



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

## **Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan Review**

### **Recommended modifications and HBBC's proposed response (Part of the Regulation 18 Decision Statement)**

**08 May 2025**

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

Below is Table 1, which outlines all the modifications listed in the Examiner's report, the Local Planning Authority's response to each, and the associated action, as required. Table 2 also includes another comment addressed by the Local Planning Authority.

**Table 1: Examiner's proposed modifications and HBBC's proposed response**

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
1	4.2.1 – 4.2.5	<p>...the extant NPPF (2018 and revised publications in 2019, 2021, 2023 and 2024) explains that a presumption in favour of sustainable development means that Neighbourhood Plans should support the strategic development needs set out in the Development Plan and plan positively to support appropriate local development. This has not changed from the 2021 and 2023 versions of the NPPF. Understandably the Revised NP was prepared given the context of the 2023 version of the NPPF. As noted earlier, given the Government advice with regard to implementation of the updated NPPF by March 2025 for plan making, it is appropriate for my examination of this NP to proceed in the context of the 2023 version of the NPPF.</p>	<p><i>To avoid any confusion, I consider that brief commentary is added to the BCS which explains that while the 2023 was the contextual NPPF as the Revised NP was being prepared, the QB is aware that a new version of the NPPF was issued in December 2024.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommended that the Basic Conditions Statement, at para 5.1, be amended to the following:</p> <p>“The Neighbourhood plan has been prepared having regard to the policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) of December 2023. During Examination it was noted that an updated NPPF had been published post-submission, dated December 2024. However, whilst the 2023 version of the NPPF is the contextual piece that has informed this neighbourhood plan, the Qualifying Body is aware that a new version was issued in December 2024, and the implementation of this NPPF is March 2025, post-examination, and therefore the plan proceeded in the context of the 2023 NPPF. It also gives ...”.</p> <p>As the Basic Conditions Statement was prepared by an external party, it is noted that it now may not be possible to update another persons piece of work at this stage, although it would be preferable.</p> <p>If this is the case, HBBC recommended that the paragraph above also be inserted into the neighbourhood plan, in Section 3 at para 3.1.1, as follows:</p> <p>“This modified plan meets the basic conditions as laid down in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF December 2023). During Examination it was noted that an updated NPPF had been published post-submission, dated December 2024. However, whilst the 2023 version of the NPPF is the contextual piece that has informed this neighbourhood plan, the Qualifying Body is aware that a new version was issued in December 2024, and the implementation of this NPPF is March 2025, post-examination, and therefore the plan proceeded in the context of the 2023 NPPF. It sets out ...”</p>
2	4.4.8 – 4.4.9	<p>I find that notwithstanding the difficulty of bringing forward a revised NP in advance of an up-to-date Local Plan, I consider that the QB in this case has progressed matters appropriately. The BCS is clear and comprehensive, although for completeness, it should refer to the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD at Section 6 of that document.</p>	<p><i>“for completeness, [the BCS] should refer to the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD at Section 6 of that document”</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommend wording is added to the Basic Conditions Statement, at para 6.2, as follows:</p> <p>“The current development plan for the area is the adopted Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Local Plan which sets out land allocations and planning policies for the period 2006 – 2026. The adopted Local Plan comprises of four key documents, of which two documents are relevant to this neighbourhood plan: the Core Strategy (2009), and the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016).”</p> <p>Similarly to modification ref 1, the Basic Conditions Statement is an externally produced piece of work, and the QB may not be able to amend it at this stage, although it is preferable. HBBC are satisfied that the Local Plan is covered sufficiently in para 3.3.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
3	5.1.5	Paragraph 1.2.3 is a repetition of para 1.1.2 and is superfluous and can be omitted.	<i>Paragraph 1.2.3 is a repetition of para 1.1.2 and is superfluous and can be omitted.</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendation. HBBC recommend that para 1.2.3 is deleted. Paragraph numbers to be amended as a result.
