

# Barlestone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

Dear Mr Ashcroft

Please find below our responses to the points you raised in your Examiner’s Clarification Note.

## Points of Clarification for the Parish Council

Policy H1 – we would welcome recommendations for modification of the policy and supporting text to ensure we correctly reflect the emerging overall housing need in the parish.

Policy H2 – as the Parish Council has no role in delivery of any of the developments we cannot give assurances however we are confident that the sites identified will be developed within the plan timescale. Our confidence in each site is supported as follows:

* Site 1 (Bagworth Road); when we published our pre-submission documentation prior to the Regulation 14 consultation we were very quickly approached by Ross Jackson of Clarendon Land & Development wishing to discuss development opportunities with the Parish Council. We did not feel that it was appropriate at that time however it demonstrates that there are developers keen to develop that site.
* Site 2 (Rear of 11-19 Newbold Road); although we have no specific evidence, this is one of the few areas of infill opportunity close to the village centre and would therefore anticipate a developer to be keen to develop within the plan timescales. As the site is only identified as being for 6 residential dwellings and the plan allows for 57 versus a target of 48 for the parish we would however not be unduly concerned should this not be developed quickly.
* Site 3 (Newbold Road); this site has already been cleared and drainage works are currently ongoing.

Policy H3 – we do mention that existing planning permissions are included in the methodology but would be willing to clarify by referring back to “What is the Barlestone Housing Need” section on page 16 if that would suffice. We would welcome any alternative you may suggest to make this more explicit. The reason for the settlement boundary included in the plan being different to the current settlement boundary included in H&BBC’s planning documentation is that we have extended it to encompass the sites we have allocated where they were not previously included plus the two sites allocated in the Site Allocations DPD so that all sites counted within our housing numbers are within the settlement boundary. Our settlement boundary map is also aligned to our Parish boundary as per our designated area which excludes the land south of 132 Newbold Road (apart from the access to it which is within our Parish boundary) and the land south of 182 Newbold Road as they are in Newbold Verdon Parish. It also excludes Curtis Way to the West of Barlestone which is in the H&BBC Settlement Boundary because that is in Osbaston Parish. The inclusion of the small patch of grass north of Littlemill Close is just a mapping error I believe as there was no deliberate intention to include it. If our understanding of aligning the settlement boundary to our designated area is incorrect then we would be happy to revert to the H&BBC version in these instances while retaining the inclusion of the sites we have allocated where they were not previously included plus the two sites allocated in the Site Allocations DPD.

Policy H4 – Policy H3 supports limited development outside of the settlement boundary where that development is carefully controlled, Policy H4 is specifically related to windfall sites where a previously developed piece of land becomes unexpected available. What we are trying to achieve is keeping any such opportunities within the settlement boundary so that, for example, an outlying property is not deliberately allowed to decay to the stage where it can be sold for a new larger scale development. If you wish to suggest alternative wording to make this clearer we would welcome that.

Policy H6 – this Policy adds the reference to the Parish Housing Needs Survey Report 2016 which we would wish to retain as we do not believe that the emerging H&BBC Local Plan will include this reference. The other points are to put this into context for the reader to understand the full proposals for affordable housing in the parish. When we determined housing numbers for any site we used a standard measure of land required per house; we would be willing to remove the reference to site area and make this purely a percentage of the number of dwellings if this would clarify this bullet point.

Policy ENV1 – I confess that I am not an expert in land measurement however using the scale included in Appendix 7, Local Green Space 1001 is approximately 40,000 square metres, Local Green Space 1015 is approximately 21,600 square metres, Local Green Space 2001 is approximately 16,500 square metres.

Policy ENV4 – given that ENV1 aims to protect the Local Green Spaces we could remove those also mentioned in ENV4 from ENV4 as they are protected by ENV1. Please let us know if that would make this clearer.

Policy ENV5 – yes, we intend that the various buildings will be non-designated heritage assets. We have already lost at least one of the buildings on our original list due to re-development (this has been removed from the plan since then as there is no discernible remnants of it) and wish to give as much protection to the others as practicably possible. We have added our reasoning for retaining some buildings where these do not align to the revised draft H&BBC heritage assets list we were provided with.

Policies ENV6 and ENV7 – we thank you for your comments.

Policies CFA1/3/4 – we thank you for your comments.

Policy BE3 – we agree with your proposal.

## Representations

Response 11 – Leicestershire County Council; as you know, their site is outside of our designated area and therefore we could not include it within our plan. We did attempt on a number of occasions to persuade Osbaston Parish Council to let us include that area of their parish adjacent to ours so that the area of land we are concerned with here (and others) could be considered but they told us in no uncertain terms that they did not want any of their parish to be included within our designated plan area. I am somewhat confused by the insistence that we allow for 200 houses instead of 57 because the plan clearly explains how it does comply with the emerging H&BBC Local Plan numbers, a point which we checked thoroughly with H&BBC.

Response 13 states that it is regarding Gladman so I believe this is actually response 14 ? I have responded to the Gladman representation regardless of the number. The various points raised regarding the inclusion of the two DPD Site Allocations and the housing requirement were thoroughly checked with H&BBC. It is not surprising that Gladman believe their site is “better” than the ones we have chosen but the fact is that their planning applications and subsequent appeals were rejected and this appears to be another attempt to put their development proposals back on the table by discrediting the plan.

Response 14 states Land Allocation Limited so I believe this is actually response 15 ? I have responded to the Land Allocation Limited representation regardless of the number. The issue of the housing need arises again so I re-iterate that the numbers and methodology were thoroughly checked with H&BBC along with exactly which previous permissions could be counted. Again, it is not surprising that Land Allocation Limited believe their site is “better” than the ones we have chosen. Regarding the various points about flexibility and future proofing, the Parish Council have made a commitment within the plan to review it to keep it as a current document in line with any future changes to the Local Plan, etc.

Response 15 states Maruti Developments so I believe this is actually response 16 ? I have responded to the Maruti Development representation regardless of the number. Yet again, there is much discussion about the housing numbers so I re-iterate again that the numbers and methodology were thoroughly checked with H&BBC. Again, it is not surprising that Maruti Developments believe their site is “better” than the ones we have chosen.

Response 18 states Lagan Homes so I believe this is actually response 19 ? I have responded to the Lagan Homes representation regardless of the number. Again, it is not surprising that Lagan Homes believe their site is “better” than the ones we have chosen and that more land should be made available for development. No site received more or less scrutiny than any other, a robust and recognised methodology was used across all sites.

We have been working closely with H&BBC regarding the plan and have already made some significant changes in line with their comments between the Pre-Submission version and the Submission version as their new representation acknowledges. We will of course take heed of the comments raised by them and will attempt, where we see it contributes to the plan, to address their perceived issues.

Kind regards,

Cathie Watkins

Steering Group Chair

Barlestone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

12th December 2021