

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
David Causon	Retired	56 Bosworth Road, Barlestone, CV130HU; 0145529019 4; david@thebagger.plus.com	This document is very refreshing taking into account the number of applications that are being banded around at the moment. We all realise we need housing but they do not account for the infrastructure needed to compensate for the amount of houses being planned. This document does just that being put together by local people who understand the village's needs. I am totally in agreement with this plan and I would like to thank everyone who contributed.	Thank you for this comment.	None
Derek Crane	Retired; Chairman Parish Council	18 Church Road, Nailstone, CV13 0QH; 0795756646 4; derek.crane@virgin.net	Policy H2, Page 17, Site 1; this site is not suitable for development as access on bend is dangerous and visibility poor. Road access to village is very restricted with parked cars on Main Street and sharp bends to Bagworth, 2 sharp bends. Site already has 2 refusals for planning in past. Building should be off good access roads, Newbold or Barton Road.	It is acknowledged in the assessment of the site that improvements will be needed to the site access. The site has previously been refused planning permission but this was at a time that the site was outside of the settlement boundary and therefore considered against the policies relating to development in the countryside. The site is now within the settlement boundary for Barlestone. In the SHLAA, HBBC classed the site as 'developable'.	None
Derek Crane	Retired; Chairman Parish Council	18 Church Road, Nailstone, CV13 0QH; 0795756646 4; derek.crane@virgin.net	Policy H6, Design Standards; heritage assets list properties B17 and others. Entrance to Croftersvale - a property in heart of village heritage sites must be used and built in character of position. The building knocked down was a large Georgian house and should be replaced with similar building.	Noted. The policy is intended to apply to all development activity across the Parish.	None
Derek Crane	Retired; Chairman Parish Council	18 Church Road, Nailstone, CV13 0QH;	No allocation made for small industrial units - is there a need ? A lot of history and present information, not a lot of vision for the future only "keep it as it is today". We have to move forward.	We disagree. The vision on page 14 indicates the sort of place we want Barlestone to be over the Plan period, and the policies seek to help to achieve this vision. No commercial	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		0795756646 4; derek.crane @virgin.net		allocations are made however there are policies supported economic development in specified circumstances - see policies BE1, BE2 and BE4 in particular	
Ross Jackson	Land Director; Clarendon Land & Development	4 Clarendon Street, Nottingham, NG1 5HQ; 01158562085; info@clarendonland.co.uk	On behalf of Clarendon Land & Development Limited, we write in support of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted	None
Ross Jackson	Land Director; Clarendon Land & Development	4 Clarendon Street, Nottingham, NG1 5HQ; 01158562085; info@clarendonland.co.uk	Whilst the NDP 'talks to the' the current housing requirement, it is important to recognise that the new Local Plan is currently being prepared by Hinckley & Bosworth and that the housing requirement is expected to increase.	Noted. If the housing target changes following the NP being made, there will be consideration of a review of the NP to reflect the changed circumstances. Proposed housing targets from the Local Plan currently being prepared will be reflected in the NP document to be submitted to H&BBC	Proposed housing targets from the Local Plan currently being prepared will be reflected in the NP document to be submitted to H&BBC
Matthew Mortonson	AAH Planning Consultants	2 Bar Lane, York, YO1 6JU; 01904629258; matthew.mortonson@aa	Policy H1, Housing Provision to Meet Identified Need; We have concerns with the overall housing provisions identified within draft Policy H1. It is considered to be overly restrictive given that it is a key government objective to 'significantly boost' housing supply. Furthermore, it is clear that over the Neighbourhood Plan period, the housing requirements for the District will	Noted. The NP allocates a 20% buffer in housing to provide flexibility in the event that housing need increases in the Plan period.  Although the nominal Plan period was up to 2036 this has now been revised to 2039 in line with the revised Local Plan being worked on, it	None (plan date revised to 2039)