4	5.1.6 - 5.1.9	<p>Paragraph 1.4.2 explains that the Revised NP is not presented as an extensive document 'encapsulating everything in the Plan, including all the supporting evidence'. Instead, throughout the document there is cross reference to the Market Bosworth Design Codes, and core documents: Market Bosworth Station Field Design Brief 2024 and the Landscape Review for Market Bosworth NP 2023. It is explained that these documents are presented as 'part of this Plan' and should be read in conjunction with it.</p> <p>While I acknowledge and accept the approach taken by the QB in this situation and indeed endorse the reference to these documents as 'core documents', I consider this is cumbersome for any user of the NP. I advise that these documents need to be more clearly presented.</p> <p>I do not expect to see all supporting evidence presented within the NP, particularly given that it is a review of an extant NP. However, if any user is being required to view specific documents 'as part of this Plan' and those documents will be used to guide development proposals and planning decisions, they need to be incorporated in a more formal way. A mere cross reference and a listing in the reference section of the Plan is not sufficient.</p> <p>I reiterate that while the approach taken to date by the QB does not make the NP non-compliant, it does not present a clear or user-friendly document.</p>	<i>I recommend that the documents in question are included at the Appendices of the Revised NP and a direct link be included within the text, for on-line readers.</i>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC will support the Qualifying Body to make the supporting documents that need to be read in conjunction with the plan (as below) be made available and listed as Appendices on the website and in any hard copies printed.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that hyperlinks to supporting documents should be added throughout the document to aid online readers.</p> <p>The core documents to be linked are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market Bosworth Design Code</li> <li>• Market Bosworth Station Field Design Brief 2024</li> <li>• Landscape Review for Market Bosworth NP 2023</li> </ul>
5	5.1.10 – 5.1.1.11	<p>Para 1.4.3 notes at (ix) that there are 10 Character Areas. These reflects 8 areas presented and endorsed in the extant NP plus two further Character Areas presented formally in the Revised NP. While a map illustrating these is attached at page 60 in the appendices, there is little if any text explaining the context of the areas. This is in contrast to the extant NP which helpfully sets out a description and explanation of why particular areas have been identified.</p> <p>I accept that the Character Areas have been discussed in detail within the 'core / supporting documents but recommend that the QB consider including some explanatory text after para 4.3.1 so that all the Character Areas can be fully understood by any user of the Revised NP, including the two new areas.</p>	<i>"...recommend that the QB consider including some explanatory text after para 4.3.1 so that all the Character Areas can be fully understood by any user of the Revised NP, including the two new areas."</i>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that at para 4.3.1 the list of areas is replaced with a table that covers all the character areas, and a short summary of each provided. It is also recommended that link to the Design Code is added, as per modification ref. 4 above. Changes as follows:</p> <p>"4.3.1. <a href="#">The Market Bosworth Design Codes</a> identifies the Neighbourhood Plan area as being defined by ten character areas (A-J). <del>[map on page 60]</del>. A map is provided on page X, and a summary of the character areas is provided in the table on page Y.</p> <p>Table design as an example below:</p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action										
				<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Character Area</th> <th>Summary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A Leisure &amp; Tourism</td> <td>Summary to be provided by the Qualifying Body, agreed by HBBC.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B Industry</td> <td>Summary to be provided by the Qualifying Body, agreed by HBBC.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C Education &amp; Community</td> <td>Summary to be provided by the Qualifying Body, agreed by HBBC.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Etc.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Character Area	Summary	A Leisure & Tourism	Summary to be provided by the Qualifying Body, agreed by HBBC.	B Industry	Summary to be provided by the Qualifying Body, agreed by HBBC.	C Education & Community	Summary to be provided by the Qualifying Body, agreed by HBBC.	Etc.	
Character Area	Summary													
A Leisure & Tourism	Summary to be provided by the Qualifying Body, agreed by HBBC.													
B Industry	Summary to be provided by the Qualifying Body, agreed by HBBC.													
C Education & Community	Summary to be provided by the Qualifying Body, agreed by HBBC.													
Etc.														
6	5.1.12	Para 3.2.1 includes the text 'see Error! Reference source not found'. It is assumed this is a drafting comment, and needs to be deleted.	<i>Para 3.2.1 includes the text 'see Error! Reference source not found'. It is assumed this is a drafting comment, and needs to be deleted.</i>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that the para reads as follows:</p> <p>"This draft plan was sent to all the required consultees as part of the consultation process <del>[see Error! Reference source not found].</del>"</p>										
7	5.1.13 – 5.1.14	The QB has acknowledged that the format and presentation of the revised NP differs from the 'made' version. I consider that while it has been 'streamlined' in places, it has not become an easier document to follow. The inclusion of most maps in the appendices rather than at appropriate junctures through the text, again makes the document difficult to follow, while I accept this is a matter of style and not a compliancy matter.	<i>The inclusion of 'Character and Environmental Policies' at the top of pages 21, 22, 23 and 25 is confusing and doesn't relate the approach and text within those pages. To reduce confusion, I advise that the page titles be removed from pages 21,22,23 and 25.</i>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that 'Character and Environmental Policies' is removed from the header of pages 21 to 25 of the plan, and headers be replaced with appropriate alternatives, i.e. Vision and Aims etc, if the Parish Council wishes.</p>										
