, historic parks and other cultural assets, including heritage assets on the 'Heritage at Risk' Register

57. The assessment records a Green score for 'Listed Building' (9a), a Green Score for 'Conservation Area' (9b), and an Amber score for 'Non-designated Heritage' (9c). The criteria for a Green score for 9c involves the site being unlikely to be affected by archaeological assets.

58. The site is not affected by any listed buildings or conservation areas. A recent archaeological desk-based assessment concludes that there is a low potential for prehistoric remains, low to moderate potential for Roman remains, low potential for Saxon remains and a low-moderate

		<p>potential for medieval remains. There is a low potential for settlement remains of medieval and post-medieval date and a low to moderate potential for agricultural remains of medieval to post-medieval date. The low to moderate findings are common for village sites and there is no evidence to support a finding that there is anything of archaeological value. There also looks to be no ridges, furrows or digging trenches. Therefore, 9c should be given a Green score.</p> <p>59. Even without any changing to the scoring our view is that a balanced judgement would score 1xAmber and 2xGreen as a Green overall. However, taking account criteria 9c being scored as Green, giving 3x Green, in our view this is sufficient to score Green overall or at the very worst Green/Amber for Criteria 9.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>10. To conserve and enhance the character, diversity and local distinctiveness of the rural landscape in the borough area</i></p> <p>60. The assessment records an Amber score for 'Rural Character' (10a), an Amber score for 'Rural Views' (10b), an Amber score for 'Landscape Setting' (10c), an Amber score for 'Character' (10d), an Amber score for 'Working with the Site and its Context' (10e) and a Red score for 'Green Infrastructure' (10f). The Red score criteria for 10f mentions the 'loss of green infrastructure'. However, whilst the site is currently undeveloped it does not have access for pedestrians or perform a function as part of a green infrastructure network. In fact, the layout for development of the site currently the subject of planning application 20/00848/FUL includes open space and landscaping which would add to the network of green infrastructure, accessible for pedestrians. Therefore, criteria 10f should be given a Green score.</p> <p>61. Even without any changing to the scoring our view is that a balanced judgement would score 1xRed and 5xAmber as an Amber overall. However, taking account of the potential improvement to green infrastructure would result in 1x Green and 5x Amber and in our view this is sufficient to score Amber overall for Criteria 10.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>11. To conserve and enhance woodland cover in the borough area, particularly where it supports the National Forest area</i></p> <p>62. The assessment records a Green score for 'Woodland' (11a) and a Red score for 'Hedgerows'</p>
--	--	--

		<p>(11b). To be classed as Red in criteria 11b, all or most of an important hedgerow would have to be removed. However, the design of any development on this site has taken hedgerows into account. Some removal of hedgerows for access may be required but there is wide scope for retention. Therefore, 11b should be attributed an Amber score.</p> <p>63. Even without any changing to the scoring our view is that a balanced judgement would score 1xRed and 1xGreen as an Amber overall. However, taking into account retention of hedgerows would result in 1x Green and 1x Amber and in our view this is sufficient to score Amber overall for Criteria 11.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>15. To improve access to education and training for children, young people and adult Learners</i></p> <p>64. The assessment records an Amber score for 'Access to Markfield Primary School or Stanton Under Bardon Community Primary School' (15a), a Red score for 'Access to South Charnwood High School' (15b), and a Red score for 'Access to Public Transport' (15c).</p> <p>65. The Red scoring criteria for 15b mentions that the walking distance is more than 2,000m. However, South Charnwood High School is itself out of the main part of Markfield on the western side of the M1 Motorway. It takes less than a 5 minute drive from the site and the school bus could easily pick up children from the development. To be clear, none of the sites have good access by foot to South Charnwood High School. Therefore, 15b should be scored Amber.</p> <p>66. The criteria for 15c supports a Green score where the walking distance to the nearest bus stop providing a regular service is less than 300m. There is a bus stop directly opposite the site providing services to Leicester and Castle Donington throughout the day and hourly at peak times. It is not clear why this was not acknowledged in the assessment. 15c should be scored Green</p> <p>67. If criteria 15b is scored Amber then there would be 1xRed and 2xAmber, making an Amber score the most fitting. If criteria 15c is scored correctly as Green then there would be 1xRed,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>1xAmber, and 1xGreen in which case it would make sense for the category to be Scored Amber overall.</p> <p>68. However, taking both scoring changes into account would result in 1x Green and 2x Amber and in our view this is sufficient to score Green/Amber overall for Criteria 15.</p> <p>Overall Scoring</p> <p>69. The scoring undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Group ranked the site 12th with 12 x Red scores, 5 x Amber scores and 3 x Green scores. On the basis of our assessment above, the site would rank 2nd with 5 x Red scores, 7 x Amber scores and 8 x Green scores.</p> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>70. The Neighbourhood Plan references a 2018 Midlands Rural Housing (MRH) Housing Needs Survey of Markfield Parish which identified a need for 24 affordable houses (for rent or shared ownership) in the next five years for those with a connection to Markfield. It also references cross referencing of these survey results with the Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Housing Register which found a further 54 households in housing need.</p> <p>71. No overall figure for affordable housing need is given. It might be noted that the MRH Survey identified 24 homes for the next five years; 2018-2023 at that time. The 54 households on the Council's register which were cross referenced would also be relevant to the same time period.</p> <p>72. The plan goes onto to note that the site it intends to allocate at the south of London Road would deliver around 112 affordable homes. Policy M20 goes on to set a minimum affordable housing provision of 40% for developments of 10 or more homes, or if the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more.</p> <p>73. The treatment of affordable housing in the neighbourhood plan is curious in that no robust assessment of overall need across the plan period is made and no assessment of the provision to meet that need is offered. Affordable housing is recognised as a matter to be dealt with by the plan; hence Policy M20 (and the Vision recognising the need to meet the housing needs of all residents).</p>
--	--	---