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		hplanning.com	change and vary. It is therefore felt that the policy should be more flexible to accommodate this change in need across the plan period so that additional sites can come forward should it be required, and without having to undertake a formal review of the Plan.	is inevitable that the Local Plan will be reviewed within this period and consideration will be given to reviewing the NP at the same time to ensure it remains in general conformity. Consideration will be given at that time to increasing housing provision is an evidenced need is provided.	
Matthew Mortonson	AAH Planning Consultants	2 Bar Lane, York, YO1 6JU; 01904629258; matthew.mortonson@aa hplanning.com	<p>Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations; Our client's site measures circa 2.36 hectares in area of agricultural land on the north eastern edge of the village of Barlestone. The site is situated on land to the east and south of Bagworth Road. It is envisaged that the site would provide approximately 60 dwellings together with appropriate landscaping, and Public Open Space.</p> <p>However, whilst we consider Site 2 to be a reasonable and sensible option for new housing, we do have strong concerns surrounding the other proposed allocations.</p> <p>Site 1 - It is our strong belief that our clients site is a preferable option to this site as it is located in broadly the same location but would be better related to the existing built form and be less obtrusive and cause less harm to the open countryside.</p> <p>Site 3 - Residents of this site would be required to walk a significant distance to the village services, which may increase the use of cars and increase pressure upon car parking which is already an issue in the village. As such, this makes the allocation a less favourable location than those closer to the village centre, such as my clients land off Bagworth Road.</p>	<p>Noted. The site was assessed but did not feature in the list of preferred sites for an allocation in the NP. The assessment process was comprehensive and independently led.</p> <p>This response is one of a number from site sponsors claiming that their specific site is preferable. It is not the role of the examiner to reassess sites, merely to determine that the chosen sites are developable.</p>	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Matthew Mortonson	AAH Planning Consultants	2 Bar Lane, York, YO1 6JU; 01904629258; matthew.mortonson@aa hplanning.com	<p>Policy H3, Settlement Boundary; the policy supports development within the proposed settlement boundary of Barlestone. This boundary is proposed to update and supersedes the existing settlement boundary used by HBBC in the adopted Local Plan, using the allocations in Policy H2. It is thought that the inclusion of a restrictive boundary would limit development for the plan period, having a negative impact on the socioeconomic context of the village and exacerbating a continual failure by the Borough Council to meet its housing needs. It is clear that the Borough Council understand the implications of imposing such a restrictive boundary, hence why the emerging plan is considering the removal of the settlement boundaries entirely.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is however noticeable that the proposed Settlement Boundary does not accord with that adopted as part of the existing development plan.</p>	Noted. However, the NP has the ability to update the settlement boundary and has chosen to do so. HBBC 'considering' the removal of the boundary is not the same as removing it ... and with the NP exceeding its minimum housing target it cannot be criticised for being restrictive.	None
Matthew Mortonson	AAH Planning Consultants	2 Bar Lane, York, YO1 6JU; 01904629258; matthew.mortonson@aa hplanning.com	<p>Policy H5, Affordable Housing; the policy sets out that affordable housing will consist of 40% of the site area for all development sites of 4 dwellings or more. This policy reflects the HBBC Core Strategy requires 40% Affordable Housing on sites of four dwellings or more in rural areas such as Barlestone. However, at Paragraph 63. the NPPF is clear is stating that "<i>Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer).</i>"</p>	We disagree. It is important that the NP is in general conformity with the Local Plan... The NP achieves this.	None
Matthew Mortonson	AAH Planning Consultants	2 Bar Lane, York, YO1 6JU;	ENV3, Protection of Sites of Natural Environmental Significance; It is noted that part of our clients' land is identified as a site of biodiversity significance in the	Noted. The identification of sites of environmental significance should be taken into account in the planning process to	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		01904629258; matthew.mortonson@aa hplanning.com	Neighbourhood Plan. However, looking at the evidence behind this environmental designation at Appendix 6, the site is described as being as a 'flat paddock with pond & ducks'. The site only scores 7 points out of possible 25, with 4 of these due to its proximity to the local community. It is our position that there is insufficient justification for this site to be classed as a 'site of biodiversity significance' simply because it accommodates a pond and some ducks.	make sure that development takes these features into account, and that the benefit of development outweighs the harm. It does not, and is not intended to, prevent any development, just that it takes the identified features into account.	
Matthew Mortonson	AAH Planning Consultants	2 Bar Lane, York, YO1 6JU; 01904629258; matthew.mortonson@aa hplanning.com	As presently drafted, we do not believe that the plan meets the Basic Conditions. The plan is in conflict with National Policy in terms of affordable housing provision and it is not considered to be flexible enough to meet the unequivocal need to boost the supply of housing over the plan period.	These objections are strongly refuted and do not recognise the need for proportionality in neighbourhood planning. The details of the concerns are dealt with above.	None
Roger Denton		4 Church Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EE; 01455291272; rogerdenton.denton@gmail.com	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations; Site 1 - I refer to the suggested building site north of Bagworth Road for about 40 dwellings. I would like to know what "subject to improved access to local facilities and amenities" means in terms of alterations. No new building should be permitted on or off Main Street or Bagworth Road until the chaotic and dangerous existing traffic situation is resolved. They are through roads and cannot take safely or acceptably existing traffic levels, let alone increased traffic from new housing. This would be the only route into the village for this development. Main Street is a particular problem as it is a narrow road with vehicles parked on one side leaving one narrow lane for the two way traffic. The situation is worsened because you cannot see from one end to the other so that traffic meets head-on. Unless a new route	Concerns noted. The specific reference is to the creation of footpaths to local facilities and amenities and to the creation of a safe entryway to the site. No development will be able to take place until Leicestershire Highways is satisfied with the access arrangements.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			into the village can be provided no new building should be allowed to proceed. It would certainly "impact on the amenity of neighbours" and does not "provide safe access" , which are requirements before permission is granted.		
Graham Johnson		7 Church Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EE; gjonno@btinternet.com	<p>APPENDIX 3 BARLESTONE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN SUSTAINABLE SITE ASSESSMENT (SSA); Most of my comments on the NDP relate to the results of the 'Sustainable Site Assessment' and, the inclusion of site #1 north of Bagworth Road for a potential 40 dwellings.</p> <p>Whilst I fully appreciate the task that has been put in front of the parish council to come up with a plan, the inclusion of this site as a preferred site cannot be considered a serious proposal. How and why this site has reached this point in the consultation proceedings?</p> <p>Site #1 north of Bagworth Road (40 dwellings) This site is completely inappropriate for any development. I note that a condition specified is that this development is subject to 'improved access to local facilities and amenities'. But how can this be achieved? This site should not be included in the plan if there is no proposal how to achieve this improvement. My observations and experiences as a very local resident of the area are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no scope to, and it is not possible to widen what is in effect a single track road into the village (Bagworth Road)</li> <li>• Bagworth Road cannot sustain any increase in traffic over current traffic levels</li> <li>• What does the 'improved access to local facilities and amenities' mean? There is no detail or suggestion as to</li> </ul>	The site was selected as the preferred site following a comprehensive site selection process which ranked sites in order of priority based on a wide range of criteria. It is not necessary at this stage to undertake the detailed site appraisals such as access and other studies - these will all be undertaken appropriately at planning application stage. It will be up to LCC Highways to comment on the detailed proposals and to support the proposed solutions. The reference to 'improved access to local facilities' makes it clear, in the policy, that this refers to footpaths as well as improved access. We will make the full scores of each site available on the PC website on submission.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>how this improved access will be facilitated. Will a new access road into the village be built? If so, where and how?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only way in which this site could be considered for development is to build a new access road into the village. However, without any suggestion how this would be achieved makes the proposal of site #1 completely meaningless.</li> <li>• I see from in Section 5.3 Table 2 – SSA Outcomes of Appendix 3 that the overall score for this site 1 north of Bagworth Road is '4'. However, the detail behind the issue scores are 'not published'. The final scores are completely meaningless without the detail supporting the final score of both this site and the other 13 sites that were considered. Please can you send me the full detail supporting the scores for all 13 sites</li> </ul>		
Graham Johnson		7 Church Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EE; gjonno@btinternet.com	<p>Whilst I do appreciate that the Barlestone Neighbourhood Development Plan Advisory Committee has put in a lot of time and effort into the creation of the NDP, the plan is largely untenable in respect of the proposals being put forward in this document.</p> <p>My issue is with the fact that Site #1 north of Bagworth Road (40 dwellings) is being considered at all, let alone one of the 3 sites being put forward as a serious proposition</p> <p>Any development on Bagworth Road should be rejected out of hand. Any organisation or body, be it Parish Council or private developer proposing developments here, will be held to account for the future catastrophic impact that this would have on local residents. The primary consideration for ANY development is ACCESS. Without ACCESS, ANY new development will FAIL. This failure will impact</p>	The policy clearly states that the development will be allocated, 'subject to ... the creation of clear and safe entranceways to the site'. Any allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan will also have to obtain a planning approval from HBBC - its inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan alone is not sufficient to achieve development.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>everyone, not only the current residents, but to any new residents in the new development. If this plan is put forward in its current form, and is approved, this CANNOT be turned back or undone. My concern is profoundly serious and even if I were not a resident, I would still be opposing this plan</p> <p>As a long-term resident of the village I am acutely aware of the some of the issues that impact the residents now, in 2020. The NDP, whilst it does put forward a plan, that plan is deeply flawed and should NOT be put forward in its current form and with its current content</p> <p>If there are no suitable options available within the parish boundary to make up the 'quota', then the committee must stand up for itself and feed this back to the higher level and say 'NO'. The committee must be strong in such matters and not simply crumble without challenging these directives and/or targets. Sometimes it needs to be accepted that there are no viable options available.</p> <p>I have studied the parish boundary and current potential development sites and the obvious site for a larger development must be blocks 2029 and potentially even 2030. These blocks are adjacent the main Barlestone Road and opposite residential properties in the case of block 2029. Maybe speak nicely to the land owner and make a good offer?</p>		
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Gladman Developments specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development and associated community infrastructure and has considerable experience in the development industry. From that experience, we understand the need for the planning system to provide	Noted – although this general information is not of relevance to the Regulation 14 consultation.	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			the homes and jobs that are required to meet Central Government's objectives and the needs of local communities.		
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).	Noted	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.	Noted	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Following the impact of COVID-19, the Government introduced new legislation through the Local Government and Police and Crime Commissioner (Coronavirus) (Postponement of Elections and Referendums) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020. This legislation came into force on 7 April 2020.	Noted. We are aware of the timescales involved.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	On 6th August 2020, Government published the Planning for the Future White Paper setting out proposals for how it is seeking to 'radically reform' the planning system. The proposals are seeking to streamline and modernise the planning process.	We are mindful of the proposals – no changes have been agreed - but it is completely inappropriate to make any amendments to the NP based on proposals which are likely to change and are extremely unlikely to become law before the neighbourhood plan is Made.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	The Barlestone Neighbourhood Plan should be sufficiently aligned and drafted with flexibility to ensure that conflicts are minimised with the strategic policies of the emerging Local Plan, to avoid risk of the BNP failing at examination.	The NP will not be tested against draft provisions within the emerging Local Plan. This is a very basic misunderstanding of neighbourhood plan legislation.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Developments Ltd				
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Following the changes to coronavirus regulations (as noted above), the qualifying body must be aware of progress that may happen on the emerging Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan before the BNP is able to proceed to referendum and check there is no conflict arising between the plans.	Whilst it is good practice to be aware of the strategic policies within the emerging Local Plan it is not an issue that will impact on the examination of the BNP.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	The BNP is being prepared at a time when there remain significant uncertainties in establishing the housing need for Hinckley and Bosworth, and Barlestone more locally.	Noted. All NPs are prepared at a time of uncertainty and this is no different with the BNP.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	In determining the minimum number of homes needed for the emerging Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan, the housing requirement will be based upon a local housing needs assessment, defined using the standard method. The introduction of the revised standard methodology, as outlined in the 'Changes to the Current Planning System Consultation', identifies an indicative housing figure of 889dpa for Hinckley & Bosworth.	This is not yet confirmed. The proposed changes to identifying a housing target through the White Paper are subject to continued re assessment. We can only move forward with the best available information at the time, and build in a buffer to guard against potential future increases. The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.	The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	The introduction of the revised standard methodology for calculating housing need, whilst subject to further amendments, indicates a clear direction of travel with regards to the number of homes that need to be planned for across Hinckley & Bosworth.	Noted. The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.	The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	The housing requirement for Hinckley and Bosworth, and in turn sustainable settlements such as Barlestone, is likely to increase considerably in view of wide-ranging emerging evidence on housing need. Given this, it is essential that the BNP is prepared with appropriate flexibility ahead of the preferred strategy for the emerging Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan being known.	The NP builds in a 20% buffer against future increase in housing need. The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.	The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H1, Housing Provision to Meet Identified Need; Gladman are concerned that Policy H1 is determining a housing requirement that is not based on the latest evidence with regards to housing need, lacks sufficient flexibility to respond to significant changes in the housing requirement for Barlestone	Noted. See above.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations; Policy H2 seeks to allocate three sites for residential development based on the residual identified housing need proposed by Policy H1. Gladman have serious reservations regarding the site selection process used to determine these three provisional allocations. Gladman have previously been asked by the Parish Council to review how 'Extension South of Cunnery Close' scored. This was in isolation however and no comparisons could be drawn against other submitted sites. We previously raised objections to the parameters of the RAG scale and scoring of the site and we do not consider these objections to have been resolved.	We have taken on board all comments received from all landowners/agents and have amended the scoring where appropriate. All scores were awarded consistently across each site.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations; Gladman do not consider the site selection process to be supported by a proportionately robust evidence base.	We understand your disappointment that the site that you are promoting has not been selected as an allocation, but criticism of the process is unfounded as it has been	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Developments Ltd			undertaken in a comprehensive manner and has been tried and tested across many other neighbourhood plans.	
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	An alternative approach (to the comment made above) would be to pause work on the plan and undertake a SA, incorporating the requirements of a SEA, to help demonstrate that the plan is capable of delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition.	This is another fundamental misrepresentation of what neighbourhood plans are required to do. A SEA screening has been undertaken by the LPA and it has been found to not require a full SEA. There is not requirement of a NP to have a SA.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H3, Settlement Boundary; Gladman object to the wording of this policy and use of settlement boundaries as an appropriate planning tool where they would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward.	It is entirely within the remit of a NP to designate settlement boundaries to distinguish between where development will be supported and where it will not usually be suitable. The objection is therefore totally without foundation.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H3, Settlement Boundary; the use of settlement boundaries which arbitrarily restrict suitable development on the edge of settlements does not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework which is clear that development which is considered sustainable should go ahead without delay in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. As a result, this approach is also contrary to basic condition (a).	You cannot cherry pick the policies within the NP as you seem to do. The policies need to be taken as a whole. To say that having a settlement boundary is contrary to BC a) is completely without foundation.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H3, Settlement Boundary; Gladman contend that this policy should be worded more flexibly in accordance with Paragraphs 11 and 16(b) of the NPPF (2019) and the requirement for policies to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change and prepared positively.	The policy wording reflects the Core Strategy and NPPF.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H3, Settlement Boundary; It is suggested that Policy H3 should support development proposals adjacent to the settlement boundaries provided that any adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development alongside according with other policies of the BNP and other development plan policies.	This is rejected as the NP has exceeded its housing target and there is no justification provided to support this proposal. The Core Strategy references development 'within the settlement boundaries' so the NP is not in conflict with the Core Strategy.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H3, Settlement Boundary; a flexible policy approach for developments adjacent to a settlement boundary has recently been considered in the Examiner's report into the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan (published April 2020). The Inspector highlighted; "There is a major question whether the Parish Council's approach to only allowing housing within the settlement boundary, will allow the future housing needs of the community to be met.	This is specific to Burbage. The BNP allocates in excess of its housing target so this concern does not apply.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H4, Windfall Sites; Echoing our comments on policy H3, policy H4 as currently drafted is too restrictive and limits new development to within the defined settlement boundary. Given the housing requirement for Barlestone over the plan period is likely to increase, Gladman contend that the policy should be reworded to support sustainable development opportunities well related to the existing settlement.	If housing need increases significantly consideration will be given to a review of the NP to address the new circumstances.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H5, Affordable Housing Provision; The expected publication of the Regulation 19 version of the emerging Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan in March 2021 could contain meaningful changes related to affordable housing provision, particularly the threshold at which developments are expected to provide affordable housing. Gladman contend therefore that Policy H5 could be subject	We are not prepared to make changes based on what might or might not happen at some stage in the future. The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.	The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			to further change as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses through the plan-making process and the Parish Council should be alert to the potential implications.		document to be submitted.
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy H6, Design Standards; Policies require some flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area. In essence, there will not be a 'one size fits all' solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles.	The policy is clear in stating that the criteria should apply "to a degree that is proportionate to the development' which we consider to be sufficiently flexible and not overly prescriptive.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	ENV3, Protection of Sites of Natural Environmental Significance; this policy identifies sites as being of significance for their natural environment and seeks to ensure development proposals demonstrate that the developments value outweighs the natural environment significance of the site or its features. On figure 7.2 there is a small area shaded yellow on site 2002 that encroaches on land west of Bosworth Road, it is identified as being a Local Wildlife Site. The shaded area on Figure 7.2 does not correspond with the evidence contained within Appendix 6, nor does it correspond with the mapping on Figure 7.1 or Figure 10.2 which are also both informed by Appendix 6.	There are no inconsistencies for field 2002. This is referring to the potential LWS in field 1018 - this is a species-rich hedge beside the road as recorded by Leics. CC in the latest Phase I habitat survey, it had not (2019) been validated by the LWS panel but otherwise is good as a LWS. It is noted in App 6 field 1018 as LWS, but of course not in the entry for field 2002.  All 3 designations (LWS, hist env and r&f) on field 2002 are noted in App6 and are shown on the 3 figures listed here	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Policy ENV4, Important Open Spaces; identifies 12 sites that the Parish Council consider of high value for recreation, beauty, amenity, tranquillity or as green spaces within or close to the built-up area. The policy further states that development proposals that result in their loss, or have a significant adverse effect on them, will not be supported unless the open space is replaced by equivalent	Gladmans suggest that repeating a Local Plan policy could lead to inconsistencies – this is not the case.  It is important however that the policy is retained in the NP as the sites could be removed by HBBC on review of the Local Plan,	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>or better provision in an equally suitable location, or unless it can be demonstrated that the open space is no longer required by the community.</p> <p>All designated sites match with the sites designated in the Site Allocations &amp; Development Management Policies DPD as open spaces under policy DM8. It is not necessary for a neighbourhood plan to repeat designations made in another Plan.</p>	<p>so placing them in the NP ensures that they will remain protected whatever happens to the Local Plan.</p>	
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	<p>Policy ENV12, Protection of Important Views; the policy identifies 'important' views which the Parish Council consider key to the setting and character of the settlement and seeks to ensure that development proposals do not significantly harm these views. Gladman propose that this is a subjective issue and the policy does not provide support for a decision maker to apply the policy predictably and with confidence.</p> <p>Identified views must ensure that they demonstrate a physical attribute elevating a view's importance beyond simply being a nice view of open countryside. The Plan refers to consultation responses from local residents which highlight 'highly-valued views', however this information is not provided within the evidence base. Furthermore, Appendix 13 contained within the supporting evidence base does little to indicate why these views should be protected, other than providing a view of the surrounding fields and countryside. Gladman consider that to be valued, a view would need to have some form of physical attribute that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than selecting views which may not have any landscape significance and are based solely on community support.</p>	<p>Gladman provide a definition of an important view that is theirs alone. They cannot then say that the views should be removed because they do not meet Gladman's definition.</p> <p>Specific views are objected to because they cover land in private ownership and where there is no access. You do not need these attributes to be in place to recognise the benefit of a view....</p>	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			Gladman specifically object to Important Views 5a and 5b. These correspond with comments relating to Important Open Space 1005 (above). The areas identified are all within private ownership, in land part of planning applications for 176 dwellings, as part of land currently used for agriculture.		
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Strategic Environment Assessment: In accordance with PPG ID: 11-027, the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans may fall under the scope of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SEA Regulations) that require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be undertaken where a Plan's proposals would be likely to have significant environmental effects.	The correct processes were followed and a decision made that no SEA was required. Although the PPG says that a SEA <u>MAY</u> be required where site allocations take place, the relevant legislation says that a SEA is needed in only limited circumstances where there is a potentially significant harmful impact. This is clearly not the case here.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Gladman recognises the Government's ongoing commitment to neighbourhood planning and the role that such plans have as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that the BNP must be consistent with national planning policy and needs to take account of up-to-date evidence. If the Plan is found not to meet the Basic Conditions at Examination, then the Plan will be unable to progress to referendum.	Noted. All concerns have been addressed above.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman Developments Ltd	01260288904; a.collis@gladman.co.uk	Gladman request to be added to the list of consultees and contacted about the next stages of the Barlestone Neighbourhood Plan.	This is a matter for HBBC.	None
Andrew Collis	Graduate Planner; Gladman	01260288904;	Gladman are promoting land south of Cunnery Close for residential development. The 7.5ha site comprises fields in agricultural use and lies adjacent to the existing residential	Noted. The site was comprehensively assessed and was not the preferred site and has not	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Developments Ltd	a.collis@gladman.co.uk	development on the edge of Barlestone. The proposed development has been carefully considered to ensure that it will provide high quality sustainable development. The design-led approach, informed by consultation with key stakeholders and the local community, responds sensitively to the site setting, respecting the grain of the surrounding landscape, both built and undeveloped.	therefore been selected for an allocation in the NP.	
Tim Farley	Director, Copesticks Ltd	39 Tudor Hill, Sutton Coldfield, B73 6BE; 03334566543; tim.farley@copesticks.co.uk	<p>Policy H1, Housing Provision to Meet Identified Need; this policy is based on out-dated information on housing need. The Borough Council is in the process of reviewing its Local Plan, with the Sustainability Appraisal Consultation starting today (Friday 27th November 2020). Indication from the HBBC Policy Team is that the Local Plan review will be based on a local housing needs assessment using the Government's Standard Method, which is set out in the Changes to the Current Planning System Consultation, the subject of consultation between August and October 2020. The Standard Method gives rise to a housing figure of 889 dwellings per annum for Hinckley &amp; Bosworth Borough Council, which is almost double the annual figure on which the NDP is based (473).</p> <p>When the methodology is adopted, it will be afforded weight in determining planning applications, it will not be rolled out on a staggered basis to meet Local Plan reviews, hence HBBC is proceeding on this basis, with its own early review.</p> <p>It is considered that if the Barlestone Neighbourhood Development Plan is adopted with policy H1 in the current form, there is a danger that policy will be out-of-date, on adoption, or shortly after.</p> <p>To resolve the issue, it is suggested that the BNDP follows the example of the Adopted Borough Development Plan</p>	A new methodology is yet to be agreed by HBBC. If a new target is introduced in the new Local Plan, and this figure is greater than the housing allocated in the neighbourhood plan (plus an allowance for windfall) the consideration will be given to a formal review of the neighbourhood plan. The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted. The neighbourhood plan has built in a significant buffer against future increases in housing need.	The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>and incorporates within the Plan the existing allocations and sites with planning permission for residential development, for example land off Spinney Drive and Brookside, which together will give rise to 49 dwellings. A fresh application for the development of these sites will be submitted in the coming weeks and the planning permission will be implemented at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>The site off Spinney Drive and Brookside was submitted in response to the BNDP call for sites, it is included within the Borough Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and has been confirmed to be a suitable and sustainable development proposal through the recent planning permission granted on Appeal</p>		
Tim Farley	Director, Copesticks Ltd	39 Tudor Hill, Sutton Coldfield, B73 6BE; 03334566543; tim.farley@copesticks.co.uk	<p>Policies H1, Housing Provision to Meet Identified Need and H2, Residential Site Allocations; both policies conflict with the adopted Development Plan.</p> <p>Policy H1 is based on out-of-date information and is in danger of being obsolete at or shortly after adoption.</p> <p>Policy H2 omits sites that ought to be included to be consistent with the Borough Development Plan and includes allocations for sites that are clearly less suitable, sustainable and accessible than alternative options.</p>	<p>We disagree with these comments. If policy H1 'is in danger' of becoming obsolete shortly after adoption, then it confirms that it will be 'in date' at the time of being Made - so there is no conflict with the development plan.</p> <p>Similarly, the only consideration for policy H2 to meet the basic conditions is that the chosen sites are developable and deliverable ... the views of organisations that have vested interests in promoting their own sites is not a valid or independent assessment.</p>	None
Karen Early		65 Bagworth Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EQ; 01455292038;	<p>Page 3 Bagworth Road; I would like to express my concerns in respect of the plan to build 40 houses on Bagworth Road. My concerns relate to the effect on the environment, local nature that has noticeably declined over the last 30 years, Highways and infrastructure.</p> <p>All of the objections submitted on the planning application for Garden Farm also relate to this development. Traffic is</p>	<p>It is a fact that Barlestone has to accommodate significant levels of new housing in the future. We can either allow HBBC to determine where that goes or, as we have chosen to do, take the responsibility ourselves to decide where the new development will have the least damaging</p>	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		k.early@btinternet.com	<p>a major problem in the centre of the village, going up Bagworth Road and the speeding vehicles that have caused problems for years, particularly dangerous outside the entrance to the field.</p> <p>Approximately 25 years ago planning permission was refused for one bungalow due to the entrance that was perceived to be dangerous. Nothing has changed apart from there being far more vehicles on that road as a result of all the new houses that have been built since. How can it be a sensible proposal to put 40 houses on there? I am also dismayed at the prospect of even more devastation to the environment and local wildlife. Birds have already drastically reduced on this road. Hedgerows used to be full of a variety of finches, woodpeckers were commonplace, Cuckoos are no longer heard and even blackbirds, robins, tits and sparrows are less and less each year.</p> <p>TV programmes are constantly asking us to do our bit and let some land / gardens grow wild to provide everything bees, insects, birds etc need. This field is a perfect example of how we can do more. I believe the Parish Council should be doing more to preserve the countryside and educate future generations.</p>	<p>impact. We realise that the chosen sites will not please everyone, but we do feel that having considered all sites that were put forward for development, the sites chosen for an allocation are the least damaging sites to deliver the required level of housing for our community.</p>	
Karen Early		65 Bagworth Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EQ; 01455292038; k.early@btinternet.com	<p>Policy CFA2, New and Improved Community Facilities; There will be unacceptable traffic movement, parking etc on Bagworth Road therefore this policy will not be fulfilled. Parking is already a problem and dangerous. Vehicles park on the path so pedestrians have to walk in a road that regularly has speeding traffic. People with disabilities would need a vehicle to move around safely in my opinion. Elderly residents are also at risk.</p>	<p>If traffic movements are considered by the Highways Authority to be severe then the planning proposal will not be supported.</p>	None
Karen Early		65 Bagworth Road,	<p>Policies CFA3, Doctors Surgery and CFA4, School and Pre-school Facilities; A lot of work needs to be done to fulfil</p>	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		Barlestone, CV13 0EQ; 0145529203 8; k.early@btinternet.com	these policies. Many residents already travel to Doctors Surgeries in other surrounding villages. Schools can only accommodate so many children before their education is affected. Some pupils will never have the opportunity to recover from poor education in their early years.		
Karen Early		65 Bagworth Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EQ; 0145529203 8; k.early@btinternet.com	Policies TR1, Traffic Management and TR2, Electric Vehicles; Employment prospects in the Parish? Electric charging points will need to be a reality due to Govt. Changes	These policies help to achieve that reality.	None
Karen Early		65 Bagworth Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EQ; 0145529203 8; k.early@btinternet.com	The fact that I have concentrated on Bagworth Road does not mean that I am in favour of the other sites in the plan. I am not so familiar with the peculiarities with those individual sites but believe the environmental effects are the same	This is the dilemma we understand that people have. However, the neighbourhood plan cannot promote less development than is required through the Local plan. It can, however, help to prevent more unsuitable development in the future by allocating sites to meet this housing need and therefore securing additional powers to shape housing development in the future.	None
Nicholas Early		65 Bagworth Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EQ; 0145529203 8; k.early@btinternet.com	Page 3 Bagworth Road; I would like to express my concerns in respect of the plan to build 40 houses on Bagworth Road. My concerns relate to the effect on the environment, local nature that has noticeably declined over the last 30 years, Highways and infrastructure. All of the objections submitted on the planning application for Garden Farm also relate to this development. Traffic is a major problem in the centre of the village, going up Bagworth Road and the speeding vehicles that have caused	It is a fact that Barlestone has to accommodate significant levels of new housing in the future. We can either allow HBBC to determine where that goes or, as we have chosen to do, take the responsibility ourselves to decide where the new development will have the least damaging impact. We realise that the chosen sites will not please everyone, but we do feel that	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>problems for years, particularly dangerous outside the entrance to the field.</p> <p>Approximately 25 years ago planning permission was refused for one bungalow due to the entrance that was perceived to be dangerous. Nothing has changed apart from there being far more vehicles on that road as a result of all the new houses that have been built since. How can it be a sensible proposal to put 40 houses on there? I am also dismayed at the prospect of even more devastation to the environment and local wildlife. Birds have already drastically reduced on this road. Hedgerows used to be full of a variety of finches, woodpeckers were commonplace, Cuckoos are no longer heard and even blackbirds, robins, tits and sparrows are less and less each year.</p> <p>TV programmes are constantly asking us to do our bit and let some land / gardens grow wild to provide everything bees, insects, birds etc need. This field is a perfect example of how we can do more. I believe the Parish Council should be doing more to preserve the countryside and educate future generations.</p>	<p>having considered all sites that were put forward for development, the sites chosen for an allocation are the least damaging sites to deliver the required level of housing for our community.</p>	
Nicholas Early		65 Bagworth Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EQ; 0145529203 8; k.early@btinternet.com	<p>Policy CFA2, New and Improved Community Facilities; There will be unacceptable traffic movement, parking etc on Bagworth Road therefore this policy will not be fulfilled. Parking is already a problem and dangerous. Vehicles park on the path so pedestrians have to walk in a road that regularly has speeding traffic. People with disabilities would need a vehicle to move around safely in my opinion. Elderly residents are also at risk.</p>	<p>If traffic movements are considered by the Highways Authority to be severe then the planning proposal will not be supported.</p>	None
Nicholas Early		65 Bagworth Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EQ;	<p>Policies CFA3, Doctors Surgery and CFA4, School and Pre-school Facilities; A lot of work needs to be done to fulfil these policies. Many residents already travel to Doctors Surgeries in other surrounding villages. Schools can only</p>	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		01455292038; k.early@btinternet.com	accommodate so many children before their education is affected. Some pupils will never have the opportunity to recover from poor education in their early years.		
Nicholas Early		65 Bagworth Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EQ; 01455292038; k.early@btinternet.com	Policies TR1, Traffic Management and TR2, Electric Vehicles; Employment prospects in the Parish? Electric charging points will need to be a reality due to Govt. Changes	These policies help to achieve that reality.	None
Nicholas Early		65 Bagworth Road, Barlestone, CV13 0EQ; 01455292038; k.early@btinternet.com	The fact that I have concentrated on Bagworth Road does not mean that I am in favour of the other sites in the plan. I am not so familiar with the peculiarities with those individual sites but believe the environmental effects are the same	Noted	None
Guy Longley	Executive Director, Pegasus Group representing Leicestershire County Council	4 The Courtyard, Lockington, Derby, DE74 2SL; 07881914067; guy.longley@pegasusgroup.co.uk	Page 10 – Barlestone Today; At page 10 of the Draft Plan, a physical, economic and social profile of the village of Barlestone and the civil parish the subject of the Neighbourhood Plan is set out. There is no reference to the fact that land and existing properties to the west of the village along Barton Road fall within Osbaston Parish and therefore outside the Neighbourhood Plan Area. This is despite the fact that the properties on Curtis Way clearly form part of the existing settlement and physically adjoin properties off Manor Road falling within Barlestone Parish. Figure 1 at Page 5 clearly shows this physical relationship. As well as residential properties that physically form part	It is considered inappropriate and unnecessary to refer to dwellings outside of the Parish. The Parish boundary showing the neighbourhood plan area is clearly shown on page 5 of the neighbourhood plan. It is likely that the adjoining residents of Osbaston will be included in the referendum area, although this is a decision for the Examiner. A number of approaches were made to include certain areas of Osbaston Parish within the designated area but this was denied by the Osbaston Parish Council.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>of the village, there is also a convenience store (Dhiveya Convenience Store) and a dental practice (Tollgate Dental Practice) that provide important services and facilities for the settlement.</p> <p>Reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan as a whole, there is a failure to recognise the interrelationship with Osbaston Parish and the important physical and functional relationship with existing residential and business properties along Barton Road. it is noted that the Barlestone Village Plan, 2006, residents of Osbaston living on Barton Road up to the Tollgate were included in the plan due to their proximity and use of facilities in the village.</p> <p>Whilst it is understood that the land and existing properties do not form part of the Neighbourhood Plan Area, it is important nevertheless for the plan to acknowledge these physical and functional relationships and that they are taken into account in framing the policies of the plan.</p>		
Guy Longley	Executive Director, Pegasus Group representing Leicestershire County Council	4 The Courtyard, Lockington, Derby, DE74 2SL; 07881914067; guy.longley@pegasusgroup.co.uk	<p>Page 16- What is Barlestone's Housing Need; This section of the Draft Plan indicates a pro-rata housing figure for Barlestone of some 59 dwellings over the period 2016-2036, based on a proportionate share of Hinckley and Bosworth's population.</p> <p>This is not considered to be a sufficiently robust way of identifying the likely housing needs in the settlement over the period to 2036. Reference is made in the Draft Plan to the Local Housing Needs Assessment prepared by the Midlands Rural Housing Trust in 2019. This identified a need for market and affordable housing of some 48 dwellings over a five-year period. If this data was</p>	The housing need figure was provided by HBBC and is deemed therefore to be the most appropriate available, although it is recognised that it is provided at a time of significant uncertainty where the impact of Coronavirus and Brexit could push the figure up or down in the future. The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.	The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>extrapolated for the 20-year plan period, it would suggest a need approaching some 200 dwellings.</p> <p>A more refined approach to considering the future housing needs of the settlement should be considered. This should take proper account of the role of the settlement as a Key Service Centre as identified in the adopted Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy, reflecting the good range of services and facilities in the village.</p>		
Guy Longley	Executive Director, Pegasus Group representing Leicestershire County Council	4 The Courtyard, Lockington, Derby, DE74 2SL; 07881914067; guy.longley@pegasusgroup.co.uk	Section 5.3 Community Sustainability; Section 5.3 of the Draft Plan outlines the range of community facilities and services available for residents in the village. No reference is made to the dental practice and convenience store off Curtis Way/Barton Road. Whilst within Osbaston Parish, these facilities serve the needs of the village and should be recognised and referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan.	The neighbourhood plan can only include policies relating to land within the neighbourhood area. Although close by, the fact that the facilities mentioned are within the Osbaston Parish means that they cannot be included in the neighbourhood plan.	None
Guy Longley	Executive Director, Pegasus Group representing Leicestershire County Council	4 The Courtyard, Lockington, Derby, DE74 2SL; 07881914067; guy.longley@pegasusgroup.co.uk	Policy H1, Housing Provision to Meet Identified Need; this policy proposes that a minimum of 48 dwellings is provided through proposed allocations over the plan period to 2036. We have identified above that the assessment of the housing requirement for the parish is not robust and should be revisited.	Housing targets do change over time. It is for this reason the neighbourhood plan has allocated development in excess of the minimum target. The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.	The latest housing targets from the emerging Local Plan have been included in the document to be submitted.
Guy Longley	Executive Director, Pegasus Group	4 The Courtyard, Lockington, Derby, DE74	Policy H2, Housing Allocations; this policy proposes the allocation of 3 sites to meet the housing needs identified in the Draft Plan. This includes the proposed allocation of land to the north of Bagworth Road (site 1) to provide	The promotion of the site by an interested party is noted. We have decided on the site allocations on the basis of a comprehensive and independently led site selection process	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	representing Leicestershire County Council	2SL; 0788191406 7; guy.longley @pegasusgroup.co.uk	<p>some 40 dwellings. Reference is made to a Site Sustainability Assessment at Appendix 3 to the Draft Plan which informed the assessment of sites proposed for allocation. The Draft Plan indicates that further east to west growth was considered less suitable than expansion to the north and south.</p> <p>We have referred above to the failure of the Draft Plan to properly consider land and buildings adjoining the western edge of the village but falling within Osbaston Parish Council's area. The failure to recognise this relationship has also meant that the assessment of potential development opportunities is flawed.</p> <p>Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan cannot propose the allocation of sites outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area, it should have considered the potential for suitable and sustainable development opportunities on land to the west of the settlement falling within Osbaston Parish.</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council has interests in land to the north of Barton Road and is currently progressing an application for some 55 dwellings on the site along with extensive areas of new public open space. A copy of the Indicative Masterplan is included for information. The land is physically well related to the existing settlement form and would not extend built development further to the west than existing housing off Curtis Way. The site is well related to the available services and facilities in the village, including the nearby convenience store and dentist practice on Curtis Way/Barton Road. The site also has easy access to existing bus services running through the village. When compared with the proposed allocation north of Bagworth Road, it is considered that the site represents a</p>	and we do understand that those organisations representing land that was not favoured through this process will be unhappy with the outcome, however we believe that the sites allocated represent the best sites from those available. The identification of a reserve site is not considered necessary as the neighbourhood plan has 'over allocated' against its housing target which helps to provide a buffer against potential future increases in housing need.	