8	5.2.3 – 5.2.4	My minor comment on section 6.1 of the Revised NP is that the text following para 6.2 would benefit from being presented as clearly numbered paragraphs, reflecting the style of the rest of the document. Again, this offered as a suggestion and does not make the document non-compliant.	<i>"...the text following para 6.2 would benefit from being presented as clearly numbered paragraphs, reflecting the style of the rest of the document."</i>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that paragraph numbers are added to para 6.2, as per style of the rest of the plan.</p>										
9	5.2.7	I recommend that the Character Areas map is relocated to follow para 6.3 and a summary of each of the Character Areas is included.	<i>"I recommend that the Character Areas map is relocated to follow para 6.3 and a summary of each of the Character Areas is included."</i>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>Similar to modification ref. 6 above, HBBC recommend that at para 6.3, Policy DC1: Design Codes remains as written, but a paragraph is added to the policy justification section, a new paragraph numbered 6.3.3, to reflect the summary of character areas, see modification ref 6 above.</p> <p>"6.3.3. Policy DC1: Design Codes is based on the <a href="#">Market Bosworth Design Code (2023)</a>. The areas, A to J, are identified on the Character Areas Map, and summarised in Table X Character Areas Summary"</p>										

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
10	5.2.8	<p>The text preceding the formal policies is relatively helpful and informative. However, in places, any user of the document could be assisted by additional information;</p> <p>Para 6.5.8 makes reference to a 'Local Heritage Asset List'. While the 'Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Heritage Assets of local value in the Parish of Market Bosworth 2023' is identified in Section 8 of the Revised NP, ie the reference list, the 'Local Heritage Asset List' is not.</p>	<p><i>I recommend that Para 6.5.8 is redrafted to include reference to the accurate title of the relevant document.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that Para 6.5.8 is redrafted as follows:</p> <p>"... These have been identified in a document called the '<a href="#">Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of local value in the Parish of Market Bosworth</a>'. <del>Local Heritage Asset List</del> This document was produced in collaboration with the Borough Council and The Market Bosworth Society in accordance with English Heritage Guidance. Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of local value in the Parish of Market Bosworth. ..."</p>
11	5.2.8 continued	<p>Furthermore, it would be helpful if the heritage properties found within the NP area are listed out within the Revised NP, in addition to their reference to the 'Heritage Gateway Website'. The illustrations at the top of page 32 are not explained. Presumably they are all local properties, and I recommend that full referencing should be included.</p>	<p><i>The illustrations at the top of page 32 are not explained. Presumably they are all local properties, and I recommend that full referencing should be included.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that a reference is added below the images above para 6.5.9 to describe the images shown and their relevance to this section of the plan.</p> <p>In addition, the examiner suggests that the heritage properties be listed within the NP, however HBBC find this to maybe be overly onerous as all properties/buildings of heritage interest has been provided in supporting evidence, so a direct link to the 'Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of local value in the Parish of Market Bosworth' document has been added in para 6.5.8 as per modification reference 10 above.</p>
12	5.2.8 continued	<p>Para 6.5.9 references important green spaces and describes the two areas later designated at Policy CE2. I accept that this approach, namely providing details of the areas within 6.5 is a matter of style. However, the extent of gaps between sections does not allow the document to flow well. If the NP progresses, I recommend that further attention is given to the setting out of the illustrations and the text. While it is helpful to place key maps that are referenced throughout the Revised NP in the appendices, other maps or illustrations that relate to specific policies or explanatory text should sit with those policies or text.</p>	<p><i>I recommend that further attention is given to the setting out of the illustrations and the text. While it is helpful to place key maps that are referenced throughout the Revised NP in the appendices, other maps or illustrations that relate to specific policies or explanatory text should sit with those policies or text</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommends that the maps at Appendix 1, pages 59 to 63 be redistributed throughout the documents to their relevant policies.</p> <p>As a result, all references to maps throughout the document should then be amended to the updated page numbers/figure references.</p> <p>With the maps being located at relevant sections throughout the document, the reading of policies in relation to maps should make the plan more user-friendly. HBBC can advise on formatting if required.</p>
13	5.2.8 continued	<p>Para 6.6.3 again refers to the 'Landscape Review for Market Bosworth NP' and the 'Station Field Design Brief'. Any user of the NP is instructed to view these documents 'as part of this Plan'. While I accept the approach taken by the QB on this matter, it would assist if these documents were more easily accessed either with direct electronic links or attached to the appendices.</p>	<p><i>"..., it would assist if these documents were more easily accessed either with direct electronic links or attached to the appendices."</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommends that hyperlinks are added to relevant supporting documents where needed.</p> <p>For example, para 6.6.3 can be amended as follows:</p> <p>"The Character and Environment section builds on Design Codes Policy DC1, Core documents '<a href="#">Landscape Review for Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan</a>' and '<a href="#">Station Field Design Brief</a>'"</p>