		<p>74. Even if we accept that the base need for 2018 to 2023 was 78 homes (24 plus 54) and assume that provides an annual figure of 16 homes (15.6 homes rounded up). That would give a working figure of 304 affordable homes being required for the neighbourhood plan period 2020 to 2039 (or 296.4 if we accept the base figure of 15.6 homes a year needed). The neighbourhood plan is not providing for this need.</p> <p>75. Hinckley and Bosworth overall has a significant affordable housing need for 271 dwellings per annum between 2018 and 2036 (Housing Needs Study 2019). In addition to this, there has been a shortfall in delivery totalling 1,308 affordable dwellings since 2011 against the lower need set out in the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2017. There is a clear delivery failure to meet the need against a backdrop and direction of travel that need is continuing to increase.</p> <p>76. Historically, Hinckley and Bosworth have managed to deliver around 21% of dwellings as affordable homes. If we presume that 21% of the housing supply of 2,445 dwellings would be delivered as affordable homes supply would amount to 513 affordable dwellings within the next 5 years. This is equivalent to just 103 affordable dwellings per annum (2020-2025) which is significantly lower than the HEDNA need of 247 dwellings per annum but even lower than the HNS need for 271 dwellings per annum. This could see a further shortfall of around 840 affordable dwellings within the Borough within the next 5 year period.</p> <p>77. The Planning Inspectorate and Secretary of State have made clear that the delivery of affordable housing should be given substantial weight when making planning decisions. A development for 128 affordable dwellings at Land off Aviation Lane, Burton on Trent was allowed at appeal in October 2020 (APP/B3410/W/20/3245077) with the Inspector considered that there was a significant pressing need for affordable housing 'now' and therefore the aim should be to meet the shortfall as soon as possible. Delivery of affordable homes was a significant benefit in helping to address the shortfall in the supply in the short term that given no certainty it would be met from existing or future planning permissions.</p> <p>78. An appeal for Land at the Former North Worcestershire Golf Club Ltd, Hanging Lane,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Birmingham was allowed in July 2019 and endorsed by the Secretary of State (APP/P4605/W/18/3192918). In this case, the Inspector attached significant weight to affordable housing provision, noting there had been a very low level of affordable housing provision against a background of a pressing and growing need for new affordable homes.</p> <p>79. The Land North of Pulley Lane and Newlands Lane joint appeal (APP/H1840/A/13/2199085 and APP/H1840/A/13/2199426) saw the Secretary of State agree with the Inspector's that very significant weight should be attached to the delivery of affordable housing noting the Council were seriously underperforming in terms of supplying affordable housing.</p> <p>80. There are serious shortfalls in the delivery of affordable homes in Hinckley and Bosworth and an increasing level of need. There are extremely limited prospects for meeting need in the next five years and potentially across the plan period. The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has not planned to meet the need for Markfield or planned to contribute to wider affordable housing need as part of the role Markfield plays in the existing and emerging development strategies and settlement hierarchy. Without action now it is highly unlikely that the required number of affordable homes will be provided in the long term. In accordance with the appeal record discussed above these matters should be afforded considerable weight in planning decisions.</p> <p>81. Owl Homes site at Ratby Lane is promoted as a 100% Affordable Housing development in partnership with Midland Heart Housing Association. The scheme would deliver 48 much needed affordable homes. Allocation of the site together with the assumed 112 affordable homes to be sought from the land at London Road would deliver 160 affordable homes overall. Whilst this continues to be below the need for c.300 affordable homes across the life of the plan it would represent a significant improvement on the prospects for affordable homes delivery in the plan as submitted.</p> <p>Consultation and Strategic Environmental Assessment</p> <p>82. There is an added problem with the site assessment process. Notably, the assessment was not made available during the production of the plan and as a result there has been no scrutiny, engagement or dialogue with landowners and promoters on the assessment or the way sites have been assessed and selected. It might be noted that PPG Paragraph: 048 Reference ID:</p>
--	--	--

		<p>41-048-20140306 says 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 '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.'</p> <p>83. Whilst a general consultation invitation was 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 has not been 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 least, our client should have had an opportunity to consider the assessment and provide any comment and evidence they consider pertinent to the site selection process prior to the plan being submitted to Hinckley and Bosworth for examination.</p> <p>84. 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.</p> <p>85. 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 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</p>
--	--	--

		<p>in the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan review.</p> <p>86. 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.</p> <p>87. 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 (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).</p> <p>88. 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.</p> <p>Other Matters</p> <p>89. Map 8 identifies areas of ‘known archaeological remains’ with paragraph 4.80 suggesting these are taken from the Historic Environment Record. No extracts or supporting evidence have been published on the Neighbourhood Plan evidence page and so it is not possible to corroborate the basis for the quite substantial areas of land covered by Map 8.</p> <p>90. Policy M9: Non Designated Heritage Assets seeks to protect these assets and says that the</p>
--	--	--

		<p>determination of planning applications which would directly or indirectly affect non designated heritage assets ... will balance the need for the proposed development against the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset [emphasis added].</p> <p>91. Paragraph 185 NPPF say plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. Matters to be taken into account by this strategy include:</p> <p>b) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring [emphasis added].</p> <p>92. Paragraph 197 NPPF says that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>93. Neither paragraph 185 or 197 NPPF seek a narrow balancing exercise limited to the 'need' for development, rather they seek to weigh matters relating to the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits in a balanced manner. Policy M4 is at odds with the NPPF and requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>94. Policy M10: Design only supports those developments that reflect the traditional character of Markfield unless they are development is of exceptional quality or innovative design [emphasis added].</p> <p>95. The NPPF sets out the Government's ambitions for design, noting that clarity about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential and so too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process (paragraph 124). The NPPF goes on to say that plans should set out a clear design vision and give applicants as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. Design policies should reflect local aspirations and be grounded in an understanding and</p>
--	--	---

		<p>evaluation of each area's defining characteristics [emphasis added]. It is entirely appropriate for neighbourhood plans to identify the special qualities of each area and explain how this should be reflected in development (paragraph 125).</p> <p>96. Paragraph 126 NPPF says the ambition should be the creation of distinctive places, with a consistent and high quality standard of design but the level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances in each place, and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified [emphasis added]. Paragraph 127 says that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:</p> <p>c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change [emphasis added].</p> <p>97. Policy M10 is myopic in its approach and overly restrictive, seeking only design of traditional character unless a proposal is innovative or exceptional. This is a stronger policy requirement than for development within a conservation area with large parts of Markfield outside of the statutory designated conservation area. Importantly, paragraph 126c notes that innovation or change should not be prevented or discouraged. As written policy M10 is at odds with the NPPF and requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>98. Policy M11: Community Services and Facilities Development says development must show regard for the retention of the community facilities in accordance with Policy DM25 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. Whilst it is not necessary for Neighbourhood Plans to duplicate policies set out in local plans Policy M11 seeks to identify a local list of facilities which are relevant to the implementation of Policy DM25. Whilst this, and the signposting of Policy M11, is appropriate the requirement for development to have 'regard to retention' is ambiguous and not entirely consistent with DM25 which introduces a sequence of matters that should be taken into account for retention and loss of facilities and services.</p> <p>99. As written Policy M11 is too prescriptive and seeks to introduce a test singularly pointed a retention. As a consequence, is it at odds with Policy DM25 and requires modification if it is to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>100. Our client supports the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans which meet 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).</p> <p>101. Whilst the difficulties of the strategic policy context are acknowledged it is not appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan to determine a housing requirement with complete disregard for the emerging strategy for Hinckley and Bosworth or to undertake a site assessment behind closed doors and prevent any engagement in that process or at the very least any sight of an assessment used to determine a site allocation process.</p> <p>102. The Neighbourhood Plan is based on an unstable footing and together with the absence of any evidence to understand the housing requirement and the site selection process there must be some doubt that the Neighbourhood Plan is setting a framework that meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>103. Furthermore, 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.</p> <p>104. The engagement in strategic policies in respect of housing requirements and site assessment (land in Charnwood Borough Council and Newtown Linford Parish) means that the neighbourhood plan has engaged in cross boundary matters and sought to influence matters at a scale beyond its area. Cooperation is required on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries under the provisions of section 33 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2011. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to show that cooperation has taken place at all, let alone has been active and ongoing.</p> <p>105. In accordance with the provisions of Schedule 1 to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) the neighbourhood plan group must consult any of the</p>
--	--	---