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>more sustainable option. It has a better relationship with the existing built form of the settlement, is well related to existing services and facilities, would have a more limited landscape impact and would not result in the loss of existing ridge and furrow.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should properly consider all opportunities for development on the edge of the village, including land in Osbaston Parish adjoining the settlement. This exercise would demonstrate that land off Barton Road represents a sustainable development opportunity.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Parish Council cannot allocate land outside the defined Neighbourhood Plan Area. However, it should recognise this development opportunity and, rather than allocate land north of Bagworth Road, it should treat this as a reserve site that would come forward in the event that the land off Barton Road is not developed in the next 5-10 years.</p>		
Guy Longley	Executive Director, Pegasus Group representing Leicestershire County Council	4 The Courtyard, Lockington, Derby, DE74 2SL; 07881914067; guy.longley@pegasusgroup.co.uk	Policy H3, Settlement Boundary; this policy of the Draft Plan proposes the identification of a settlement boundary for the village and this is shown on Figure 3. The purpose is to identify the built-up area of the village and areas of countryside. The definition of a settlement boundary should relate to physical features on the ground. The approach is therefore flawed in that it follows the parish boundary on the western side of the village. It would be more appropriate for the boundary in this location not to be closed off along the parish boundary to recognise that the built form of the village extends westwards into the adjoining parish and logically would form part of the settlement limits, were it not for the parish boundary. In response to Policy H2 above, we have suggested a reserve site approach to the proposed allocation north of	The settlement boundary ends at the boundary of the neighbourhood area. It is illogical to leave it open as it only relates to development within Barlestone Parish - its proximity with Osbaston is irrelevant here. Saying that the adjoining parish would form part of the settlement boundary if not for the parish boundary may be the case, but the settlement boundary demarcates the development boundary for Barlestone so the settlement boundary cannot be open ended here and it is necessary for it to end where it does.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			Bagworth Road. In accordance with this approach, the proposed settlement limits should exclude this land from the proposed settlement limits and should instead identify it as a potential reserve site.		
Guy Longley	Executive Director, Pegasus Group representing Leicestershire County Council	4 The Courtyard, Lockington, Derby, DE74 2SL; 07881914067; guy.longley@pegasusgroup.co.uk	Policy H4, Windfalls; the policy supports small residential proposals within the proposed settlement limits. The text to the policy suggests that this source could provide for a further 30 dwellings over the plan period to 2036 based on previous delivery rates of 1.5 dwellings a year. The assessment of the potential for delivery from windfall sites is unrealistic. The proposed settlement limits are tightly defined and there is no clear evidence to demonstrate that a further 30 dwellings could come forward on windfall sites over the plan period.	The settlement boundary is broadly similar to that adopted by HBBC until the proposed change in the neighbourhood plan. This boundary has therefore delivered that level of housing previously. In any event, the neighbourhood plan is not reliant on windfall to deliver its housing target.	None
Guy Longley	Executive Director, Pegasus Group representing Leicestershire County Council	4 The Courtyard, Lockington, Derby, DE74 2SL; 07881914067; guy.longley@pegasusgroup.co.uk	Policy ENV6, Ridge and Furrow; Policy ENV6 seeks to safeguard areas of surviving ridge and furrow identified in Figure 10.2, with any loss or damage arising from development proposals to be avoided. It is noted that Figure 10.2 shows the land proposed for allocation off Bagworth Road as an area of surviving ridge and furrow. Again, the land adjoining the western edge of the settlement within Osbaston Parish is considered to represent a sustainable option for growth to meet future requirements that should be acknowledged in the Draft Plan as part of the assessment of the local context for the settlement.	Figure 10.2 to be corrected as it incorrectly identified areas as surviving Ridge & Furrow. It is not relevant to acknowledge land outside of the neighbourhood area in the Barlestone neighbourhood plan.	Changes to be made as identified.
Glyn Bowen		29 Spinney Drive, Barlestone, CV13 0JQ; 01455291920;	We wish to advise you that we are concerned that an application has been again be made for 110 houses on land off Bagworth Rd. Barlestone, which we consider will bring many risks & problems.	We note the comments made.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		glynbowen@ btopenworld .com			
Glyn Bowen		29 Spinney Drive, Barlestone, CV13 0JQ; 0145529192 0; glynbowen@ btopenworld .com	The main issue is that the current access to Barlestone is not suitable for an increase in traffic, due to current resident's essential car parking needs.	It is a fact that Barlestone has to accommodate significant levels of new housing in the future. We can either allow HBBC to determine where that goes or, as we have chosen to do, take the responsibility ourselves to decide where the new development will have the least damaging impact. We realise that the chosen sites will not please everyone, but we do feel that having considered all sites that were put forward for development, the sites chosen for an allocation are the least damaging sites to deliver the required level of housing for our community.	None
Glyn Bowen		29 Spinney Drive, Barlestone, CV13 0JQ; 0145529192 0; glynbowen@ btopenworld .com	The main route to the village from Bagworth Rd. is via Main Street, which currently also has need for car parking by current residents, together with two food shops & hairdresser on Main Street. This frequently necessitates a need for drivers using Main St. to be sensible which often requires reversing back to allow traffic through. Main Street is also the main route to Church Rd. which is access route to :- St. Giles Church (which provides normal Church services, weddings, & funerals), Old School Hall (in use daily for pre-school children, & also other village community group usages), Gilliver's Funeral service. Again, increasing housing in this area will clearly cause disputes in traffic issues & disrupt Community access. We recommend that you carry out a number of visits to Main Street at various times to view possible traffic disruption.	Detailed Highways issues will be addressed at planning applications stage.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Glyn Bowen		29 Spinney Drive, Barlestone, CV13 0JQ; 01455291920; glynbowen@btopenworld.com	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations; We accept that an increase in housing needs may be required to our area, but quite simply, the fields opposite existing housing on Barton Rd., would probably be the most sensible & acceptable & should also include a proportion of private Housing (as an alternative to the Bagworth Road site).	Noted. The NP can only include suites that have been put forward for development by the landowner.	None
Planning Administration Team	Sport England	Sport Park, 3 Oakwood Drive, Loughborough, Leicester, LE11 3QF; planning.north@sportengland.org	Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important. It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document. <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</a>	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Planning Administra tion Team	Sport England	Sport Park, 3 Oakwood Drive, Loughboroug h, Leicester, LE11 3QF; planning.nor th@sporteng land.org	Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</a>	Noted	None
Planning Administra tion Team	Sport England	Sport Park, 3 Oakwood Drive, Loughboroug h, Leicester, LE11 3QF; planning.nor th@sporteng land.org	Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery. Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance">http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</a></p>		
Planning Administration Team	Sport England	Sport Park, 3 Oakwood Drive, Loughborough, Leicester, LE11 3QF; <a href="mailto:planning.north@sportengland.org">planning.north@sportengland.org</a>	<p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p>	Noted	None
Planning Administration Team	Sport England	Sport Park, 3 Oakwood Drive, Loughborough, Leicester, LE11 3QF; <a href="mailto:planning.north@sportengland.org">planning.north@sportengland.org</a>	<p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place. In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to</p>	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</a></p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</a></p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a></p>		
Dr Luke Evans	Member of Parliament for Bosworth	Bosworth House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA t: constituency: 01455 635741 parliament:	I am a big supporter of neighbourhood planning as I believe it gives local people a real say in shaping the future of their area. Therefore I am really pleased to see Barlestone taking part in the process. Believe me, I know how much hard work and effort goes in to developing a neighbourhood plan so I would like to say thank you to you and your team for giving up some much of your time to help your local community. I would be very grateful if you would pass on my thanks to everyone involved. I hope the consultation is going well and that local people	Noted	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		0207 219 4250 m: 07920 619812; w: drlukeevans. org.uk	are taking the opportunity to have their say. If I can be of any assistance, please let me know.		
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the following points which cover the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted	None
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	The Magic website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones). Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment.	Noted	None
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ;	Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation. Most of these will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk			
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan.	Noted	None
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	There may also be a local landscape character assessment covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.	Noted	None
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.	Noted	None
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery	Hornbeam House,	General mapped information on soil types and Agricultural Land Classification is available (under 'landscape') on the	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Consultation s Team, Natural England	Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	Magic website and also from the LandIS website, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.		
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	The National Planning Policy Framework sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. Planning Practice Guidance <sup>8</sup> sets out supporting guidance. Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.	Noted	None
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness. If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats, such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Ancient woodland. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.	Noted	None
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.	Noted	None
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 171. For more information, see our publication Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land.	Noted	None
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation	Hornbeam House,	Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for	Noted. The NP addresses these issues.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	s Team, Natural England	Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	<p>development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.</li> <li>• Restoring a neglected hedgerow.</li> <li>• Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.</li> <li>• Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.</li> <li>• Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.</li> <li>• Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.</li> <li>• Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife.</li> <li>• Adding a green roof to new buildings.</li> </ul>		
Ben Jones	Operations Delivery Consultation s Team, Natural England	Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Cheshire, CW1 6GJ; consultations @naturaleng land.org.uk	<p>You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community.</li> <li>• Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision.</li> <li>• Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation.</li> <li>• Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less</li> </ul>	Noted. These comments are largely inappropriate at this stage in the preparation of the NP	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planting additional street trees.</li> <li>• Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.</li> <li>• Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore).</li> </ul>		
Beth Hendy (on behalf of Clive Fletcher)	Business Officer; Historic England	The Axis, 10 Holliday Street, Birmingham, B1 1TF; Bethany.hendy@historicengland.org.uk; 0121 625 6862	<p>The area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of important designated heritage assets. In line with national planning policy, it will be important that the strategy for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets so that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area.</p> <p>If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the planning and conservation team at your local planning authority together with the staff at the county council archaeological advisory service who look after the Historic Environment Record. They should be able to provide details of the designated heritage assets in the area together with locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (<a href="http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk">www.heritagegateway.org.uk</a> &lt;<a href="http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk">http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk</a>&gt;). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society or local historic groups in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted	None
Beth Hendy	Business Officer;	The Axis, 10 Holliday	Historic England has produced advice which your community might find helpful in helping to identify what it	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
(on behalf of Clive Fletcher)	Historic England	Street, Birmingham, B1 1TF;Bethany.hendy@historicengland.org.uk; 0121 625 6862	is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:- < <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/</a> >		
Beth Hendy (on behalf of Clive Fletcher)	Business Officer; Historic England	The Axis, 10 Holliday Street, Birmingham, B1 1TF;Bethany.hendy@historicengland.org.uk; 0121 625 6862	You may also find the advice in “Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level” useful. This has been produced by Historic England, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Forestry Commission. As well as giving ideas on how you might improve your local environment, it also contains some useful further sources of information. This can be downloaded from: < <a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</a> >	Noted	None
Beth Hendy (on behalf of Clive Fletcher)	Business Officer; Historic England	The Axis, 10 Holliday Street, Birmingham, B1 1TF;Bethany.hendy@historicengland.org.uk; 0121 625 6862	If you envisage including new housing allocations in your plan, we refer you to our published advice available on our website, “Housing Allocations in Local Plans” as this relates equally to neighbourhood planning. This can be found at < <a href="https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/heag074-he-and-site-allocation-local-plans.pdf">https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/heag074-he-and-site-allocation-local-plans.pdf</a> >	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations; Site 1 - Based on a high level assessment of this site, there is a risk that development could impact on the performance of the sewerage network, Severn Trent would therefore strongly encourage developers to contact Severn Trent early within the site design and development process to discuss how and when the development will be brought forward and enable more detailed assessments of the sewerage requirements to be made and any associated works to be programmed in. It is also important that all opportunities to manage surface water in a sustainable way are undertaken, in particular the use of SuDS to control flow rates and the Drainage Hierarchy to ensure that the most sustainable outfall is used to discharge surface water from the site.	Noted. This will be dealt with at planning application stage.	None
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations; Site 2 - Based on the scale of development the impact of foul flows from the development are not anticipated to have any significant impacts, it is however important that surface water flows are managed to prevent any adverse impacts on the sewerage network. Severn Trent would therefore recommend the use of SuDS principles and the Drainage Hierarchy are utilised within the development.	Noted.	Utilisation of SuDS to be as a condition in the development proposals.