14	5.2.8 continued	<p>Para 6.5.5 lists out the documents that support the subsequent policies. Again, it would help if direct links were provided to each document, and the issuing body and date are set out for each document. As currently presented, there is inconsistency.</p>	<p><i>"it would help if direct links were provided to each document, and the issuing body and date are set out for each document"</i></p>	<p>HBBC are presuming the Examiner is referring to para 6.6.5 instead of 6.5.5. Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommends that hyperlinks are added to the list of documents at para 6.6.5 to aid online reading of the plan. HBBC will</p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
				<p>also assist in ensuring links to relevant supporting documents are linked on our web pages as appropriate.</p> <p>HBBC also recommends that each document listed is clear in the date of publishing of each document, so that the context of relevant versions of documents is clear, and that the author/issuing body of each document is listed also.</p> <p>Overall, HBBC believe that hyperlinks is a more user friendly way of pinpointing to other supporting documents, as well as printed hard copies provided at convenient locations is preferable than having all supporting documents linked as appendices. This would render the document too large and unreadable if all in one file. HBBC will work with the QB to overcome this matter.</p>
15	5.2.19	<p>The Landscape Character Assessment was prepared in 2017 as an update to a previous study undertaken on behalf of the LPA. This divided the Borough into ten landscape character areas based on their physical, cultural, natural and perceptual characteristics. Fourteen of the larger settlements, including Market Bosworth were further evaluated.</p>	<p><i>"...While a relevant element of the evidence base, I consider that its inclusion within the text of the policy could be confusing. It should be included within the accompanying supporting text."</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>The examiner has recommended new wording for Policy CE3 in modification ref 16, see below. However for this modification ref, HBBC recommend the supporting text at para 6.9.1 must include an additional paragraph as follows:</p> <p><i>"Policy CE3 has been prepared in the context of two supporting evidence base documents, the <a href="#">Landscape Review for Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan</a> and the <a href="#">Hinckley &amp; Bosworth Landscape Character Assessment Report (2017)</a>. Both of these documents were the most up to date evidence for this policy at the time of writing, and therefore should be used in conjunction with Policy CE3. If newer or more up to date evidence is produced for Market Bosworth neighbourhood plan, or by the Local Planning Authority for the Market Bosworth area, these will take precedence over those listed above."</i></p>
16	5.2.20 – 5.2.28	<p>5.2.20 The Landscape Review of 2024 is clearly the most up to date document and potentially of most value to users of the NP. It is a review of the evidence supporting a similar policy in the extant NP and has comprised a systematic assessment of the area, in terms of main views and key vistas into and out from the town. I note that it concludes that a very high proportion of the area is of value in terms of views into and out of Market Bosworth. While this may be the case, I share the concern of some Regulation 16 submissions in that the impact of this, without any qualification, could result in a blanket embargo of new development.</p> <p>5.2.21 While the Landscape Review is comprehensive in that it sets out factual descriptions of views into and out the town, it appears that a systematic approach to vista assessments has been adopted. There is no explanation as to whether some vistas are of more importance to stakeholders than others. In all vista cases it concludes 'Protect vista from future encroachment of development' and for the views chosen, it recommends that 'signage clutter' be addressed.</p> <p>5.2.22 There is little, if any, recommendation or advice to a user of the NP as to the potential to incorporate appropriate design to mitigate any perceived harm, should the land in question be needed for development. In effect the Landscape Review appears to be a blanket approach to resist any potential development.</p> <p>5.2.23 As presented and if applied without any qualification, the Landscape Review would result in very little land being available for consideration for future development needs. NPPF 2023 and PPG guidance clearly advises that NP policies should not undermine future plan</p>	<p>5.2.26 Hence, I recommend the following:</p> <p><i>Comprehensive reference to both the Landscape Review and the Landscape Character Report should be included within the supporting text of the policy and accompanied by direct links. The best location for this is as additions to para 6.5.2 of the Revised NP.</i></p> <p><i>A clear map illustrating key views should be included within the policy, to overcome any potential confusion on the part of the reader when comparing a number of supporting documents.</i></p> <p>5.2.27 I further recommend that the first sentence is omitted, and the policy is redrafted as follows;</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendations.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that Policy CE3 is redrafted to read:</p> <p><i>"Policy CE3: Important Views and Vistas and Landscape Character.</i></p> <p><i>The location and direction of important views and vistas are illustrated on map X [hyperlink], and identified in the core document 'Landscape Review for Market Bosworth NP (2023)'. New development proposals impacting these areas should include an assessment, appropriate to the scale of development, of the impact on the landscape character of Market Bosworth. Development will be resisted if it has a significant adverse impact on an important view, vista or the character of the Parish, unless it can demonstrate how that development is appropriate and considered sustainable development, and can integrate with the character of the landscape setting whilst conserving, and where appropriate, enhancing the character of the landscape."</i></p> <p>HBBC also recommend that a map be brought into the plan, at para 6.9 below the policy to aid user friendliness, as per modification reference 12 above. Figure 5 of the Landscape Review document</p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		<p>making. Given the status and importance of Market Bosworth as a Key Rural Centre and as a location for future growth, as acknowledged by AECOM in its HNA and as proposed in the emerging LP, the application of Policy CE3 as written could compromise future plan-making.</p> <p>5.2.24 Given my concerns over the Landscape Review evidence, I have considered two options; The first is that policy CE3 is omitted completely. The second is that reference to the Landscape Review is qualified.