		<p>consultation bodies whose interest it considers may be affected by the draft neighbourhood plan with Schedule 1(p) identifying ‘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. By deciding to forego engagement on the site selection framework and site assessment process the neighbourhood plan group have failed in their duty to prepare a plan in accordance with the Schedule 1 to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended).</p> <p>106. Policy M4 seeks a narrow balancing exercise limited to the ‘need’ for development, rather than seeking to weigh matters relating to the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits in a balanced manner. As a consequence, Policy M4 is at odds with paragraph 185 and 197 NPPF and requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>107. Policy M10 is overly restrictive and at odds with paragraph 126c NPPF which notes that innovation or change should not be prevented or discouraged. As a consequence, Policy M10 requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>108. Policy M11 is too prescriptive and seeks to introduce a test singularly pointed at retention of services and facilities. As a consequence, is it at odds with Policy DM25 and requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>109. There are serious shortfalls in the delivery of affordable homes in Hinckley and Bosworth and an increasing level of need which result in extremely limited prospects for meeting need in the next five years and potentially across the plan period. The Markfield Neighbourhood Plan has not planned to respond to this context or to meet the need for Markfield. Owl Partnership’s site at Ratby Lane is promoted as a 100% Affordable Housing development in partnership with Midland Heart Housing Association and the 48 much needed affordable homes are a benefit that should be afforded considerable weight in planning decisions.</p> <p>110. The Site Assessment Framework does not consider benefits and disadvantages in a balanced manner as promoted by the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. In our</p>
--	--	---

		<p>view a balanced approach is necessary and a requirement of national policy. There are also a number of inaccuracies in the assessment which when corrected and results in the site being ranked 2nd overall. Taken together with the weight that should be afforded to affordable homes delivery in the face of a significant undersupply and limited prospects for dealing with need it is clear that the site should be allocated within the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>111. We consider that in order to pass examination and proceed to referendum and be made that the Neighbourhood Plan should re-assess the level of housing required and be re-drafted with policies and allocations that meet that identified housing requirement. Strategic Environmental Assessment is also required. Our client is willing to work with the Parish Council to this end with a view to their interest at Ratby Lane being allocated to meet the need.</p> <p>112. In light of the above, this representation should be read as an objection to the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan at this time albeit we are hopeful that further work and amendments can be made in order to allow the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the basic conditions and proceed to referendum. In the absence of any amendments our client must, regrettably, maintain an objection and wishes to have that heard by the examiner with a view to preventing the Neighbourhood Plan from being made due to a failure to meet the basic conditions 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).</p>
86	Marrons Planning on behalf of Member of the Public 71	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Please find attached our submission on behalf of our client to the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation.</p> <p>In addition, please find attached a response to the Call for Sites consultation for Land east of Ratby Lane, Markfield.</p> <p>Please can confirmation of receipt be provided.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>

		<p>[Personal details removed].</p> <p>[Appendices also submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Submission Consultation Representations On Behalf Of [personal details removed]. • New Directions for Growth 2019 Submission Form.]
87	Marrons Planning on behalf of Penland Estates	<p>Introduction</p> <p>1. These representations have been prepared by Marrons Planning on behalf of our client, Penland Estates.</p> <p>2. Penland Estates has an interest in land at Ashby Road, Markfield and is pursuing development of the land for approximately 90 dwellings on the site. The site is partially located within the Hinckley and Bosworth administrative boundary and therefore the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan boundary, with the vast majority of the site located within the Charnwood administrative boundary.</p> <p>3. 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).</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>4. 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.</p> <p>5. 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.</p> <p>6. The amount of housing required in an area is a strategic matter (paragraph 20 NPPF) although</p>

		<p>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).</p> <p>7. 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).</p> <p>8. 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.</p> <p>9. 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.</p> <p>10. 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.</p> <p>11. Paragraph 67 of the NPPF says that strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area and that planning policies should identify a supply of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan periodb) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan.
--	--	--

		<p>12. Paragraph 70 of the NPPF says that where an allowance is to be made for windfall sites as part of anticipated supply, there should be compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends.</p> <p>13. 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 existing and emerging spatial strategy’ (paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 41-105-20190509 – emphasis added).</p> <p>14. Where a neighbourhood planning body needs to determine a housing requirement figure themselves (in accordance with the above) the national planning practice guidance signposts them to the neighbourhood planning toolkit on housing needs assessment, noting that the neighbourhood planning body will need to work proactively with the local planning authority through this process, and the figure will need to be tested at examination of the neighbourhood plan, as neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with strategic policies of the development plan to meet the ‘basic conditions’ (Paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 41-105-20190509)</p> <p>Duty to Cooperate</p> <p>15. Local planning authorities and other prescribed bodies are under a duty to cooperate with each other, and with other prescribed bodies, on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries under the provisions of section 33 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2011. The duty requires constructive, active and ongoing engagement in any process by means of which the preparation of development plan documents and other local development documents (and any activities that support those activities) are undertaken.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan Policies</p>
--	--	---