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations; Site 3 - Based on the scale of development the impact of foul flows from the development are not anticipated to have any significant impacts, it is however important that surface water flows are managed to prevent any adverse impacts on the sewerage network. Severn Trent would therefore recommend the use of SuDS principles and the Drainage Hierarchy are utilised within the development.	Noted.	Utilisation of SuDs to be as a condition in the development proposals.
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	Policy H6, Design Standards, point c - Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within Policy H6, in particular the protection of trees and hedges as highlighted in point c, however we would recommend that bullet point c is expanded to also highlight the need to protect watercourses. Watercourse provide multiple benefits including ecology and flood risk, the removal or culverting of these assets could result in detriment to the habitats and flood resilience therefore they should be retained as open features. Watercourses also provide a sustainable outfall for surface water from development sites reducing the need direct surface water into the sewerage networks. Example policy wording is provided below to assist you in incorporating this recommendation: <i>No development shall prevent the continuation of existing natural or manmade drainage features, where</i>	Agreed – wording to be amended.	Change to be made as indicated under design standards and Policy H7

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p><i>watercourses or dry ditches are present within a development site, these should be retained and where possible enhanced.</i></p> <p><i>Access to drainage features for maintenance should be retained and ownership of land clearly defined as part of the overall site maintenance plan.</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the alteration of any alignment an assessment will be required to ensure that all connections into the watercourse are retained and that exceedance flows are not then directed away from the watercourse channel towards properties.</i></p> <p>The supporting text for the policy should also include:  <i>The removal of watercourses and ditches from development sites, presents a risk for future growth and development in such that links to the natural water cycle can be removed resulting in a potential increase of on site and off site flood risk. The removal of these features would result in an increased need to connect surface water to the sewerage network, as identified above this is against the drainage hierarchy outline in the Planning Practice Guidance</i></p>		
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21	Policy H6, Design Standards, point d - Severn Trent are supportive of the approach outlined within bullet point d to incorporate sustainable designs such as energy and water efficiency. We would recommend that the policy advises that development is design to the optional water efficiency target of 110 l/h/d, so that developers understand what is expected from the outset. Example policy wording is provided below to assist you in incorporating this recommendation:	Agreed.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		7JA;chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	<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>		
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA;chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	<p>Policy H6, Design Standards, point f - Severn Trent are also supportive of the approach to incorporate SuDS into development as outlined in bullet point f, we would recommend that this is expanded to incorporate the use of the drainage hierarchy and that SUDs are designed to provide multiple benefits as outlined in current industry best practice.</p> <p>Example policy wording is provided below to assist you in incorporating this recommendation:</p> <p><i>Drainage Hierarchy</i></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. SuDS</i></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>	Agreed – we will add to the policy to include the intent as included here.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p><i>Where possible, all non-major development should look to incorporate these same SuDS principles into their designs. The supporting text for the policy should also include: 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. We would also recommend that advice around SuDS policies are obtained from the Lead Local Flood Authority as they are the statutory consultee for the planning process.</i></p>		
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	<p>Policy ENV1, Protection of Local Green Space - 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 like 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 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 ENV1</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	Noted. The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the LGS therefore the works identified would not be refused under the current policy wording.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	Policy ENV4, Important Open Spaces - Severn Trent understand the need for Open Spaces and the need for them to be protected, however some open spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes like 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 can result in additional benefits to the open space in the form of Biodiversity or Amenity improvements. We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy ENV4 <i>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.</i>	Noted. The policy wording does not prohibit development which does not have a significant adverse effect; therefore it is not considered necessary to change the policy.	None
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	Policy ENV11, Flood Risk - Severn Trent is supportive of the principles outlined within Policy ENV 11, however we would recommend that Policy ENV11 incorporates the Drainage Hierarchy as detailed in our response regarding Policy H6, the appropriate discharge of surface water is key to mitigating the risk of flooding as a result of development and the impacts of climate change.	Agreed. Reference to the appropriate discharge of surface water will be made.	Change to be made as indicated