</p> <p>5.2.25 The illustrations within the Design Code document and the Landscape Review 2024 do not correlate. While the guidance offered in both documents is clear, there is the potential for confusion due to the differing styles of the supporting documents, I advocate the latter.</p>	<p><i>'The location and direction of important views and vistas are illustrated at fig .... and identified in the core document 'Landscape Review for Market Bosworth NP (2023)' (insert direct link). New development proposals impacting these areas should include an assessment, appropriate to the scale of development, of the impact on the landscape character of Market Bosworth. Development will be resisted if it has a significant adverse impact on an important view, vista or the character of the Parish, unless it can demonstrate how that development is appropriate and considered sustainable development, and can integrate with the character of the landscape setting whilst conserving, and where appropriate, enhancing the character of the landscape.'</i></p> <p>5.2.28 <i>Only with these modifications do I find Policy CE3 compliant.</i></p>	<p>seems the most appropriate. Please also ensure the map is referenced appropriately.</p> <p>Please note: HBBC have slightly amended the Examiner's recommendation here to provide consistent wording throughout the plan, i.e. reference to maps rather than figures.</p> <p>The references to the supporting evidence has been covered in the modification recommended in modification reference 15 above.</p>
17	5.2.31 – 5.2.34	<p><b>POLICY CE5: LANDSCAPE OF THE WIDER PARISH</b></p> <p>5.2.31 Until reaching this policy, any reader would assume that previous policies applied to the whole of the NP area. Nothing is included within the supporting information and formal text accompanying previous policies, to the contrary. Furthermore, Policy CE5 simply reiterates the need for any user of the NP to have regard to national and local plan policy.</p> <p>5.2.32 It is only through the inclusion of 'Outside the settlement boundary' does the policy have any relevance to Market Bosworth. I accept this but am concerned that as drafted, it could be used as a 'catch-all' to resist new development regardless of the sustainability of such development.</p> <p>5.2.33 As is discussed later in this report, I recommend that the Revised NP needs to acknowledge that housing needs are likely to change in the near future, and that residential proposals by relevant parties will need to be considered appropriately. It is therefore important that Policy CE5 does not conflict with this stance and so provides for suitable flexibility to allow for sustainable development.</p>	<p><i>As such my recommendation is that the policy be redrafted as follows;</i></p> <p><i>'Outside the development boundary, new development proposals that accord with national policy and the development plan for the area, and other policies within the Market Bosworth Revised NP, will not be resisted providing they:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>contribute to the local economy</i></li> <li>- <i>re-use or extend an existing building</i></li> <li>- <i>relate to sport or recreation land uses</i></li> <li>- <i>reflect para 84 of NPPF 2023 if concerning a single dwelling house.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Any housing proposal adjacent to the existing settlement boundary will be considered positively providing it is accompanied by an up-to-date housing needs assessment and providing any adverse impacts do not outweigh the benefits of the development.'</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendations.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that Policy CE5 be redrafted as follows:</p> <p><i>"Outside the development boundary, new development proposals that accord with national policy and the development plan for the area, and other policies within the Market Bosworth Revised NP, will not be resisted providing they:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>contribute to the local economy</i></li> <li>- <i>re-use or extend an existing building</i></li> <li>- <i>relate to sport or recreation land uses</i></li> <li>- <i>reflect para 84 of NPPF 2023 if concerning a single dwelling house.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Any housing proposal adjacent to the existing settlement boundary will be considered positively providing it is accompanied by an up-to-date housing needs assessment and providing any adverse impacts do not outweigh the benefits of the development."</i></p>
18	5.2.35 – 5.2.39	<p>5.2.35 This is a new policy for which I note there is community support, and the evidence base is appropriate. I note however that it fails to acknowledge recent and applicable national guidance relating to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) which has been in existence for some time. This places an obligation on developers to ensure their proposals have a positive or net gain impact in terms of biodiversity. It has been at the discretion of the QB to include such reference. As written, the policy remains compliant, notwithstanding the omission of any BNG reference.</p>	<p><i>... I recommend that it can remain, but only in the following modified form;</i></p> <p><i>'Development proposals that incorporate into their design, features and provisions which encourage wildlife to thrive will be strongly supported.'</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that Policy CE6 be amended to read as follows:</p> <p><i>'Development proposals that incorporate into their design, features and provisions which encourage wildlife to thrive will be strongly supported.'</i></p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		<p>5.2.36 The reference to 'development' in the opening sentence would cover 'new housing proposals' and hence the second sentence is superfluous.</p> <p>5.2.37 The examples of provisions are helpful and while they might be better located in the accompanying text in section 6.5, with modification, I accept their inclusion within the policy itself, again with modification.</p> <p>5.2.38 There is repetitive reference at (D) to veteran tree retention which is already covered by Policy CE4 and the reference at (B) to 'measures to support character species of fauna and flora' is vague and unhelpful.</p> <p>5.2.39 While I have concerns that the policy simply repeats standard national policy and Local Plan policy, I accept it presents emphasis.