		<p>16. 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). The Neighbourhood Plan provides for the period to 2039; some 13 years beyond the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy plan period. Despite this the neighbourhood plan claims (paragraph 1.17) that it has been aligned with the emerging Local Plan to cover the period 2020 to 2039. Unfortunately, there is no exploration of these strategic matters in the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan or its evidence base.</p> <p>17. 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 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.</p> <p>18. Whilst the planning practice guidance notes that Neighbourhood Planning bodies are not bound by the duty to cooperate, nor are they required to produce or be involved in a statement of common ground [Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 61-009-20190315] it might be noted that cooperation is required on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries under the provisions of section 33 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2011.</p> <p>19. Our client's site also falls predominantly within Charnwood Borough Council and the parish of Newtown Linford. It is notable that part of the site has been considered within the site assessment framework as site ref AS421. In doing so, the neighbourhood plan has further engaged in cross boundary matters and sought to influence matters at a scale beyond its area.</p> <p>20. Unfortunately, the planning practice guidance is just that; guidance, and the Act is legislation that must be met. The neighbourhood plan has engaged in strategic cross boundary matters and there is no evidence to show that cooperation has taken place at all, let alone has been active and ongoing.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>21. It might also be noted that in considering our client's site, the neighbourhood plan is also required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area); in this case the Charnwood Core Strategy 2016 and the Borough of Charnwood Local Plan 2004.</p> <p>22. The Site Assessment results are provided as part of the Neighbourhood Plan evidence base and involved the assessment of 13 sites, including part of our clients land interest identified within the assessment as 'Land at 50 Ashby Road' (AS421). We have not sought to review this assessment, primarily due to the location of the site within Charnwood Borough, and therefore the site is not located within the area contained within the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan. We reserve the right to comment further on the Site Assessment and methodology should it become necessary to do so.</p> <p>23. Policy M3: Green Infrastructure seeks to maintain and enhance the local Green Infrastructure network with two main priorities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The creation of a new footway, cycle and bridleway route between Markfield and Groby; and • Opportunities to mitigate traffic impacts arising along the A50/A511/M1 road corridors. <p>24. The policy refers to Map 3, which identifies all source of green infrastructure within the Plan boundary and some located adjacent to it. This includes a small section running north of Ashby Road at the frontage of our clients' site. Given the scale of Map 3 a reader is unable to assess whether the Green Infrastructure relates to the grass verge north of Ashby Road or the tree belt located within our clients land interest. However, there is no assessment of green infrastructure quality within the Neighbourhood Plan nor reference within Policy M3, or the supporting text, to the type of Green Infrastructure associated with each parcel. The identified Green Infrastructure located north of Ashby Road has limited connections to surrounding Green Infrastructure, as is visible on Map 3, and if associated with the tree belt is not publically accessible.</p> <p>25. The NPPF sets out a definition of Green Infrastructure: 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.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>26. It is unclear how small unconnected areas of 'Green Infrastructure' identified within the Neighbourhood Plan meet this definition.</p> <p>27. In addition, the Policy wording to 'maintain and enhance the local Green Infrastructure network' poses a number of issues as to how any parcel can be both maintained and enhanced. The policy should be amended to remove this requirement, which as currently drafted does not allow any development to comply.</p> <p>28. Policy M5: Trees seeks to support proposals that retain ancient trees or trees of arboricultural and amenity value. The policy must allow for the suitable mitigation of tree loss where a tree survey has identified trees or hedgerows of lower arboricultural and amenity value and removal is required for access to development.</p> <p>29. Map 7 identifies 'Features of Local Heritage Interest' with paragraph 4.77 listing evidence sources including the Self-guided Village Trail, Markfield Conservation Area Appraisal and the Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record. No extracts or supporting evidence have been published on the Neighbourhood Plan evidence page and so it is not possible to corroborate the basis for the large number of features of local heritage interest identified by Map 7.</p> <p>30. Policy M9: Non Designated Heritage Assets seeks to protect these assets and says that the determination of planning applications which would directly or indirectly affect non designated heritage assets ... will balance the need for the proposed development against the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset [emphasis added].</p> <p>31. Paragraph 185 NPPF outlines that plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. Matters to be taken into account by this strategy include: b) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring [emphasis added].</p>
--	--	---

		<p>32. Paragraph 197 NPPF says that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>33. Neither paragraph 185 or 197 NPPF seek a narrow balancing exercise limited to the ‘need’ for development, rather they seek to weigh matters relating to the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits in a balanced manner. Policy M9 is at odds with the NPPF and requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>34. Policy M10: Design only supports those developments that reflect the traditional character of Markfield unless they are development is of exceptional quality or innovative design [emphasis added].</p> <p>35. The NPPF sets out the Government’s ambitions for design, noting that clarity about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential and so too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process (paragraph 124). The NPPF goes on to say that plans should set out a clear design vision and give applicants as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. Design policies should reflect local aspirations and be grounded in an understanding and evaluation of each area’s defining characteristics [emphasis added]. It is entirely appropriate for neighbourhood plans to identify the special qualities of each area and explain how this should be reflected in development (paragraph 125).</p> <p>36. Paragraph 126 NPPF says the ambition should be the creation of distinctive places, with a consistent and high quality standard of design but the level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances in each place, and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified [emphasis added]. Paragraph 127 says that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:</p> <p>c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change</p>
--	--	--

		<p>[emphasis added].</p> <p>37. Policy M10 is myopic in its approach and overly restrictive, seeking only design of traditional character unless a proposal is innovative or exceptional. This is a stronger policy requirement than for development within a conservation area with large parts of Markfield outside of the statutory designated conservation area. Importantly, paragraph 126c notes that innovation or change should not be prevented or discouraged. As written policy M10 is at odds with the NPPF and requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>38. Policy M11: Community Services and Facilities Development says development must show regard for the retention of the community facilities in accordance with Policy DM25 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. Whilst it is not necessary for Neighbourhood Plans to duplicate policies set out in local plans Policy M11 seeks to identify a local list of facilities which are relevant to the implementation of Policy DM25. Whilst this, and the signposting of Policy M11, is appropriate the requirement for development to have 'regard to retention' is ambiguous and not entirely consistent with DM25 which introduces a sequence of matters that should be taken into account for retention and loss of facilities and services.</p> <p>39. As written Policy M11 is too prescriptive and seeks to introduce a test singularly pointed at retention. As a consequence, is it at odds with Policy DM25 and requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>40. Our client supports the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans which meet 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).</p> <p>41. The engagement in strategic policies in respect of housing requirements and site assessment (land in Charnwood Borough Council and Newtown Linford Parish) means that the neighbourhood plan has engaged in cross boundary matters and sought to influence matters at a scale beyond its area. Cooperation is required on strategic matters that cross administrative</p>
--	--	--

		<p>boundaries under the provisions of section 33 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2011. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to show that cooperation has taken place at all, let alone has been active and ongoing.</p> <p>42. Policy M3 identifies all source of green infrastructure within the Plan boundary and some located adjacent to it, including a small section running north of Ashby Road at the frontage of our clients' site. There is no assessment of green infrastructure quality within the Neighbourhood Plan nor reference to the type of Green Infrastructure associated with each parcel. The identified Green Infrastructure located north of Ashby Road has limited connections to surrounding Green Infrastructure, as identified on Map 3, and if associated with the tree belt is not publically accessible.</p> <p>43. It is unclear how the Green Infrastructure identified within the Neighbourhood Plan meets the definition set out in the NPPF. Additionally, the Policy wording to 'maintain and enhance the local Green Infrastructure network' poses a number of issues as to how any parcel can be both maintained and enhanced. The policy should be amended to remove this unclear and confused requirement which will not allow any development to comply.</p> <p>44. Policy M9 seeks a narrow balancing exercise limited to the 'need' for development, rather than seeking to weigh matters relating to the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits in a balanced manner. As a consequence, Policy M9 is at odds with paragraph 185 and 197 NPPF and requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>45. Policy M10 is overly restrictive and at odds with paragraph 126c NPPF which notes that innovation or change should not be prevented or discouraged. As a consequence, Policy M10 requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>46. Policy M11 is too prescriptive and seeks to introduce a test singularly pointed at retention of services and facilities. As a consequence, is it at odds with Policy DM25 and requires modification if it is to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>47. We consider that in order to pass examination and proceed to referendum and be made that</p>
--	--	---