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	<p>Proposed One- Way Traffic System -Severn Trent would note that if this approach was to be taken forward there may be opportunities to incorporate Source Control SuDS such as Tree pits, Rain Gardens and Bio-retention areas, Reducing the risk of flooding in the area, These features could be used to demarcate support the one way system and slow the speed of traffic, demarcate parking areas etc. Severn Trent would encourage that this approach is considered as part of the design approach when bringing forward the one-way traffic system.</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>	Noted	None
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	<p>Position Statement:</p> <p>As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead.</p>	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills.		
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	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.	Noted	None
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk;	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	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		07966 174600	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 <a href="https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/">https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</a>		
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	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.	Noted	None
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment	Drainage and Wastewater	Water Supply - When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific	Noted	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Managemen t Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramle y@severntre nt.co.uk; 07966 174600	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.		
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Managemen t Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramle y@severntre nt.co.uk; 07966 174600	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 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. We recommend that in all cases you consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres.</li> <li>• Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute.</li> <li>• Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres or less.</li> <li>• Water butts for external use in properties with gardens.</li> </ul>	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			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 <a href="https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/">https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</a>		
Chris Bramley	Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts); Severn Trent Water Ltd	Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP), Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA; chris.bramley@severntrent.co.uk; 07966 174600	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.	Noted. This is already covered by building regulations.	None
Melanie Lindsley	Planning and Local Authority Liaison team; Coal Authority	planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk; 01623 637119	The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas. Our records indicate that the Neighbourhood Plan area does not contains any recorded risks from past coal mining	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>activity at the surface or at shallow depth. On this basis we have no specific comments to make.</p> <p>In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality it will not be necessary for you to provide The Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Preface; Third paragraph refers to the NP being the basis for planning decisions up to 2036. HBBC is now planning for its new local plan to run from 2020 to 2039. HBBC recommends that the Neighbourhood plan period is aligned with this to achieve closer conformity between local plan and NP which should help the NP progress through examination and meet the basic conditions. And this will also minimise risk of the NP being out of date soon after it is “made”.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Page 7; The NP and what we want it to achieve - 2nd Para. Text “...covers the period up to 2036...”. Same comment as for Preface (above); Policy intention bullet points. If these were roman numerals, it would aid referencing and navigation of the NP.	The timescale will be updated.  It is not considered necessary to introduce roman numerals in place of bullet points.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Page 11, Barlestone Today - 3rd Para. Text “Around two fifths (20%)...” Should be “one fifth”	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Page 11, Barlestone Today - Final two paragraphs. Quoted house prices need a date/year.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-	Community Engagement Process - Consultation and engagement is an important part of the journey in preparing a NP and it is necessary to submit a report of consultation when the NP is submitted for examination (Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012). However, it is not necessary to report on all the consultation undertaken in the NP itself. The NP Group could consider removing section 3 or substituting it with a	Noted. We believe that the summary provided is succinct and gives a flavour of the processes followed. It is important contextual information which we will retain in the NP.	None.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Bosworth Borough Council	bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	<p>short summary which refers to a report of consultation for further details. This will make the NP lighter and easier to use for its principle purpose of providing policy and guidance for determining planning applications.</p> <p>From the summary in Section 3 of the NP and the reports on the NP website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community Drop In Session Report (September 2017)</li> <li>- Stakeholder Event Report (January 2018)</li> <li>- School Stakeholder Report</li> </ul> <p>the community engagement undertaken with the local community appears extensive.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Vision for Barlestone - Section 4 provides a concise straightforward vision of what is important for Barlestone up to 2036. The time horizon could be changed to 2039 to align with HBBC's Local Plan. Is there room for the vision to include a strand about employment in Barlestone, perhaps around increased self-sufficiency of local jobs?	Noted. The timescale will be changed. The vision will be changed to include an additional bullet point "Appropriate local employment opportunities will be made available"	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR;	Housing Need - P16 Para 2. Text "As at the 2011 census (the most recently available comprehensive data) Barlestone housed 0.63% of HBBC's total population." 0.63% is incorrect. On page 10 of the NP the population of Barlestone is given as 2,481 people according to the 2011	Noted. The figure will be updated.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	census, which equates to 2.4% as a proportion of the Borough census population of 105,078. Using the Office of National Statistics Mid-Year Estimates for 2017, Barlestone has 2.3% of the Borough population (2,522 / 111,370).		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Housing Need - Para 3. Text “...all planning approvals from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2017 onwards can count towards achieving the overall minimum target.” That is correct, except if the Barlestone NP is to mirror the new Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan its time period will be 2020 – 2039, which means that outstanding planning permissions from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2020 will count, but dwellings completed prior to then will not.	Noted. The latest targets contained within the emerging Local Plan have been included; the qualifying planning approvals have been checked by H&BBC prior to revising the Housing Need section wording and figures	The latest targets contained within the emerging Local Plan and qualifying approvals have been included
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Housing Need - Para 4. Text: “Based on information provided by the Borough Council, the gross housing requirement for HBBC for 2016 – 2036 is 9,460 (473 dwellings per annum). The pro-rata figure for the parish is 59 units over this same time period.” Using the correct pro-rata percentage of 2.3% would give a requirement of 218 dwellings for Barlestone for the 2016 – 36 period. However, HBBC recommends the NP Group go with the plan period of 2020 – 39, for which the latest gross requirement figure is 8,588. HBBC have recommended that neighbourhood plans include an additional buffer to give flexibility to the plan. For example this would help if sites did not come forward for development as anticipated and/or if the local plan, once	The latest targets contained within the emerging Local Plan have been included	The latest targets contained within the emerging Local Plan have been included

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>adopted, set a different housing requirement for the parish. Also, the Borough may need to accommodate unmet housing need from the City of Leicester. In December 2020 the Standard Method for establishing housing need for Local Planning Authorities was revised so that the housing need for the 20 largest cities in England, including Leicester, was increased by 35%. This is likely to lead to a significant increase in the level of unmet housing need arising in Leicester. Whilst work is ongoing across Leicester and Leicestershire to agree a method of apportioning this unmet need it is possible that the Borough may be expected to accommodate part of this additional 35% uplift. It is therefore considered important that neighbourhood plans in the borough are flexible enough to respond to a potentially higher housing need figure in the emerging local plan. Without flexibility it is possible that neighbourhood plans may quickly become out of date. A 10% buffer has been recommended which would raise the borough requirement to 9,447 and Barlestone's apportionment to 214 dwellings for 2020-39.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	<p>Housing Need - Para 5. Text: "The number of dwellings built or with a current planning consent in Barlestone granted since the 1st April 2017 is 11 units, against the minimum requirement of 59 units this leaves a shortfall (as at January 2020) of a minimum of 48 units to be delivered through the Neighbourhood Plan to 2036"</p> <p>The calculation of completions and outstanding permissions should start at April 2020 to reflect the 2020-2039 local plan timescales. HBBC records indicate that there were outstanding planning permissions for 17 dwellings at 1/4/20, but 6 of these overlap with the proposed allocation at land to the rear of 11-19</p>	The latest targets contained within the emerging Local Plan have been included	The latest targets contained within the emerging Local Plan have been included

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Newbold Road, giving potential for double counting. Barlestone could also include an allowance for windfall development based on historic trends. HBBC records have 24 dwellings completed on unallocated sites since 2006, giving an annual rate of 1.6 dwellings over the 15 year period. Projecting this forward for the 19 year period 2020 – 2039 gives an allowance of 30 dwellings. Taking these factors into account gives a minimum residual requirement of 173 dwellings to be planned for through allocations.</p> <p>Housing requirement  -214 Outstanding permissions 11*  -203 Windfall allowance 30  -173  *not including the 6 dwellings of site r/o 11-19 Newbold Road.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H1, Housing Need - should be reworded to set out the housing requirement as per the above figures. There will not be a need for an early review of the Barlestone NP as these figures provide a best estimate of housing need for the plan period of 2020-39.	The latest targets contained within the emerging Local Plan have been included	The latest targets contained within the emerging Local Plan have been included
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley,	Housing Allocations - Page 17. The third paragraph “Following this comprehensive exercise...” will need to be re-written to reflect identification of sufficient allocations to meet need.	The section will be rewritten to demonstrate conformity with the revised housing requirement included in the emerging Local Plan	Change to be made as indicated.



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley- bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449			
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley- bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations - sets out 3 sites which are shown on Figure 2. Site 1: Land North of Bagworth Road. Text says “...for around forty units...”. The examiner of the NP will need certainty of numbers to understand the ability of the housing land supply to meet the housing requirement. HBBC recommends using the words “...for a minimum of...” and include a figure which is the minimum possible taking account of the site requirements. Site 2: Land behind 11-19 Newbold Road. Same comment. Delete the word “...around...” Site 3: Land at Newbold Road. Same comment. Delete the word “...around...”.	HBBC recommendation is noted.  The use of the word ‘around’ provides for flexibility should it be needed and has been used in site allocation policies in several NPs including Medbourne, Ryton on Dunsmore and South Kilworth.  It is not considered necessary to amend the choice of words used.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley- bosworth.gov.uk	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations - One of the national policy tests for allocation of sites is to show that they are deliverable. It is likely an examiner would want to see evidence to support this such as evidence of developer interest	This is not so. The examiner will be considering the NP against the Basic Conditions. There is no need to demonstrate developer interest to evidence that the site is suitable for development.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Borough Council	v.uk; 07468 352449			
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	<p>Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations - Further allocations that could make up the shortfall include two sites allocated in HBBC's Site Allocations &amp; Development Management Plan (SADMP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Garden Farm, ref Site Bar102. Allocated for 64 dwellings however a planning application (Ref 20/00470/FUL) is due to be considered by HBBC Planning Committee shortly for 99 dwellings on a slightly larger site.</li> <li>ii) Spinney Drive, South of Brookside, Ref Bar127PP with capacity for 49 dwellings. It is understood that land issues that had held up development have recently been resolved to make this a deliverable site.</li> </ul> <p>As these are already allocated in the SADMP it would be very unusual not to include them in the Barlestone NP as their status as allocations means the principle of residential development is established.</p> <p>The NP Group can also draw upon the other sites assessed and scored in the Sustainable Site Assessment (Appendix 3).</p>	These allocations will be referenced in the Submission version of the NP.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go	Policy H2, Residential Site Allocations - Fig 2: Residential Allocations. This map serves well to illustrate the locations of the sites in Barlestone. However, it would be helpful for more detailed scale maps, say 1:1000 or 1:500 to show the exact boundaries of all the sites so people will be able to see whether fences, trees, small structures are inside or outside the site.	High resolution versions of all figures will be available on submission of the NP.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Borough Council	v.uk; 07468 352449			
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H3, Figure 3 Settlement Boundary & Policy H4, Windfall Sites - Policy H3 expects development within the Settlement Boundary to respect the character, shape and form of Barlestone, whereas development outside the boundary will be carefully controlled in accordance with local and national policy. Policy H4 (windfall housing) is the only other NP policy to be applied differently according to the Settlement Boundary. HBBC considers that the wording “shape and form” are probably unnecessary as this is likely to be covered by the word “character”. If the NP Group believe “shape and form” means something that would not be covered by “character” this should be explained in the supporting text.	Agreed. We will reword this.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	HBBC defines Settlement Boundaries for all settlements in the Borough with the location of development being inside or outside of the boundary being important for several Borough policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Core Strategy Policy 7 setting out the purpose and service provision for Key Rural Centres, including Barlestone</li> <li>- SADMP Policy DM14, Replacement dwellings</li> <li>- SADMP Policy DM15, Redundant buildings</li> <li>- SADMP Policy DM20, Employment Sites</li> </ul> <p>The only real difference in policy scope between Policy H3 and HBBC policies is the Policy H3 emphasis on development respecting local character, whilst in all other respects Policy H3 defers to Borough policy. This is not a problem.</p>	Points noted. The settlement boundary map will be amended to include BARL02 and BARL27PP. It is expected that HBBC will amend its settlement boundary to align with the NP once the NP has been made in line with the methodology is clearly described in the document	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>However, the NP Settlement Boundary as shown on Figure 3 differs from HBBC's Settlement Boundary as set out in the SADMP page 74 in a number of respects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The housing allocations of BARL02 and BARL27PP are excluded from the settlement. This makes no sense as the principle of development is established and permissions are therefore expected to be granted. The Settlement Boundary should be redrawn to include these sites.</li> <li>• Barlestone proposed housing allocations. These are to be expected as an iteration of planning for Barlestone and HBBC would need to update its Local Plan in due course.</li> <li>• At the western end of the village, the housing estate of Curtis Way is excluded from the NP settlement but included in HBBC's settlement. This is because the housing estate falls outside of the Parish boundary.</li> <li>• Open Spaces included in the NP Settlement Boundary: The cemetery (Ref BARL06), Cunnery Close Amenity Green Space (Ref BARL04), part of Bosworth Road Park (Ref BARL10).</li> <li>• There are a number of other variations: North of Little Mill Close, South of 132 Newbold Road and South of 182 Newbold Road</li> </ul> <p>The variations appear to be about rationalising or straightening a boundary line to iron out irregularities. Such changes could pose uncertainty for the way policies are applied if development proposals are made on land that is on different sides of the boundary line in the two Plans. Ideally, the boundaries ought to be the same.</p>		

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			Otherwise, the rationale for these differences in the NP boundary needs to be set out in the supporting text so that the implications for decision making can be understood.		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H4, Windfall development - Policy H4 and supporting text seeks to do several things under the heading of Windfall development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Criteria for windfall development</li> <li>- Design standards (overlap with Policy H6)</li> <li>- Housing mix</li> <li>- Windfall housing allowance (part of housing supply)</li> </ul> <p>If these policy roles were separated out, it would allow for easier navigation of policy requirements and clearer expression of intentions. For illustration, the Desford NP (referendum version) has 3 separate policies for housing mix, windfall development and design.</p> <p>HBBC comments on particular aspects of Policy H4 and supporting text.</p> <p><u>Windfall development</u></p> <p>The first paragraph of the supporting text states “...further residential development will be restricted to windfall sites wholly within the Settlement Boundary.” This should be part of the policy rather than supporting text as it is a definitive direction on acceptability of different locations for development.</p>	Points noted. It is considered that the policies on windfall and design are clear and are appropriately separated. The policy already says ‘development proposals within the settlement boundary will be supported’.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services;	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan	Policy H4, Windfall development - Policy H4 and supporting text seeks to do several things under the heading of Windfall development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Criteria for windfall development</li> <li>- Design standards (overlap with Policy H6)</li> <li>- Housing mix</li> </ul>	Noted. It is considered that the policies on windfall and design are clear and are appropriately separated. Changes to policies as suggested will be made.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Windfall housing allowance (part of housing supply)</li> </ul> <p>If these policy roles were separated out, it would allow for easier navigation of policy requirements and clearer expression of intentions. For illustration, the Desford NP (referendum version) has 3 separate policies for housing mix, windfall development and design. HBBC comments on particular aspects of Policy H4 and supporting text.</p> <p><u>Design</u> <u>Criterion c)</u> concerning character, is a less detailed duplication of criterion a) of Policy H6. Therefore, it could be deleted.</p> <p>Criterion f) concerning impact on amenity of neighbours would be a better fit under Policy H6. Such impacts should be a consideration for design of all development, not just housing windfall schemes.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	<p>Policy H4, Windfall development - Policy H4 and supporting text seeks to do several things under the heading of Windfall development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Criteria for windfall development</li> <li>- Design standards (overlap with Policy H6)</li> <li>- Housing mix</li> <li>- Windfall housing allowance (part of housing supply)</li> </ul> <p>If these policy roles were separated out, it would allow for easier navigation of policy requirements and clearer expression of intentions. For illustration, the Desford NP (referendum version) has 3 separate policies for housing mix, windfall development and design. HBBC comments on particular aspects of Policy H4 and supporting text.</p>	Noted. It is considered that the policies on windfall and design are clear and are appropriately separated. Housing mix will be separated as suggested.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p><u>Housing mix</u>            Criterion g) would be better packaged as a separate policy. Housing mix is an important aspect of planning for Barlestone that is somewhat underplayed by relegating it to the penultimate criterion of a policy about something else. A separate policy would clearly apply to both development of allocations and windfall sites. As proposed in the draft NP it is rather cumbersome to have to have a cross reference in Policy H2 (Residential Site Allocations) to Policy H4 (Windfall) to see the housing mix requirements. A separate policy would also be better able to articulate any exceptions or nuances for example differences between affordable and market housing and townscape character not being impaired by demanding small dwellings where they are not appropriate and cannot be designed to be sympathetic to their surroundings.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Appendix 2 - In terms of the evidence to justify the housing mix requirement, Appendix 2 Midlands Rural Housing Need Survey concludes slightly different size requirements for affordable compared with market housing. The need for market housing is more toward 2 & 3 bedroom dwellings whereas the need for affordable is more toward 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings. This could be drawn out in a separate policy on housing mix.	Agreed; a policy on Housing Mix will be incorporated	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley,	Windfall allowance The last paragraph of the section, coming immediately after Policy H4 sets out a windfall allowance of 1.5 dwellings p.a. over a plan period to 2036. Although this	Agreed; changes will be made as suggested	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	does have a relationship with the windfall development Policy H4, its main role is to serve as a deduction from the housing requirement to help establish how much housing needs to be allocated. As such, this paragraph would best sit in the section on housing need, but with adjustments for the 2020-39 period as recommended above.		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H4, Windfall Sites - the expectation for development to meet “...all Development Plan requirements...” is not strictly necessary, because it is always expected that development proposals comply with all relevant policies of the development plan (Local Plans and made Neighbourhood Plans).	Noted, however reinforcing this requirement is not in conflict with the Basic Conditions so we would prefer it remains.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H5, Affordable Housing - P.21 Paragraph 2. Last sentence. The rural housing premium is explained in Appendix 2, not Appendix 4. The sentence could easily add an explanation after the words “rural housing premium”, “...(ie the higher price of rural compared with urban housing)...”. This would save readers having to look up what it means. Appendix 2 actually quotes “£55,000” for East Midlands.	Agreed; to be amended	Change to be made as indicated.