</p>	<p><i>Examples of such provision include;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. <i>Bird and bat boxes and hedgehog runs,</i></li> <li>B. <i>Planting schemes including native species of trees and shrubs and nectar rich plants for bees and pollinators,</i></li> <li>C. <i>A Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) approach to natural water management and flood resilience, including soft green and blue infrastructure close to where people live.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Planting and landscaping schemes which encourage wildlife in new development should connect wider ecological networks, where possible.'</i></p>	<p><i>Examples of such provision include;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. <i>Bird and bat boxes and hedgehog runs,</i></li> <li>B. <i>Planting schemes including native species of trees and shrubs and nectar rich plants for bees and pollinators,</i></li> <li>C. <i>A Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) approach to natural water management and flood resilience, including soft green and blue infrastructure close to where people live.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Planting and landscaping schemes which encourage wildlife in new development should connect wider ecological networks, where possible.'</i></p>
19	5.2.49	<p>Para 6.14.1 refers to the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) but omits any date or author. Some references to a HNA include a date of 2022 but earlier references are to 2020. Para 6.14.4 advises that a Housing Needs Survey was prepared by Midland Rural Housing on behalf of the LA in 2020 which found that there was a need for a range of different house types. I find the various references to HNAs throughout the Revised NP are confusing.</p>	<p><i>... references within this section of the Revised NP should be clarified and explained with the inclusion of dates and issuing parties, and particularly at paras 6.14.1 and 6.14.3.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC assumes that the Housing Needs Assessment document referred to here is <a href="#">this one</a>. Therefore HBBC recommend that the opening sentence of para 6.14.1 is amended as follows:</p> <p><i>"<a href="#">The Housing Needs Assessment (2022, AECOM)</a> identifies there are currently 1006 dwellings in the Parish of Market Bosworth".</i></p> <p>And as a result, para 6.14.3 should be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>"...<a href="#">The Housing Needs Assessment (December 2022, AECOM)</a> ... The HNA (<del>December 2022</del>) identifies..."</i></p>
20	5.2.50	<p>Para 6.14.3 suggests a residual requirement of 77 units for the 'Plan period' but is confusingly explained. I consider that the context of the most recent AECOM HNA should be summarised and set out clearly in this section, including acknowledgment that housing needs are likely to change in the near future. Initial reference should also be made in Section 1.3 (where there is already reference to the AECOM HNA prepared in 2020).</p>	<p><i>The QB should also consider explaining at para 1.3 that an updated HNA has been undertaken and detailed further in Section 6.14. I suggest that a summary of the AECOM 2022 HNA is taken from Section 3 of the BCS.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendation.</p> <p>HBBC recommends that a new paragraph is inserted as para 1.3.4 (current para 1.3.4 becomes para 1.3.5), as follows:</p> <p><i>"Market Bosworth Parish Council considered that a major part of the review of the neighbourhood plan would be undertaking an updated Housing Needs Assessment. This was as a result of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council not being able to provide housing requirement figures until the new Local Plan had progressed sufficiently. The new Local Plan was in the early stages of production, and therefore the neighbourhood plan would require an interim Housing Needs Figure (HNF) for the reviewed neighbourhood plan. The Housing Needs Assessment was undertaken in December 2022 by AECOM in line with national policy and best practice. The outcomes of which can be found in section 6.14. It is acknowledged that housing needs are likely to change in the coming years, and through the emerging HBBC Local Plan a housing requirement figure may be provided by the Local Planning Authority. In which case, any updated housing figures in the Local Plan would supersede the 2022 Housing Need Assessment."</i></p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
21	5.2.51	There is no clarity as to which Plan period is being referenced in para 6.14.3. If it is the Revised NP period, then this should be explicit.	<i>There is no clarity as to which Plan period is being referenced in para 6.14.3. If it is the Revised NP period, then this should be explicit.</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendations. HBBC recommend that para 6.14.3 is amended as follows: "The Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan (2006-2026) set a target for a minimum of 100 new dwellings to be built in Market Bosworth, up to 2026. <a href="#">The Housing Needs Assessment</a> document (December 2022) identifies that during the reviewed Neighbourhood Plan's plan period (2020 – 2039) to December 2022 107 new dwellings have been built or are under construction. Permissions have been granted for a further 7 dwellings. The HNA (December 2022) identifies a residual requirement of 77 new homes for the Plan period to 2039."  See further comments at reference C regarding the original 117 figure in Table 2 'Other General Comments' table at the end of this paper.
22	5.2.51 – 5.2.52	5.2.51 ....Reliance is being placed on the AECOM HNA and so any reader needs to be able to clearly understand why just one housing site is being identified at this time, and why this site is proposed for a specific minimum number of units.  5.2.52 To assist, I recommend that the text at 6.14.3 includes clear details of development that has come forward in Market Bosworth together with commentary on the anticipated phasing of new development.	<i>I recommend that the text at 6.14.3 includes clear details of development that has come forward in Market Bosworth together with commentary on the anticipated phasing of new development.</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendations. HBBC recommend that a table be inserted following 6.14.3 detailing the commitments/completions from 2020 to 31 December 2022 (the date of the Housing Needs Assessment) which make up the 107 (completions/under construction) + 7 (permitted) figures in para 6.14.3.  HBBC can assist the QB if required, however such details of planning applications and monitoring data is publicly available.  See further comments at reference C regarding the original 117 figure in Table 2 'Other General Comments' table at the end of this paper.