		<p>the Neighbourhood Plan should re-draft a number of policies in line with considerations set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>48. In light of the above, this representation should be read as an objection to the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan at this time albeit we are hopeful that further work and amendments can be made in order to allow the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the basic conditions and proceed to referendum. In the absence of any amendments our client must, regrettably, maintain an objection and wishes to have that heard by the examiner with a view to preventing the Neighbourhood Plan from being made due to a failure to meet the basic conditions 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).</p>
88	Cerda Planning Limited on behalf of Glenalmond Developments	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support with modifications</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan. Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition. Please see supporting statement.</p> <p>[A supporting statement and appendices were also submitted].</p>
89	Avison Young on behalf of Jelson Homes	<p>Overall do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support with modifications</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan. Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition. Please see letter for details of comments.</p> <p>[A supporting Statement was also submitted, including:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representations on behalf of Jelson LTD to the Regulation 16 consultation on the pre-submission version of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan; • Letter to Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group; • Extent of Jelson’s land ownership; and • South of Markfield Development Framework].
90	Member of the Public 72	<p>I am supportive of the policies and I will leave this for the Examiner to consider the policies. I have made some notes and they are included in the table below.</p> <p>NP = Neighbourhood Plan CS = Core Strategy DPD = Development Plan Document</p> <p>Throughout the document: Please could you be clear whether you are talking about Markfield village, Markfield Parish or Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan throughout the document. I have not highlighted them all in the table.</p> <p>Para 1.2, Para 1.8, Paras 1.19 to 1.31: Would need updated to reflect the situation when the Neighbourhood Plan is ‘made’ by the Borough Council.</p> <p>Para 1.3 or 1.4: Needs to start by saying the parish including Markfield village. Like what you have done to explain about Copt Oak and Groby in para 1.5.</p> <p>Para 1.5: Perhaps refer to the service station and hotel off M1 junction? And also refer to “Billa-Barra” to the north of Stanton-under-Bardon?</p> <p>Para 1.6: First sentence. Please be consistent when using the wording “Markfield parish” – is it Markfield parish or Markfield Parish?</p> <p>Para 1.11: Needs to start by saying that Hinckley & Bosworth Council prepare development plan for the Borough. And then say “The relevant Development Plan for the Neighbourhood Plan Area is the Hinckley and ...”</p> <p>Para 1.13: Is it necessary to repeat CS policy here? If yes, the following comment apply to be consistent with the CS policy:- Third bullet point – missing “New green space and play provision will be provided where necessary” so need to add. Combine fourth and fifth bullet points as this is shown as one bullet point in the CS policy. Fifth bullet point – missing “Tourism Support”. Eleventh bullet point – I am aware CS policy incorrectly use “Alter”. I think this should be corrected to “Altar” in this NP.</p> <p>Paras 1.19 to 1.31: Are they needed for the final version of the NP?</p> <p>After Para 1.31: Make clear that “Note, when considering a development proposal within the Neighbourhood Plan Area, ALL the relevant policies of the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan will be</p>

		<p>applied</p> <p>Section 2. Markfield Parish: Is this section needed? Delete.</p> <p>Paras 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3: Please use “The Neighbourhood Plan...”.</p> <p>Para 3.3: Be clear what you mean by Markfield – are you referring to Markfield village or Markfield parish?</p> <p>Policy M1: Why refer to the DPD policies? When determine planning applications the planners will consider the relevant policies applied.</p> <p>Para 4.22: Delete “Options include routing around Groby Pool or to the south of the A50 via Little John and Martinshaw Wood” as this falls outside the Neighbourhood Plan Area and this is the matter for Groby Neighbourhood Plan if this is being prepared.</p> <p>Policy M3: Map 3 is missing.</p> <p>Para 4.23: Delete “However, there are some SSSIs nearby including Cliffe Hill Quarry, Bardon Hill, Bardon Hill Quarry and Ulverscroft Valley” as this is not relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan. Could say Cliffe Hill Quarry borders the Neighbourhood Plan Area for reference only.</p> <p>Map 4: Delete the SSSI sites outside the Neighbourhood Plan Area as it is not relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan. See above comments.</p> <p>Policy M4: Do not list out Local Wildlife Sites and Regionally Important Geological Sites as there could be additional new sites or existing sites no longer have the status since the NP is published.</p> <p>Policy M4: Not sure if no 4 should be included if we have policy M5?</p> <p>Paras 4.37 to 4.39: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M7.</p> <p>Policy M7: “Markfield Neighbourhood Area” should read “Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Area”.</p> <p>Paras 4.46 to 4.51: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M8.</p> <p>Policy M8: Replace the wording “building” to “dwelling”.</p> <p>Paras 4.55 to 4.61: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M9.</p> <p>I would delete paras 4.57 to 4.59.</p> <p>I would delete “It was here that non-conformist John Wesley came 19 times from 1742 and 1779 to preach, first in the church where he was a great friend of the Rector, Edward Ellis, and then as his congregation grew larger, on The Green itself” in para 4.61.</p> <p>Para 4.64: It should read “Listed Building”</p> <p>Paras 4.64 and 4.65: Are the paragraphs in the wrong place? As there is a section on Listed Buildings after.</p> <p>Para 4.67: Delete the bullet points. They are not needed.</p> <p>Para 4.68: Amend to say there are one Grade II* Listed Building and five Grade II Listed Buildings. Make clear that one Grade II* Listed Building and four out of five Grade II Listed Buildings are shown on Map 6. Or amend Map 6.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Para 4.69: Refer to the Conservation Area being within the village? Also there is no map to show Conservation Area?</p> <p>Para 4.70: Please use "Conservation Area".</p> <p>Paras 4.70 to 4.71: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M8.</p> <p>Map 7: It would be nice if the map include Markfield Conservation Area boundary. If agreed, re-word the title and refer to the map in para 4.69.</p> <p>Para 4.76: Reword "above places".</p> <p>Para 4.77 and Map 7: Make clear the features of local heritage interest are within Markfield village.</p> <p>Para 4.77 and Policy M9: If the policy is too long, the list would be included in an appendix. If agreed, move paras 4.78 to 4.80 to the appendix.</p> <p>Map 7 and Policy M9: Does "U. Townhead Farm, Ashby Road" fall within the Neighbourhood Plan Area? It doesn't look like it does so sadly this need to be deleted. This is the matter for Newtown Linford Neighbourhood Plan if this is being prepared.</p> <p>Para 4.84 to 4.93: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M10.</p> <p>Policy M10: Make clear "Markfield village".</p> <p>Para 5.1: Make clear "Markfield village".</p> <p>Paras 5.3 to 4.8: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M12.</p> <p>Paras 5.3 to 5.5: do not relate to Policy M12 so delete them.</p> <p>Paras 5.9 to 5.10, 5.16 to 5.18: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M13.</p> <p>Paras 5.19 to 5.35: Are they needed? There is no policy for them?</p> <p>Paras 5.27 to 5.34: If we are keeping the paragraphs, make clear where they all are i.e. Copt Oak Memorial Hall is not within Markfield village etc.</p> <p>Paras 6.1 to 6.9: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M15.</p> <p>Policy M15: Why refer to the DPD policies? When determine planning applications the planners will consider the relevant policies applied.</p> <p>Policy M16: Reword to say "up to 280 dwelling" in case some future houses planned/built elsewhere not currently taken account of.</p> <p>Paras 6.10 to 6.18: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M16. Delete para 6.17 as the latest situation will change etc.</p> <p>Para 6.19: Reword whole paragraph. Also need to explain what is windfall housing development.</p> <p>Para 6.20: Use full name for "NPPF".</p> <p>Paras 6.25 to 6.31: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M19. Delete para 6.30 as this may change etc.</p> <p>Paras 6.32 to 6.34: Are they needed? There is no policy for them?</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Paras 6.42 to 6.43: Are they needed? There is no policy for them?</p> <p>Paras 7.1 to 7.11: Too wordy. Are they needed? Keep it simple and relevant to Policy M21.</p> <p>Para 7.3: Make clear its “Markfield Parish”.</p> <p>Paras 7.13 and Policy M22: I would suggest the brownfield land can be suitable for “business development and housing”. Reconsider Policy M22.</p> <p>Map 12: Reword title i.e. “employment” to “Markfield Industrial Estate”.</p> <p>Paras 7.18 to 7.29: Are they needed? There is no policy for them?</p> <p>Section 8 Traffic and Transport: Is this needed? There is no policy for them?</p> <p>Policies Map (Parish): Reword title i.e. “Policies Map (Parish)” to “Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map”.</p> <p>Policies Map (Parish): Remove anything outside the Neighbourhood Plan for example the green sites within Charnwood Borough Council area, Groby parish and Stanton-under-Bardon parish</p> <p>Policies Map (Village): Reword title i.e. “Policies Map (Village)” to “Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map – Markfield Village”.</p>
91	CC Town Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey	<p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>Consultation on the Markfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan (Submission Draft)</p> <p>Representations on behalf of Taylor Wimpey (UK) Limited</p> <p>Land at Ratby Lane, Markfield</p> <p>We act on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Limited (‘the client’). The following is submitted in response to the submission draft of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan (‘NDP’) which has been published by the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Group, on behalf of Markfield Parish Council. The NDP has been published for the purposes of public consultation under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>For clarity, our client has an interest (under option) in land at Ratby Lane, Markfield. The site, as detailed within the Development Framework Plan attached at Appendix A, is comprised of approximately 31 hectares of agricultural land and woodland located to the east of Ratby Lane and to the south of Jacqueline Road and the A50.</p> <p>The site is comprised of two parcels, the northern parcel (Phase 1 – 5.22 ha gross -proposed</p>