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H5, Affordable Housing - The information in the Housing and Economic Development Need Assessment 2017 has been superseded by the HBBC Housing Needs Study It is noted that the NP states, "...or any more recent document updating...these reports...", but it would still be worth referring to the latest evidence available in the submission draft of the NP. The supporting paragraph of the NP has reference to the abbreviated housing needs study. This ought to set out the full title as per Policy H5 itself.	Agreed; latest document to be referred to	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H5, Affordable Housing - The last paragraph refers to 30% total site requirement for affordable housing, whereas Policy H5 requires 40% of the site area. HBBC's Core Strategy Policy H15 requires 40% of total dwellings on a site to be affordable which is how most affordable housing policies in England are structured. If the requirement relates to site area, this could allow developers to avoid full provision by including low density dwellings, open space and undevelopable parts of sites in the 40%. Hence, HBBC recommends that the NP requires 40% of total dwellings to be consistent with HBBC policy.	Agreed; total site requirement to be changed to 40%	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-	Policy H5, Affordable Housing - The requirement of parts a) and b) of Policy H5 could be simplified. Reading from the opening line of the policy, "Affordable housing will be provided on development sites as follows:" Part a) could then say "...to consist of 40% of dwellings...". Part b) could then say "...to meet the current and future needs of the parish..."	Agreed. We will amend the tenure split as proposed. We note the "First Homes" consultation and will review the plan an appropriate time.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Bosworth Borough Council	bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	<p>Regarding Part a) expecting affordable housing on all sites of 4 dwellings or more, national policy now only allows affordable housing to be required for sites of 10 or more dwellings.</p> <p>Regarding the affordable housing tenure split, both the last paragraph and part b) of Policy H5 require 80% social and affordable rented homes and 20% intermediate / low cost starter / other home ownership products. This is out of kilter with HBBC's Core Strategy Policy H15 requirement of 75% social rented and 25% intermediate housing. An eye also needs to be given to the Government's expected policy changes concerning "First Homes" that were consulted on in 2020.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H5, Affordable Housing - The above comments would make Policy H5 consistent with HBBC affordable housing policy, but it would involve a lot of duplication. An alternative approach would be to cross reference the policy requirement of HBBC and set out locally distinctive policy expectations, for example the need for affordable bungalows, and other particular needs evidenced in the Parish Survey and the type of local connections expected.	Noted. It is important that the NP policy states the requirements in the event that HBBC falls below its 5-year land supply.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR;	Policy H6 Design - criterion b). This could be onerous for infill development, particularly in the older parts of the village where extensive off street car parking would not be possible or would jar with the historic character of the surroundings. Perhaps an exception could be written into the policy or supporting text to cover this eventuality?	We wish to retain the policy because of the problems with existing stock. It is important that development does not exacerbate the problem.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Whilst the lack of public transport is noted, the requirement for 4 off street car parking spaces for a four bedroom dwelling is excessive. The Leicestershire Highway Design Guide for rural areas sets a standard of 3 spaces for 4 bedroomed dwellings for schemes of up to 5 dwellings (para 3.173).		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H6 Design - Criterion c). What is meant by protecting “elevations”? It seems out of context, in between protecting trees and hedges.	We will remove the word ‘elevations’.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H6 Design - Criterion d). Could the supporting text explain what level of provision is necessary to determine that a proposal is acceptable? There are measurement standards for energy and water efficiency. Does the NP expect these to be higher than what is required as standard through the Building Regulations? For development to be acceptable, how many renewable/low carbon energy technologies will a development have to have?	The policy does not specify the extent of the sustainable design measures – as the policy states, this needs to be considered to a degree that is proportionate to the scale of the development. It will be up to the applicant to demonstrate how this has been taken into account in the proposal but must be to a minimum of the building regulations in force at that time.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H6 Design - Criterion f). The use of “permeable surfaces” could be added as a further example of sustainable drainage	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy H6 Design - Criterion g) could be combined with criterion e) as the subject matter is almost the same?	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-	5.2 Natural & Historic Environment - P24. Typo in 1st paragraph under Landscape, geology and setting, “...scattered tress..” should be “trees”	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Bosworth Borough Council	bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449			
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	5.2 Natural & Historic Environment - P27 – 29 Environmental Inventory and Local Green Spaces. Seems to be a thorough assessment of open spaces using the NPPF criteria and a well written policy. Table ENV1 does not need to be in the NP; it would fit better within the Environmental Inventory evidence (Appendix 6). Is there any reason why Old Pasture (ref 2001) in Appendix 6 and Appendix 8 is not included in Policy ENV1 and Figure 6?	Agreed. Table ENV1 has been moved to appendix 6c. Old Pasture (2001) to be added to Policy ENV1 and figure 6 as they were omitted in error.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	ENV2, Protection of Sites of Historical Environmental Significance - It is not explicit within the policy wording that these sites are considered to be non-designated heritage assets. The following words are suggested: “The sites listed and mapped (figure 7.1) are <i>non-designated local heritage assets</i> and have been identified as being of significance for their historical environmental features (built heritage or archaeology)...”	We do not believe it is necessary to refer to these sites as non-designated heritage assets.  Fig 7.1 shows all historical environmental site assets, not just NDHAs.  Of these, the ones which are not already covered by higher-level policies are on the LCC Historic Environment Records (HER) database, where they are not described as NDHAs.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley,	ENV2, Protection of Sites of Historical Environmental Significance - The last sentence of this policy (To be supported, development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the development’s value outweighs the	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	historic significance of the site of features) does not conform with or and reflect the provisions of Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies DM11 and DM12 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD as it does not instigate a balanced approach when assessing the significance of the non-designated heritage asset against the benefits of the proposal; the need for the value of a proposal to outweigh significance of a non-designated heritage asset to obtain support is a weight that should be afforded to designated heritage assets only in the planning balance. To accord with the NPPF and SADMP DPD it is strongly suggested that this last sentence is amended so a balanced approach is specified in the policy, utilising the format of paragraph 197 of the NPPF. Suggested options are to draft wording similar to that contained within Policy ENV 5: Local Heritage Assets on this plan, or to utilise the suggested policy wording for a very similar policy as proposed within the emerging Witherley NDP, which has been prepared by the same consultant. For reference the wording from the Witherley NDP is: <i>The historical and cultural significance of the sites and the features present on them should be balanced against the local benefit of any development that would affect or damage them.</i> Another further option would be wording similar to that contained in Policy S7: Local Heritage Assets of the Sheepy NDP, this being a made plan within the HBBC area.		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy –	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10	The environmental inventory (contained within Appendix 6), which informs the sites identified within Policy ENV 2 is quite hard to navigate as the sites are ordered by score ranking. Could they also be presented in numerical order of their reference numbers to aid with identification?	Appendix 6 has been split into 6a (by score order) and 6b (by field reference) – plus 6c as above for the scoring matrix methodology. Given these changes plus the changes made to address accessibility issues, the suggestion of	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Figure 7.1 identifies the sites of historic environmental significance with a site number cross-referenced back to the environmental inventory. For further ease of identification consideration should be given to listing the sites for protection within the Policy and providing simple information such as the site address/location and the reasoning as to why each site is of significance.	providing more information regarding listing of sites for protection should be addressed	
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV3, Protection of Sites of Natural Environmental Significance - The same comments apply as for ENV2 that it would be helpful for the policy to list the sites to be protected according to category with site address and reasoning for inclusion.	This is considered unnecessary - the information/evidence is already provided, on the map ('address'/location) and in the inventory ('reasoning').	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV4. Important Open Spaces. Fig 8 - Policy ENV4 is very similar to Policy DM8 of the Local Plan. The criteria for development exceptions have broadly comparable intentions but different wording. Duplication could be avoided if ENV4 takes Policy DM8 as the starting point and sets out the differences of emphasis applicable to the open spaces in Barlestone. The list of open spaces in ENV4 seems to mirror the list for Barlestone in the SADMP although Meadow Road Amenity Spaces (BARL14) are not included. The reasoning for differences ought to be explained, including if there are any differences to boundaries.	The policy wording is based on the NPPF so we consider it to be an appropriate policy.  The Meadow Road Amenity Space to be added to Figure 8.	Change to be made as identified.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Listed Buildings - P.35. The sentence New development will be required to take into account their settings, as defined on a case by case basis with Historic England should be amended as there are some errors – in particular the reference to Historic England defining setting (ordinarily it is the local planning authority that do this), and also direct impacts as well as impacts on the settings of listed buildings should also be acknowledged. HBBC suggests that the wording of this sentence should be amended to: <i>The Neighbourhood Development Plan notes that proposed development is required to take into account the direct impact upon the significance of listed buildings and also the effects upon their setting. Their location within, or close to, sites designated or noted for protection in the Plan's Policies can contribute to evidence of their significance.</i>	Agreed; sentence amended	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Local Heritage assets & Policy ENV5 - P.35. The first sentence of the section Local Heritage Assets is limited geographically by the reference to the built environment of Barlestone. As some proposed local heritage assets are located outside of the built environment of the village and within the wider Parish (such as a farmhouses) HBBC suggest the wording <i>in the built environment of Barlestone</i> is amended to <i>in the Neighbourhood Plan area</i> .	Agreed; sentence amended	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley,	Local Heritage assets & Policy ENV5 - Reference to footnote 63 of the NPPF within the last sentence of this section should be removed as it is not relevant or appropriate in seeking the preservation of local heritage	Agreed, wording altered.	Change to be made as indicated.