23	5.2.52	The illustrations included at para 6.14.3 are not defined. This should be rectified.	<i>The illustrations included at para 6.14.3 are not defined. This should be rectified.</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendations. HBBC recommend that a more detailed description of the photographs at 6.14.3 is included, i.e. a numbering system explaining which development/location each photo depicts. This will ensure those people outside of Market Bosworth that are reading the plan will be able to locate the areas shown.
24	5.2.53 – 5.2.60	5.2.53 I am advised that various housing proposals for Market Bosworth are currently being considered by the LPA. Indeed, I understand that proposals for land to the south of Station Rd ie the subject of proposed policy BD2, were approved by the LPA Planning Committee on the 18th February 2025, further to a delegated report. Full permission for 135 dwellings, landscaping, public open space, drainage and new access has now been confirmed, together with outline permission for 0.55ha of employment uses. Providing the residential consent is	<i>5.2.60 To address the issues raised here and allow the Revised NP to proceed, an element of flexibility and an acknowledgement of this is needed. Hence, at this juncture, and in the absence of any additional land being identified for housing development, I recommend that the following text should</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendations. The Neighbourhood Plan allocated site south of Station Road has gained planning permission (at Planning Committee on 18 February 2025, ref 24/00560/HYB) and this review of the Neighbourhood Plan does not put forward other allocations/reserve sites/preferred options to respond to future needs. It is therefore agreed that flexibility is required during the period between the neighbourhood plan being made and further progress being made in the Local Plan

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		<p>implemented and development completed, this would address the housing needs identified within the AECOM HNA.</p> <p>5.2.54 Notwithstanding this, I consider that the specific allocation of land to the south of Station Rd for residential purposes is still appropriate within the Revised NP. However, Policy BD2 leaves little guidance for the specific location of further housing development, should a need be confirmed. While I reiterate that I understand why the QB did not wish to pursue the identification of specific new housing sites, over and above the land to the south of Station Rd, I accept that the majority of the other proposed policies could be used to guide development proposals and determine their suitability.</p> <p>5.2.55 I consider that a degree of flexibility in terms of recognising that the promotion of additional housing by interested parties is highly probable would assist both the community and any party wishing to develop housing in the area. I appreciate that the community is not supportive of formally allocating additional sites when the housing need, at this point in time, does not technically support it. However, guidance on whether windfall development would be supported, subject to all other NP policies being applied would be helpful and indicate a degree of pragmatism and an acknowledgement of the need for sustainable development to take place.</p> <p>5.2.56 Section 6.15 refers to consultations undertaken with regard to identifying land for new development and the site south of Station Road was subsequently proposed for new development at the time of the preparation of the extant NP. I note that this matter was the subject of consultation for the Revised NP. The land in question south of Station Rd has since benefited from a Design Brief and a Masterplan which have been adopted as supplementary planning advice. The very recent grant of planning consent for this site simply endorses its suitability for new dwellings.</p> <p>5.2.57 While I note that the continued need for housing land with the NP area is discussed, to a degree, within the Revised NP, I am aware that some Regulation 14 and 16 submissions have found this lacking. They have suggested that additional land should be specifically identified for housing purposes at this juncture. While this would have assisted in the determination of new proposals, I accept that this was not an approach adopted by the QB or reflected through its consultations. While potentially short sighted, I accept this stance.</p> <p>5.2.58 However, I do consider that; given the NPPF and PPG guidance applicable to this review; the fact that proposals for the allocated site and others are already before the LPA, and in the case of the land south of Station Rd, have now been approved, some flexibility is required. I am also aware that the timeframe for the emerging LP is proposed to run to 2041, i.e. longer than the proposed timeframe for the Revised NP. As noted earlier, the AECOM HNA adopted a timeframe to 2039, and housing needs were considered by the QB on that basis. This indicates some non-alignment.</p> <p>5.2.59 In summary I consider that the Revised NP should accept that housing needs for the area are likely to change, further to the adoption of both the Leicester City Plan and Hinkley and Bosworth Local Plan, and indeed in light of revised national policy. Given that Market Bosworth is a Key Rural Centre, and that designation is likely to continue, there will be a need to review the housing allocations for the town.</p>	<p><i>be included within Section 6.14 of the Revised NP;</i></p> <p><i>Further to the progression of both the Leicester City Plan and the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan, and further to relevant revised national policy, it is accepted that housing needs for the NP area are likely to change. Reflecting Market Bosworth's status as a Key Rural Centre, there will be a need to review the housing allocations for the NP area, in the near future.</i></p> <p><i>Until such a review of the NP takes place, and the housing need for the area has progressed sufficiently through the Local Plan process to a point where it carries weight, windfall development proposals will not be resisted. Such windfall proposals need to be supported by a clear and up-to-date housing needs assessment, and accord with all other policies within this NP.</i></p>	<p>and/or a further neighbourhood plan review. This would allow for appropriate housing development to come forward in the neighbourhood area where a need is identified and where it complies with all other relevant policies in the neighbourhood plan, Local Plan or national policy.