		<p>developable area of approx. 4.24 ha) is accessed off Ratby Lane and adjoins Jacqueline Road to the north. This land falls outside the NDP area as defined within Map 1 of the NDP and was the subject of a refused planning application for upto 140 dwellings in 2016 (ref: 15/00889/OUT). The subsequent appeal was dismissed due to prematurity and landscape impact. The landscape issue has since been overcome. The site has the potential to provide upto 180 dwellings. Further details relating to Phase 1 (as submitted as part of the recent 'call for site' consultation) are attached at Appendix B.</p> <p>The southern parcel (Phase 2 – proposed developable area of 7.04 hectares) is accessed further to the south along Ratby Lane and falls wholly within the NDP area. The site has the potential to deliver up to 225 dwellings.</p> <p>Phase 2 was assessed as part of the NDP process and excluded from the plan. Phase 1 was not considered given its exclusion from the NDP area.</p> <p>Both parcels fall within the ownership of a single landowner.</p> <p>As well as delivering a mix of private and affordable homes to meet the Borough's housing requirement in a sustainable location, the proposed development would provide play areas, allotments and a significant increase in the amount of open space accessible to the public including access to a currently private woodland.</p> <p>It is not the intention of this submission to provide an exhaustive appraisal of the entire NDP, but it is focused on those salient elements of the emerging plan which will influence the future development of our client's site.</p> <p><u>Commentary</u></p> <p>At the outset, our client commends the significant work which the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Group and their partners have undertaken to produce and publish the Submission Draft of the NDP.</p> <p>The document's vision and corresponding detailed objectives are welcomed, it is considered that</p>
--	--	--

		<p>they provide sufficient guiding principles for the longer term social, economic and environmental development of the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>The objective of ensuring that there is sufficient housing to meet the requirements of all residents is welcomed, as is the objective of ensuring that matters such as design, energy efficiency and climate change are prioritised.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan Area</p> <p>As a starting point, the NDP area, as detailed within Map 1 of the submission draft is considered to be fundamentally flawed. Whilst our client accepts that the Neighbourhood Area was established in 2017, it seems illogical to exclude the Field Head and Jaqueline Road areas which clearly form part of the urban area of Markfield. Whilst it is accepted that such an approach would have required co-operation with Groby Parish Council, as the aforementioned areas fall within their parish and designated NDP area, such an approach would have been of greater benefit to achieving the aims and objectives for Markfield.</p> <p>These areas, which include land within our client's control (the northern parcel which is excluded from the NDP area) form a clear continuation of the built form of the settlement, before the transition into open countryside. They cannot reasonably be considered to form part of another settlement. Therefore, whilst the NDP cannot impose formal policy relating to development in those areas, commentary which acknowledges the locationally specific anomaly which exists and provides guiding principles could be included within the emerging NDP.</p> <p>When considered spatially, basing the NDP area on the traditional Parish Boundary is therefore seen as flawed and fails to recognise how Markfield has expanded over time beyond the traditional Parish Boundary. It is a shame that these areas, which are clearly part of the village and whose residents are part of the community and contribute to village life, are therefore excluded from the plan and will be unable to take part in any future referendum for a document which will influence their everyday lives.</p> <p>If the document is to be progressed in its current form, and accepting that Phase 1 of our clients site lies outside of the designated plan area, it is considered that reference should be made to its</p>
--	--	--