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	assets (footnote 63 concerns substantial harm to or loss of non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments being wholly exceptional within the planning balance). HBBC suggests that this last sentence is significantly altered to wording such as (or similar to): <i>Inclusion in the Plan records them in order that any effects upon their significance arising from a development proposal are a material planning consideration.</i>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV5. The reference to the layout and characteristic mix of architectural styles contained within part of the first sentence to Policy ENV 5 is very specific and does not cover the wider range of reasons as to why local heritage assets in the Parish are important, as has been included within Appendix 9 and partially included within the context on page 35 (with reference to architectural, historical or social reasons within this section). HBBC suggests simplifying and amending this first part of Policy ENV 5 to: <i>The structures and buildings listed here (and within figure 9) are important to the Parish and their features and settings will be protected wherever possible.</i>	Agreed, wording altered.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Regarding the list of local heritage assets identified within this policy and within Appendix 9 their inclusion is welcomed by HBBC; there is broad consistency with the Council’s adopted selection criteria for identifying local heritage assets reflecting the collaborative work undertaken by HBBC’s conservation officer and the Group over the preparation of the NP. However, some recommended improvements are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The text for each entry contained within Appendix 9 could be made much more concise and also have greater consistency with the entries drafted by</li> </ul>	Additional justification will be added for the reasoning the NP includes heritage assets deleted from the original list provided by H&BBC	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>HBBC's conservation officer as part of the preparation of the draft HBBC Local Heritage List. These drafted entries were sent to Cathie Watkins of the Group on 12th March 2020 (HBBC can make copies available on request). HBBC recommends that the format and content of Appendix 9 should be amended to reflect the draft entries sent on this date unless the Group have any specific reasons for not wanting to follow this approach.</p> <p>Throughout the assessment process of drafting the HBBC local heritage list and identifying possible local heritage assets within Barlestone Parish the HBBC conservation officer provided advice to the Group as to whether the identification of certain assets was justified against the HBBC selection criteria. Towards the end of the process he suggested five entries be removed because there was not of enough interest or value to warrant identification. This was set out in an email sent to Cathie Watkins on the 25th of March 2020; again HBBC can make copies available on request. These entries will not be included in the final draft of the HBBC Local Heritage List. The entries suggested for removal have been included within Policy ENV 5 and the text of the HBBC conservation officer's email has been quoted verbatim in red within Appendix 9 for each entry. HBBC strongly suggests that either these entries are removed from the Plan or alternatively if the Group feel their inclusion is warranted then provide additional justification including why they are of interest/value and what makes them special.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy);	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road,	Policy ENV7, Notable trees, woodland and hedges - Planning policy cannot protect trees and hedgerows from works or from felling; only a Tree Preservation Order or	Agreed, wording amended.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley- bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Conservation Area designation can do that. HBBC suggests the second sentence of the policy: “They should be protected from felling, uprooting or damage, including by development proposals, unless they are independently judged by a qualified arboriculturalist to present an unmanageable public safety risk or their retention is impossible. The principles of mitigation and biodiversity net gain should be applied where loss is unavoidable, in line with NPPF para 32.” be re-written as follows: <i>“Any proposals for new development should seek to incorporate existing trees and hedgerows. Any proposals which result in the loss of trees and hedgerow should be accompanied by an Arboricultural Survey to assess the quality of the tree and or hedgerow. Where removal is required replacement planting will be required elsewhere on the site”</i>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley- bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV8, Biodiversity & Habitat Connectivity - This section is broadly consistent with HBBC Core Strategy Policy 20 and Figure 12 gives additional detail to the Biodiversity Improvement Area illustrated on the Key Diagram. A cross reference ought to be made in the supporting text to the Bagworth to Market Bosworth Multifunctional Corridor which is the green infrastructure corridor that spans Barlestone NP area identified in Policy 20.	Agreed. We will provide the cross reference.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy);	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road,	Policy ENV8, Biodiversity & Habitat Connectivity - The second part of Policy ENV8 could seek to promote improvements to habitat connectivity as well as prevent	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	harm from development. Wording could be added as suggested in italics: “Development proposals should not damage or adversely affect, and where possible should seek to positively improve the habitat connectivity provided by the wildlife corridors identified on the map (figure 12).		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV9, Bats - As written the policy applies to all development proposals. Should minor alterations that do not involve lighting be excluded? Regarding part d) can the policy or supporting text give advice on the usual expected ratio of bat boxes?	The policy applies to all development and ‘agreed ratio’ refers to ‘current best practice’ – we will clarify this.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV10, Rights of Way - expects “appropriate mitigation” where development has a significant adverse effect on public rights of way. What is regarded as “appropriate” could be the subject of disagreement. Therefore, it would be useful if the supporting text could give some guidance on the form and level of mitigation expected. For example, if a path needs to be re-routed, consider ease of use (width, surface, gradient), visual attractiveness, safety etc.	It is not possible to cover every eventuality in the policy so this has to be left to the applicant to make the case and for the determination to take this into account when making the decision.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV11, Flood Risk - P44 paragraph 1. It is not clear what is meant by permitted development proposals in this context. There are a huge range of permitted development rights and only some have flood risk implications. This ought to be explained.	Agreed This should be changed to ‘approved development proposals’.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV11, Flood Risk - Second paragraph refers to Policy ENVx which needs updating to ENV11	Agreed, to be updated	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-	Policy ENV11, Flood Risk - applies to development proposals “of an appropriate scale” and “where relevant”. To avoid dispute about what type/size of development that the policy applies to, the supporting text needs to explain how “appropriate scale” can be gauged and the type of developments that will be “relevant” and why.	The policy is intended to avoid applications relating to extensions and porches, but this is to be determined at planning application stage.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Bosworth Borough Council	bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449			
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV11, Flood Risk - Regarding criterion c) is it clear what a “hydrological study” should report on? Should the scope of such study be proportionate to the scale of development so that it is not onerous for small developments? The supporting text should provide guidance on this. Has the NP Group considered making a policy requirement for Flood Risk Assessments which the NPPF advises on applicability to different type/size of development in footnote 50 (para 164)?	The policy introduction says ‘of appropriate scale and where relevant so this is covered.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV12, Important Views - It is useful to have the photographs and description of what is important in the identified views set out in Appendix 13. Comments on individual views are as follows:  1. From the picture, the view of buildings surrounding the village centre is pleasant and attractive, but is a short distance view, quite different to the others. Is this justified as a panorama when only one direction of view is provided in the evidence?  2a The photograph shows an attractive view of the boardwalk with watercourse. But is this justified as a panorama when only one direction of view is provided in the evidence?	Additional images and further explanation of the reasons for choosing views as “important” to be added to Appendix 13.	Changes to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>2b The photograph does not show any lakes which are implied by its title. Is this justified as a panorama when only one direction of view is provided in the evidence? It should be noted that a westward view from this location would look across the Garden Farm housing site which is allocated in the HBBC SADMP. The principle of housing development on this site is already established. The views from 2a and 2b therefore ought to be looking eastwards rather than panoramic.</p> <p>3. The photograph may not do justice to the view, which appears as a flat field with some woodland in the distance.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy ENV12, Important Views - says proposals must not significantly harm the following views or their viewpoints. The attractiveness of a view is quite a subjective matter, but would the supporting text be able to offer any guidance or examples of the type of developments that might significantly harm the views, and equally of developments that would not significantly harm the views? Regarding the protection afforded to the viewpoints, the precision of viewpoint locations is uncertain from the schematic nature of the map symbols, and if practically the same view is possible from other points, should this affect the balance of judgement in a planning decision? More guidance in the supporting text on how to apply the policy in this regard would be helpful.	This detail for officers / committee to consider on a case-by-case basis. Too prescriptive a policy might also provide inadvertent loophole. Appendix 13 will be enhanced with additional images and further explanation as above.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy);	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road,	Policy ENV12, Important Views - Figure 15 refers incorrectly to Appendix 12	Noted; appendix number changed	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449			
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	5.3 Community Facilities - The list of facilities on pages 47-50 seems comprehensive and provides more detail than HBBC's SADMP. Regular review of the NP will be required to keep this up-to-date.	Noted	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Policy CFA1 - Policy CFA1 is very similar to Policy DM25 of the Local Plan. The criteria for development exceptions have broadly comparable intentions but different wording. Duplication could be avoided if CFA1 takes Policy DM25 as the starting point and sets out any differences of emphasis or additional considerations applicable to Barlestone. There is also duplication of NP Policy ENV4 in protecting important open spaces of the recreation ground and village park listed in Policy CFA1.	Noted. The policy relates to the specific local facilities and amenities so appropriately reflects local need.	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy CFA2 – New and Improved Community Facilities. In criterion b) consider replacing the word “disturbance” with “loss of amenity”. The word “amenity” is regularly used in planning to mean all impacts on wellbeing of neighbours, which is broader than “disturbance” which perhaps implies only noise, vibration and coming-and-goings.	Agreed; wording changed	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policies CFA3 Doctor’s Surgery and CFA4 School and Pre-School Facilities. It is helpful for the NP to plan for expansion and improvement of these facilities anticipating additional demand generated by future housing growth. The traffic and transport chapter also highlights some parking and road improvements. The NP Group should consider whether a separate section on infrastructure is needed to set out how improvements listed throughout the plan could be funded and delivered. There is potential to seek contributions from major housing developments where new demands on facilities are generated, although the level of funding will be limited by the overall viability of development. Therefore, a section on infrastructure would offer opportunity for Barlestone to set out a ranking of priorities for new infrastructure. The NP could rely on HBBC’s Policy DM3 as the basis for requiring contributions from new development, or could draft its own policy with more detail tailored to the needs of Barlestone.	Section on infrastructure to be added with requirements prioritised dependent on each development site.	Changes to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policies CFA3 Doctor’s Surgery and CFA4 School and Pre-School Facilities. Regarding Policy CFA3 criterion a) is there a special reason for school buses to park near the Doctor’s Surgery?	School buses do not need to park near the doctor’s surgery; requirement to be removed.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy CFA4 School and Pre-School Facilities - criterion d), repeats the concern about residential amenity expressed in criterion c) expressed differently. The level of tolerable adverse impact needs to be clarified, and whether it is a concern to residents or other uses also needs to be clarified.	Agreed – policy to be reworded.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-	Policies CFA3 Doctor’s Surgery and CFA4 School and Pre-School Facilities - The NP group could also consider whether criteria a) in both policies should also say “easily” accessible as well as “safely” accessible? That would give priority to more centrally located sites if available.	Agreed, wording to be amended	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Bosworth Borough Council	bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449			
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Traffic and Transport - The introductory historical narrative about frustrated efforts to tackle speeding and parking over pages 54 and 55 is somewhat long and anecdotal. The consultation feedback is useful in framing the concerns about parking and speeding, and the list of location specific issues on pages 56 and 57 is useful to pinpoint where the problems are. The five paragraphs under “Possible solutions to the Car Parking Problems within the Village”, concentrate more on obstacles and frustrations. It is not very clear what the preferred solutions are, although the options of identifying land and seeking developer contributions are mentioned. Should these options link through into the Community Action TR1? See also comments above on Policies CFA3 & CFA4 concerning infrastructure funding and prioritising.	Section to be re-worded including identification of the key areas of concern.	Changes to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	The proposed one-way system is presented as a solution to congestion and parking. Further discussion with County Highways is planned. HBBC recommends that the feasibility and deliverability of the proposed scheme are fully examined before the NP is submitted so that a definitive way forward can be set out in the plan.	It will not be possible to resolve this within the timescales for the completion of the NP, hence its inclusion as a community action.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy TR2 - The electric vehicle charging policy TR2 is welcomed in anticipation of increases in the use of electric vehicles over the next decade. Where new dwellings are expected to provide parking spaces for more than one car, should sufficient charging capacity be required for all the cars?	No this is not necessary – there are many different types of charging facilities, the policy only requires the cabling to be provided, which could serve multiple outlets.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy TR3 Footpaths. There is significant overlap with the rights of way policy ENV10 particularly concerning improved provision of footpaths. Consider merging into one policy. It would be helpful if a schedule of desire lines for any new paths and locations for improvements could be drawn up and illustrated on a map. See also comments above on Policies CFA3 and CFA4 concerning infrastructure improvement.	The desired location of any new footpaths will depend on the design of any development and hence cannot be specified at this time; this will be clarified in Policy TR3.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-	Business and employment - P.62 1st paragraph, last line. "...eventually close..." should be "closed". 2nd paragraph: delete "of" from "The site employed of around 10 people..."	Agreed, wording to be changed	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Bosworth Borough Council	bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449			
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Policy BE1. Could another exception be where the business function of the land or premises would not be undermined by an alternative use on an underused part of the land or floor space, for example living above the shop?	Agreed, additional exception to be added	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Policy BE2. Criterion a). It is not entirely clear what is meant by “...within the boundary of planned limits of development for the Barlestone Parish...”? Does this mean the Settlement Boundary defined in Figure 3 and Policy H3, or something more flexible?	It does. The words will be changed to ‘settlement boundary’.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley,	Policy BE2. Criterion e) Could the benefits of change of use of a dwelling to a commercial use sometimes outweigh the harm? For example, for dwellings located appropriately in the centre of the village change of use could enable	We cannot envisage a situation where a dwelling could be converted to business use without causing harm to residential amenity.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley- bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	introduction of a shop or service of value to the community. Some dwellings may have originally operated as shops or other businesses.	On balance, we would prefer to keep the policy as it is ...	
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley- bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy BE2. Homeworking. Second paragraph. Replace the word “now” with a date or time period, for example “...at the beginning of the 2020s...”. That will make more sense when the NP is read in 5 years’ time or later.	Agreed. Will change to say ‘this number has increased’.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley- bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy BE3. The supporting text to Policy BE3 should note that working from home and using the home as an office do not require planning permission and many house extensions and buildings in the garden will count as “permitted development” and not require planning permission either. This policy therefore needs to be applicable to proposals where planning permission is required.	We think this is understood – the policy will only apply when there is a planning application to be determined.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Policy BE4: Farm Diversification. The policy is quite permissive of building conversions providing that adverse impacts are tolerable as set out in the criteria a) – e). Policies of HBBC are generally more restrictive, including SADMP policies DM5 (rural worker accommodation), DM15 (redundant rural buildings) and DM20 (provision of employment sites). Criterion a) needs further explanation in the supporting text of what is meant by uses “appropriate” to a rural location.	We do not believe it is necessary to list what is appropriate as it could be used to imply that the list is inclusive and there will always be potential exceptions.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Monitoring and Review - The neighbourhood plan should mirror the plan period of HBBC to 2039 rather than 2036 as stated.	This recent change in timescales will be reflected in the NP	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-	The NP does not deal with demand for self-build in the area. HBBC record 72 people on the register at 30th October 2020. One stated a desire to build in Barlestone and 21 others specified a rural location.	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Bosworth Borough Council	bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449			
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	There is no policy or other recognition of the village centre. The centre is designated a “local centre” in HBBC’s SADMP with Policy DM22 to protect vitality. National Government introduced a new use class (Class E) in 2020 which groups most town centre uses and other business and community uses together so planning permission is no longer required to change between these uses. This means that policies that seek to protect concentrations of shops in centres may no longer be efficacious. The NP has Policy CFA1 to protect facilities that the local community value wherever they are located in the village. Barlestone NP Group might consider whether any vision or strategy for the village local centre is needed? This could include any need for extension, contraction or physical enhancement of the centre.	The Review section will be changed to include drawing up a vision/strategy for the village “local centre” in the future as designated in the Hinckley & Bosworth Site Allocations & Development Management Plan.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	There is no reference to climate change, Solar Farms or wind farms which are in many of the other Plans	The NP covers a wide range of environmental and design issues which will impact on climate change.	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Paragraph numbering is essential. When plans are used for determining planning applications it is necessary to reference supporting text. Paragraph numbering makes the process of referencing paragraphs much easier and removes uncertainty about identifying the intended paragraph and text.	It is not essential. Many NPs have passed examination without using paragraph numbering.  For development management, it is the policies themselves that will be most important, and they are all numbered.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	The green colour of the policy text is not easy to read because of its lightness; it lacks contrast with the white background.	The policy text colour will be changed in order to address accessibility requirements.	Changes to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-	In the recent Burbage Examiner’s Report it was recommended that where the NP makes reference to adopted Borough Council Local Plan policies, these should be removed as they repeat policy. This recommendation was agreed and taken forward. The NP is an opportunity to refine and add more detail to general policy requirements, particularly where local circumstances give reason to apply a general policy requirement differently.	Noted. Different Examiners have different requirements that are about style and will change from examiner to examiner.  The inclusion of references to adopted strategic policies does not impact on the meeting of the Basic Conditions, which is the subject of the Examination.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Bosworth Borough Council	bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Sometimes, it will be appropriate to list relevant local circumstances or features that ought to be taken into account when applying a Local Plan policy. Such matters may be better set out in the supporting text with appropriate cross references to relevant policy.		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	The need for evidence is outlined in Planning Practice Guidance and this sets out that proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. Planning policies need to be based on clear planning rationale and proper understanding of the place they relate to, if they are to be relevant, realistic and to address local issues effectively. The data and analysis about a place is called the evidence base. This can include social, economic and environmental data.	Noted	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Site Selection Appendix 3 is the Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA) - Paragraph 1.3 refers to a housing need of about 50 additional dwellings between 2016 and 2036. Based on the latest housing requirement for HBBC and apportionment to settlements by population, the housing requirement for Barlestone should be 214 dwellings for the plan period of 2020 – 39 (see comments on Housing Need above).	The latest numbers for housing from the emerging Local Plan have been incorporated into the Housing Need section of the plan. Appendix 3 was prepared in July 2020 and reflects the numbers from that time.	Change to be made as indicated.
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy);	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road,	Site Selection Appendix 3 is the Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA) - The SSA framework set out in Table 1 provides a useful	The site capacity was judged against the housing requirement as set out at the time.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	systematic means of assessing site options according to generally well established planning criteria used by YourLocale. Some observations on the criteria are as follows: 1. Site capacity. Although it may be a local community preference for smaller sites, it is not axiomatic that larger sites are inappropriate in planning terms per se. This will depend on site circumstances.	It is entirely appropriate for NPs to set their own local criteria to help determine the most appropriate local sites for development.	
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Site Selection Appendix 3 is the Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA) - - The SSA framework set out in Table 1 provides a useful systematic means of assessing site options according to generally well established planning criteria used by YourLocale. Some observations on the criteria are as follows: 3. Adjoining uses. The criteria could be better explained with regard to site location in relation to the village envelope. Green is clearly within the village envelope. Amber could be read as adjoining the outside or adjoining the inside of the village envelope. If the latter, there is little difference with Green. Red could be read as adjoining the outside of the existing village envelope (which would be the same as the “adjoining outside” interpretation of Amber) or free-standing beyond the village envelope.	Noted. The criteria have been applied consistently and has resulted in a prioritised ranking list. It is not necessary to provide further clarification at this stage in the process, and changing the criteria would result in a need to re-run the assessment process which is unnecessary.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR;	Site Selection Appendix 3 is the Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA) - - The SSA framework set out in Table 1 provides a useful systematic means of assessing site options according to generally well established planning criteria used by	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	YourLocale. Some observations on the criteria are as follows: 22. Public Rights of Way. Re-routing of a PRW / bridle path would be a form of mitigation which fits better under the intentions for the Amber category rather than Red.		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Site Selection Appendix 3 is the Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA) - - The SSA framework set out in Table 1 provides a useful systematic means of assessing site options according to generally well established planning criteria used by YourLocale. Some observations on the criteria are as follows: 26. Flooding. In parts of the country with high flood risk zones (river flooding) flooding considerations ought to provide an initial sieving of site options through sequential testing, as is required by national planning policy, rather than forming part of a scoring matrix. If sites are in functional flood plains they have to be ruled out, period. If sites are in flood zones 2 or 3 they have to be subject to a sequential test and ruled out if there are sites of lower risk available. Where there is very little river flood risk, as is the case with Barlestone, the scoring for flood zones (river flooding) would be better replaced with a scoring relevant to surface water flooding.	Noted	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services;	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghlan	Site Selection Appendix 3 is the Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA) - - The SSA framework set out in Table 1 provides a useful systematic means of assessing site options according to generally well established planning criteria used by YourLocale. Some observations on the criteria are as follows:	The Examiner will want to be assured that the sites selected are developable and deliverable.  The Examiner will not test the soundness of the decisions taken.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Scoring – from Appendix 3 it is not possible to see how different sites were scored on the 27 criteria and whether greater weight was given to particular criteria. This needs to be made transparent as different interests may have different opinions on the scoring and will want to understand how it was done. Whilst it is right and proper for Barlestone to be making its own choice of which sites to include in the NP, the examiner of the submitted plan will want to be satisfied that the process of selection has been open, fair and based on sound planning judgements.		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Site Selection Appendix 3 is the Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA) - - The SSA framework set out in Table 1 provides a useful systematic means of assessing site options according to generally well established planning criteria used by YourLocale. Some observations on the criteria are as follows: Mapping. It needs to be possible to see the location and size of the sites assessed.	This is not an essential requirement.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go	Site Selection Appendix 3 is the Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA) - - The SSA framework set out in Table 1 provides a useful systematic means of assessing site options according to generally well established planning criteria used by YourLocale. Some observations on the criteria are as follows: Two HBBC Allocated Sites (Garden Farm BARL02 and South of Brookside BARL27PP) have been included in the SSA even though they have been tested through the Local Plan	The sites will be referenced within the housing requirement section.	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Borough Council	v.uk; 07468 352449	examination and allocated. As stated in comments under Housing Allocations above, it will make sense to include them in the NP as they already exist as allocations.		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Appendix 2 Midlands Rural Housing Need Survey sets out good evidence of need for market dwellings (generally 2-3 bed sizes, with an emphasis on bungalows) and affordable housing (generally 1-2 bed sizes for social rent and mainly 2 bed sizes for shared ownership). This is all useful evidence to inform the housing mix policy in the NP.	Noted. Thank you for these comments.	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Developmen t Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghla n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	Appendix 4 Housing Needs Survey conducted by YourLocale notes the relatively smaller proportion of 1 bed dwellings in Barlestone compared with other areas and the high level of under occupation of larger dwellings. This is all useful evidence to inform the housing mix policy in the NP.	Noted	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy –	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10	Appendix 8 provides a summary of the evidence for proposing Local Green Spaces and Appendix 6 provides a scoring of open spaces against criteria for designation as Local Green Spaces. Is there any reason why the Old Pasture open space (ref 2001) is not proposed for	The Old Pasture will be included as it was omitted in error	Change to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	designation as a Local Green Space? In Appendix 6 Old Pasture scores the same as The Boardwalk (ref 1015) and in Appendix 8 it is written up along with the three Local Green Spaces that are included in Policy ENV1.		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	Generally the maps are of a good standard and an appropriate scale for their purpose. Detailed comments are made about individual mapping issues above.	Noted	None
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 OFR; robin.coghlan@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk; 07468 352449	As per the new Accessibility Act, all documents published on publically accessible websites must comply with the Website Accessibility Directive (2018). The Borough Council now has to comply with this directive, and this means that's all council websites (and documents on that website available for download) must be accessible to customers who may have a disability. These disabilities include: hearing impairment/deaf, visual impairment/blind, mobility issues, dexterity issue (for example difficulty using their hands) and cognitive disability (for example dyslexia or autism). This means that all PDF, Word and Excel documents published on our website after Sep 2018 must comply. Overall all the	The NP documentation and web site will be changed in order to comply with accessibility requirements.	Changes to be made as indicated.