		<p>relationship to the existing settlement and the key role that it will play in the future development of the settlement.</p> <p>There is no requirement under the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations to base NDP areas on village or parish boundaries. As a consequence, it is considered that the NDP cannot be considered to be a plan for Markfield.</p> <p>Conformity with the Local Plan and NPPF</p> <p>To be found sound, the NDP should have regard to the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance and the Development Plan for the area.</p> <p>The current Development Plan is comprised of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan, which covers the period 2006-2026. This plan is now largely out of date as acknowledged by the LPA in considering recent planning applications such as Land East of Roseway, Stoke Golding (20/00779/OUT), Land South of Markfield Road, Raby (20/00462/FUL), Kirkby Road, Desford (20/00984/OUT) and Land off London Road, Markfield (20/01283/FUL) which were considered within the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Further, the adopted Local Plan is based on housing requirements which are now out of date.</p> <p>The Local Plan is currently being updated and it is accepted that its progress has been delayed by the Covid-19 Pandemic and other factors. The emerging Local Plan will cover the plan period from 2020 to 2039 and is expected to be published for consultation (Regulation 19) in the coming months and adopted in 2022.</p> <p>Having regard to the timeline of the emerging local plan and whilst this will be frustrating for the NDP Group, it is simply illogical to bring forward a NDP to align with a Local Plan that has not yet been published, especially when its publication is imminent. Given that the Local Plan is expected to be adopted in 2022, it would be perverse to adopt an NDP for Markfield in 2021. The fact is that the NDP will become out of date almost as soon as it is adopted, this is acknowledged within the NDP at paragraph 1.17. Quite simply how can the NDP align with and be in general conformity with the new Local Plan (as envisaged within paragraph 1.17) and as required by the NPPF and to meet the basic conditions set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, until the content of</p>
--	--	---

		<p>that plan has been made publicly available?</p> <p>It would be much more prudent (and indeed essential for the NDP to be found sound) to delay the NDP until the draft version of the Local Plan has been published for public consultation later this year. Having regard to informal discussions held between our client and the LPA, it is considered that there is a more than reasonable chance that the land at Ratby Lane will be allocated within the emerging local plan and which will also provide a more accurate housing requirement within which the NDP can work towards.</p> <p>Housing Requirement</p> <p>Having regard to the above, it is difficult to understand how the NDP can provide a housing requirement for the NDP area until such a figure has been provided within the emerging local plan. Paragraph 31 of the NPPF sets out that all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. Paragraph 20 sets out that the amount of housing requires in an area is a strategic matter. Paragraph 29 of the NPPF sets out that Neighbourhood Plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies.</p> <p>As set out in paragraph 6.5, the NDP housing requirement has been calculated based on the percentage of the total Borough Council population that reside within the parish. Calculating the housing requirement based on such a crude approach does not take into consideration matters such as sustainability and the hierarchy of settlements or the spatial development strategy within the plan area. Further, whilst using the Standard Housing Methodology requirement for the Borough (around 452 homes per year) as a starting point to arrive at an NDP housing figure is noted, this figure is likely to significantly increase within the Emerging Local Plan to take account of significant levels of unmet need for the City of Leicester. As such without a firm evidence base to support the NDP's housing requirement we fail to see how the plan could be considered to be sound in this regard.</p> <p>In summary, given that the NDP is required to conform to the emerging Local Plan and cover the plan period for 2020 to 2039, it is considered that bringing forward the NDP in advance of</p>
--	--	---

		<p>understanding the overall spatial strategy and role of Markfield in delivering the housing needs of the area over this plan period, represents a significant and fundamental shortcoming of the NDP. The NDP and in particular its housing requirement, is simply not supported by any form of robust evidence base and it is difficult to understand how this shortcoming could be overcome until the Emerging Local Plan is progressed to the Regulation 19 stage as a minimum, particularly given the requirement for the NDP to align with that plan.</p> <p>As set out we fully expect the LPA to allocate significant housing requirements within Markfield, having regards to the New Directions for Growth Consultation Paper (2019) which determined Markfield to be within such an area for growth, reinforcing its current role in the existing Local Plan as a Key Rural Centre.</p> <p>Whilst our client does not object to the allocation of Land South of London Road, reflecting the current planning application submitted by Jelson Homes, it is considered that the plan does little for the Government's objective of "significantly boosting the supply of homes" as set out at paragraph 59 of the NPPF. By allocating a single site within the NDP to meet the minimum requirement established through the plan, highlights that the plan has not been positively prepared. Further relying upon a single site within the NDP exposes the plan in the event of delays in delivery, viability etc. A prudent and proactive approach to the NDP plan would be to allocate our clients land as an additional or reserve site. This would also potentially avoid the need for a review of the NDP as soon as the Local Plan is adopted, particularly given our concerns that the NDP's housing requirement for Markfield is highly likely to have underestimated growth within Markfield.</p> <p>Finally, and of significance, given that the NDP is seeking to establish housing requirements and delivery a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required.</p> <p>Other Matters</p> <p>With regards to the site assessment process we would question the methodology that has been used in making the assessments of considered sites. The criteria fails to adopt a balanced approach to site assessment as required under the NPPF and in particular under the Presumption</p>
--	--	--

		<p>in Favour of Sustainable Development. Furthermore, we understand that the site assessment process has been carried out without any dialogue or engagement with landowners and developers as required by the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Policy M10 relates to the design of new development within Markfield. The policy sets out that “only development that reflects the traditional character of Markfield will be supported unless the development is of exceptional quality or innovative design”. At the outset we consider that this policy is particularly onerous and inconsistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Whilst it is appropriate for the NDP to set out a clear design vision for the area, paragraphs 126 and 127 of the NPPF seek to provide a degree of variety within development and ensure that development is sympathetic to local character whilst not preventing or discouraging innovation or change. The approach taken in Policy M10 is contrary to the NPPF and fails to recognise that high quality design does not have to be based on a traditional design approach. The policy requires modification to meet the basic conditions test.</p> <p>Having regard to paragraph 6.6, the NDP includes an allowance for windfall sites of approximately 2 dwellings a year. This is based on an ‘estimate’ rather than an evidence based approach which does not meet the basic conditions test for a Neighbourhood Plan. It is also not clear whether this windfall allowance should apply throughout the plan period.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.8 of the NDP notes that 112 of the 280 dwellings to be allocated in the NDP would be affordable homes as identified within the 2018 Housing Needs Survey. It is important to note that the Housing Needs Survey represents the needs of the existing village residents only and not the Borough Wide requirement which will need to be met, a proportion of which is likely to be required to be provided in Markfield as a sustainable location and its role as a key rural centre. Such surveys only represent need for a short period of time and usually have a lifespan of 5 years.</p> <p>With regards to housing mix, looking at Policy M18 it is considered that reference to the need for smaller family homes should be removed from the policy. Such a statement is unnecessary and contradicts the first part of the policy that determines that mix should be based on the most up to date evidence on housing need. Whilst it may be the case that there is a current need for smaller</p>
--	--	---