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>documents on the HBBC website must comply by the end of 2020. HBBC has an obligation to make sure any new documents meet the criteria, and <b>it is the responsibility of the author to create an accessible document.</b></p> <p>If you have Microsoft Word 2016 or newer an easy way to check accessibility in a word document is as follows: Click on File in the top left corner, go to Info, and click on Check for Issues under the Inspect Document function. You can then click on Check Accessibility. This will scan the document for any areas that may be difficult for people to read if they are using specific software to read the document out loud etc.</p> <p>Unfortunately HBBC does not have the resources to amend documents for you, so please ensure that all neighbourhood plan documents, including the plan itself, comply with the accessibility standards before submitting the plan to the LPA at Regulation 15 ready for the Regulation 16 Consultation. If HBBC finds that there are extensive parts of the plan that have not been checked for their accessibility, the plan will be returned to the group. Prior to formal submission (Reg 15) it would be advisable for the group to send the document to the Local Planning Authority to do an initial check that the document is accessible. The LPA can then raise any further areas for amendment with the group before it is formally submitted.</p>		
Robin Coghlan	Planning Officer (Policy); Planning Policy – Development Services;	Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics, LE10 0FR; robin.coghla	It is helpful that the Barlestone NP shows community proposals distinctively from planning policies. These enable community wishes, desires and intentions to be set out that rely upon mechanisms other than the planning system for their achievement, for example grant funding or commitments of other bodies such as the highway authority. By using a different name (Community Action	Noted	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	n@hinckley- bosworth.go v.uk; 07468 352449	XXX) and different coloured font these are clearly distinguished from the planning policies, which will help the planning authority responsible for planning decisions.		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershir e County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	Policy ENV 11; Flood Risk (P45) - a-f The LLFA welcomes the views to support of resilience and consideration to future climate change in accordance with EA guidance, along with the inclusion of sustainable drainage systems and actively encourages (where possible) their incorporation into new developments.	Noted	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershir e County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	Policy ENV 11; Flood Risk (P45) - The LLFA welcomes the support for proposals for flood risk resilience in accordance with National Planning Policy.	Noted	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershir e County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	Policy H6, Design Standards - f) 'Development should incorporate sustainable drainage systems such as use of water butts and balancing ponds to retard surges and to minimise the vulnerability to flooding and poor drainage.' The LLFA welcomes the inclusion of this policy	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	Policy BE4, Farm Diversification - e) 'There is no significant adverse impact on neighbours through noise, light or other pollution, increased traffic levels or increased flood risk.' The LLFA welcomes the inclusion of the above policy.	Noted	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth. Like very many local authorities, the County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding. To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>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>		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	In regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped ie they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.	Noted	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	<p>The County Council are fully aware of flooding that has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding, review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a statutory consultee on major planning applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure that the onsite drainage systems are designed in accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage solution.</p> <p>The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation.</li> <li>• Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development.</li> <li>• Require development to resolve existing flood risk.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)).</li> <li>• Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map).</li> </ul>	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk.</li> </ul>		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.	Noted. SuDS were referenced in the pre-submission NP however additional references have been added	Change to be made as indicated.
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.	Noted. The protection of Watercourses features in the NP	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies. For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning Practice Guidance webpage. Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals. Risk of flooding from surface water map: <a href="https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map">https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</a> Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): <a href="https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/">https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</a>	Noted	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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 enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations, where applicable. North Kilworth Adopted Plan (www.leicestershirecommunities.co.uk) Great Glen Adopted Plan (leicestershirecommunities.co.uk)	Noted. It was not felt necessary to include a policy on developer contributions.	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities	County Hall, Leicester Road,	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	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	; Leicestershire County Council	Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	decisions on mineral and waste development. Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood. You should also be aware of Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan. 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.		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; <a href="mailto:nik.green@leics.gov.uk">nik.green@le ics.gov.uk</a> ; 0116 305 7309	Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two-mile (primary) and three-mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places.  It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school.  However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
			every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and that development seeks to include bungalows etc of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.	Noted. This is appropriately referenced in the housing section of the NP	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	Policy H6: Design Standards. The design policy is strong but could be further strengthened by mentioning appropriate provisions for the storage of waste and recycling.	Agreed. Additional clause added	Change to be made as indicated.
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.	Agreed; wording added	Change to be made as indicated.
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities	County Hall, Leicester Road,	The plan does not reference the possible introduction of renewable energy sources (such as wind turbines and solar	Noted. The NP did not wish to include such a policy.	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	; Leicestershire County Council	Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	farms) in the Parish or have a policy regarding this. Other neighbourhood plans we have seen make reference to this.		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.	Noted. The NP does this.	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	The County Council through its Environment Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire's resilience to the existing and predicted changes in climate. Furthermore, LCC has declared a climate emergency along with most other UK councils. The County Council has committed to becoming carbon neutral as a council by 2030 and to working with others to keep global temperature rise to less than 1.5 degrees Celsius, which will mean in effect needing to achieve carbon neutrality for Leicestershire by 2050 or before. Planning is one of the key levers for enabling these commitments to be met and to meeting the legally binding target set by the government for the UK to be carbon neutral by 2050. Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and to increasing the county's resilience to climate change.	Noted. Policies in the NP help to meet this aspiration.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.	Noted. The NP has a number of policies which reflect the sensitivity of the landscape.	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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 ( <a href="https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record">https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record</a> )	Policy ENV5 addresses this issue.	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk;	The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, providing net gain for	Policy ENV8 addresses issues relating to biodiversity, along with other policies in the NP.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		0116 305 7309	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.		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of protected and priority Biodiversity Action Plan species. These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent Habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme.	Noted	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA;	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,	Noted. The NP addresses these issues including the identification of wildlife corridors.	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	e County Council	nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershir e County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.	Noted	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershir e County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@le ics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.	Noted. This issue is covered in the NP	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ;	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield,	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.	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Leicestershire County Council	LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309			
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.	Noted	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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.	Noted	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk;	High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		0116 305 7309	to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification.		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	Information for Neighbourhood Planning groups regarding Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) can be found on the Neighbourhood Planning website ( <a href="http://www.neighbourhoodplanning.org">www.neighbourhoodplanning.org</a> ) 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A statement of reasons as to why SEA was not required</li> <li>• An environmental report (a key output of the SEA process).</li> </ul> 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.	Noted. A SEA Screening has been undertaken and it has been determined that no SEA is required.	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk;	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	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
		0116 305 7309	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.		
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	<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"> <li>1. Carry out and report on a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community.</li> <li>2. Set out policies that seek to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protect and retain these existing facilities,</li> <li>• support the independent development of new facilities, and,</li> <li>• identify and protect Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Identify and support potential community projects that could be progressed.</li> </ol> <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 <a href="http://www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/useful-information">www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/useful-information</a>.</p>	The issue of community facilities is covered within the NP	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ;	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield,	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.	Economic aspirations are included in the NP	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	Leicestershire County Council	LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309			
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a superfast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life. All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to ultrafast broadband (of at least 100Mbps). Developers should take active steps to incorporate adequate broadband provision at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure ultrafast broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete. Where practical, developers should consider engaging several telecoms providers to encourage competition and consumer choice.	This is covered in Policy BE5	None
Nik Green	Policy Officer, Communities ; Leicestershire County Council	County Hall, Leicester Road, Glenfield, LE3 8RA; nik.green@leics.gov.uk; 0116 305 7309	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: <a href="http://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality-strategy2016-2020.pdf">www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality-strategy2016-2020.pdf</a>	Noted	None
Amy Hordon	Senior Planner, Avison Young (on	Central Square South, Newcastle	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.	Noted	None



Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	behalf of National Grid)	upon Tyne, NE1 3AZ; amy.hordon @avisonyou ng.com; 0191 269 0096	National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area. National Grid provides information in relation to its assets at the website below. www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and- development/planning-authority/shape-files/		
Amy Hordon	Senior Planner, Avison Young (on behalf of National Grid)	Central Square South, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 3AZ; amy.hordon @avisonyou ng.com; 0191 269 0096	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: Matt Verlander, Director, nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com; Avison Young Central Square South Orchard Street Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 3AZ and Spencer Jefferies, Town Planner; box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com; National Grid National Grid House Warwick Technology Park Gallows Hill Warwick, CV34 6DA	Noted	None
Amy Hordon	Senior Planner, Avison Young (on behalf of	Central Square South, Newcastle upon Tyne,	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	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
	National Grid)	NE1 3AZ; amy.hordon @avisonyoung.com; 0191 269 0096	that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance.		
Amy Hordon	Senior Planner, Avison Young (on behalf of National Grid)	Central Square South, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 3AZ; amy.hordon@avisonyoung.com; 0191 269 0096	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 minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: <a href="https://www.nationalgridet.com/document/130626/download">https://www.nationalgridet.com/document/130626/download</a>	Noted	None
Amy Hordon	Senior Planner, Avison Young (on behalf of National Grid)	Central Square South, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 3AZ; amy.hordon@avisonyoung.com; 0191 269 0096	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. National Grid's statutory safety clearances are detailed in their ' <i>Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets</i> ', which can be downloaded here: <a href="http://www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets">www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</a>	Noted	None

Name	Job Title/ Organisation	Contact Details	Paragraph Number, Page and Comments Policy Reference and comments General Comments	Response	Amendment to Neighbourhood Plan
Amy Hordon	Senior Planner, Avison Young (on behalf of National Grid)	Central Square South, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 3AZ; amy.hordon@avisonyoung.com; 0191 269 0096	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.	Noted	None
Amy Hordon	Senior Planner, Avison Young (on behalf of National Grid)	Central Square South, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 3AZ; amy.hordon@avisonyoung.com; 0191 269 0096	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 ' <i>Guidelines when working near National Grid Gas assets</i> ' can be downloaded here: <a href="http://www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets">www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</a>	Noted	None