		<p>family homes at the present time, this may change over the plan period and the requirement should be based on the most up to date evidence at the time that a planning application is determined.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In conclusion, whilst the efforts of the NDP Group are to be commended and the reasons for bringing forward an NDP for Markfield at the earliest opportunity are understood, the submission version is considered to be flawed in its exclusion of the Field Head and Jacqueline Road area from the NDP and the lack of evidence to support the proposed housing requirement within the NDP in advance of the publication of the emerging local plan, its spatial strategy and housing requirement.</p> <p>Further, the plans reliance on a single housing site to meet the minimum amount of need as identified within the NDP is an extremely risky strategy and highlights that the plan has not been positively prepared. Allocating additional and/or reserve sites would be a more prudent option and potentially avoid the need for an early review of the NDP.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is our principal concern that the level of housing proposed for Markfield within the NDP has significantly (and without firm evidence) underestimated the likely housing requirement for the village without any understanding or consideration of wider strategic and spatial planning matters. In our view this is a clear and deliberate ploy to 'push through the plan' in advance of the Emerging Local Plan which the NDP should be fully aligned with. As the NDP is seeking to establish housing requirements and delivery, a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required and has not been carried out.</p> <p>As such it is considered that the NDP should be delayed pending the submission of draft local plan, this would also allow for discussions to be progressed with Groby PC in regards to the plan area and provisions for our clients site within each respective NDP document, as well as providing the evidence base for the NDP to work within. Without this it is either the case that the NDP will not be found sound, or it will become out of date shortly after being adopted rendering all efforts null and void. Given the above, we fail to see how the NDP can be considered to be in general</p>
--	--	---

		<p>conformity with the Development Plan and wish to object to the NDP in its current form on that basis.</p> <p>If you require clarification on any of those points that have been raised above or require any further information in respects of our client's site, then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>[Personal details removed].</p> <p>[Three appendices were also submitted, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix A – Development Framework Plan Option 4 • Appendix B – New Directions for Growth Submission Form • Appendix C – New Directions for Growth Submission Form 2].
92	Member of the Public 73	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Support</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>
93	Member of the Public 74	<p>Overall, do you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan? Does not specify.</p> <p>Please indicate whether you wish to be informed of any decision by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to either make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, or refuse to make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan? Yes, please inform me of the decision.</p> <p>Please give reasons for support/opposition: Does not specify.</p>

94	Member of the Public 75	<p>We would like to know whether you support the plan, would support the plan with some modifications, or oppose the plan. Overall I: Support the plan with modifications</p> <p>Would you like to be informed of any decisions we make (either make/adopt the neighbourhood plan or refuse to make/adopt the neighbourhood plan)?: Yes</p> <p>Please select which policy or policies you would like to comment on: M1: Countryside, M2: Landscape character, M3: Green infrastructure, M4: Ecology and biodiversity, M5: Trees, M6: Local green spaces, M7: Renewable energy, M10: Design, M11: Community services and facilities, M14: Infrastructure, M15: Housing provision, M16: Housing allocation land south of London Road, M17: Windfall housing development, M18: Housing mix, M20: Affordable housing, M23: Business conversion of rural buildings</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M1: countryside?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: The existing settlement boundary with the modification to the south of the village provides ample space for development and growth meeting all the quotas, as well as avoiding encroaching on existing green spaces and wildlife habitat. The available settlement boundary to the south of the village provide low lying and low impact development opportunity which is close to all amenities as well as having good access. It also has a low impact on views from Hill Hole nature reserve of the Charnwood Forest and the surrounding country side.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M2: landscape character?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Any development should have a high green space to developed land ratio ensuring existing hedges, trees and grassland is retained for existing and future wildlife. It should be low impact and should not stand out in relation to the surrounding area. Low lying development with restrictions on building heights minimises this.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M3: green infrastructure?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: No existing green infrastructure should be lost and any development should add to the existing green infrastructure which is being rapidly eroded.</p>
----	-------------------------	---

		<p>Do you support or oppose policy M4: ecology and biodiversity?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Development around these areas of biodiversity and ecology should be opposed to prevent existing corridors for wildlife from being obstructed and all areas of grassland, hedgerows trees, watercourses etc should be protected.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M5: trees?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: There are a number of mature trees around the area. All of these should be protected from development and not obstructed by any development. Also due to Markfield's high location these a number of can be seen from across Leicestershire so add to the landscape of Leicestershire as well as the local area.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M6: local green spaces?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: The number of existing green spaces should be added to by ensuring any development has a high green space to developed ratio.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M7: renewable energy?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Any new developments should provide facilities for charging of vehicles using renewable energy and should also where possible contribute to the generation of local energy.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M10: design?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Any new development should ne done so that they do not create a block of generic buildings with out and individual features and should provide and good mix of building designs and finishes with out any buildings that standout against any neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M11: community services and facilities?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Any new developments should financially contribute significantly to local services and facilities to offset their impact on the surrounding area, such as increasing capacities of local schools, doctors surgeries, community facilities, allotments etc.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M14: infrastructure?: Support</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Please provide your reason for this view: Any new developments should financially contribute significantly to the infrastructure listed.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M15: housing provision?: Support Please provide your reason for this view:: Housing provision should not exceed the required amount for the area to avoid over development of the area so it maintains its character and prevents it turning into another urban sprawl. Windfall housing should also be kept to a minimum.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M16: housing allocation - land south of London Road: Support Please provide your reason for this view: The chosen development site meets the majority of the housing required and is by far the best choice. It covers an area large enough to include ample green infrastructure. It has very good access onto local and main routes. It is close to local schools, shops and other local amenities. The planning proposal that was submitted is by a well known quality house builder who have the financial backing to contribute significant amounts to local facilities. There is a commitment to plant large blocks of woodland. As well as this it allows them to keep a high ratio in favour of green spaces versus housing along with the provision of allotments which are in high demand locally. The site has multiple foot paths crossing it. As a national house builder they also fall under more constraints than smaller developers, so any development can be controlled more tightly in favour of the village. In addition to the above the development site is in a valley which slopes towards the M1 so has a low visual impact on the area.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M17: windfall housing development?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Windfall housing should be kept to a minimum and any development should be to a high standard and in keeping with the adjacent area.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M18: housing mix?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: The housing mix should avoid the over population of affordable housing to the detriment of the surrounding area and should be a good mix of housing for all needs.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Do you support or oppose policy M20: affordable housing?: Oppose Please provide your reason for this view: I think the % of affordable housing is too high and a more balanced distribution of housing should be maintained as it already is in the area.</p> <p>Do you support or oppose policy M23: business conversion of rural buildings?: Support Please provide your reason for this view: Where possible rural building should be re-lived for other repurposed such as new businesses etc to avoid the need to build new buildings taking up valuable green spaces.</p>
95	HBBC	<p>[Written response submitted, see separate document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Consultation Response to the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan submission]
96	Environment Agency	<p>The Environment Agency has now completed its review of the Markfield Neighbourhood Plan Submission. We have reviewed the Plan Area and submitted documentation with regards to those environmental constraints for which we have a remit. Following this review we can confirm we have no formal comments to make on the submission.</p>