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that the following is added at Section 6.14, potentially at 6.14.4, shifting the current 6.14.4 down to 6.14.5.</p> <p><i>Further to the progression of both the Leicester City Plan and the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan, and further to relevant revised national policy, it is accepted that housing needs for the Neighbourhood Plan area are likely to change. Reflecting Market Bosworth's status as a Key Rural Centre, there will be a need to review the housing allocations for the Neighbourhood Plan area, in the near future.</i></p> <p><i>Until such a review of the Neighbourhood Plan takes place, and the housing need for the area has progressed sufficiently through the Local Plan process to a point where it carries weight, windfall development proposals will not be resisted. Such windfall proposals need to be supported by a clear and up-to-date housing needs assessment, and accord with all other policies within this Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
25	5.2.61 – 5.2.62	<p>5.2.61 Para 6.16.2 explains the 'local connections' criteria which will apply to any new affordable housing. The last sentence of this paragraph refers to 'subsequent lettings thereafter'. This assumes that the properties in question are to be rented. Affordable housing can take the form of low cost, shared ownership or rented accommodation.</p>	<p><i>Accordingly, I simply ask if the QB is only wishing the criteria to apply to rented units, or whether this was a typographical error, and the reference should be to 'subsequent occupation thereafter'. For the avoidance of doubt, either reference</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendations.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that the last sentence of 6.16.2 be amended to the following:</p> <p><i>"... the following Local Connection Criteria in the allocation of properties will be applied to affordable housing on new</i></p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		5.2.62 Accordingly, I simply ask if the QB is only wishing the criteria to apply to rented units, or whether this was a typographical error, and the reference should be to 'subsequent occupation thereafter'. For the avoidance of doubt, either reference would be acceptable in terms of compliance, but clarity would assist any user of the NP as the nature of affordable housing to be provided.	<p><i>would be acceptable in terms of compliance, but clarity would assist any user of the NP as the nature of affordable housing to be provided.</i></p> <p><i>The first sentence of para 6.17.2 includes the phrase 'sensitive to the community'. I recommend this would be better written as 'important to the community.'</i></p>	development sites in Market Bosworth, and any subsequent <del>lettings</del> <b>occupation</b> thereafter."
26	5.2.63	5.2.63 The first sentence of para 6.17.2 includes the phrase 'sensitive to the community'. I recommend this would be better written as 'important to the community.'	<p><i>The first sentence of para 6.17.2 includes the phrase 'sensitive to the community'. I recommend this would be better written as 'important to the community.'</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendations.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that the first sentence of para 6.17.2 is amended to:</p> <p>"Landscape features which historically determined the development of the character areas are extremely <del>sensitive</del> <b>important</b> to the community (see Character and Landscape section), so visual sensitivity is a key consideration."</p>
27	5.2.73	5.2.73 I note that as drafted Policy BD2 expressly refers to a 'minimum of 77'. The word unit should be inserted. This would therefore be applicable to a scheme of 138 units.	<p><i>The word unit should be inserted. This would therefore be applicable to a scheme of 138 units.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendations.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that Policy BD2 be amended as follows:</p> <p>"An area of 7.5 hectares as shown on the proposals map [page 61] and allocations schematic is allocated for mixed use development. The development shall provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Between 0.5 hectare to 1 hectare of additional B1, B2 or B8 employment land;</li> <li>2. A minimum of 77 <b>units</b> identified in the Market Bosworth Housing Needs assessment – AECOM 2022 with overall housing density, mix and design and developed in accordance with the principles of development set out in the Market Bosworth Design Codes (in particular Character Area I), the Station Field Design Brief and the Market Bosworth Masterplan</li> <li>3. An area of open space</li> </ol> <p>The inclusion of a community facility within the development will also be encouraged."</p>
28	5.2.75 – 5.2.77	<p>5.2.75 This policy confirms the allocation of land south of Station Rd for mixed use purposes, including a minimum of 77 new residential units, open space and additional B1, B2 and B8 employment land. A series of principles address concerns previously highlighted through the consultation process and hence are appropriate to reference.</p> <p>5.2.76 The reference to B1 employment uses was superseded in the Use Classes Order further to introduction of Class E which includes offices, research and development and light industrial uses. This was highlighted by parties at the Regulation 14 stage of proceedings.</p> <p>5.2.77 This should be amended in Policy BD3 and the B1 employment land referenced as Class E(g) (I, ii and iii). The B2 and B8 references can remain as written.</p>	<p><i>This should be amended in Policy BD3 and the B1 employment land referenced as Class E(g) (I, ii and iii). The B2 and B8 references can remain as written.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendations.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that any references to B1 employment be amended <b>throughout the plan</b> to accord with the new use class order; Class E(g) (I, ii and iii).</p>

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
29	5.2.78	5.2.78 There is a small typographical error in the first sentence of para 6.20.1 'and again and the early consultations.... ' should read 'and again at the early consultations.....'	<i>There is a small typographical error in the first sentence of para 6.20.1 'and again and the early consultations.... ' should read 'and again at the early consultations.....'</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendations. HBBC recommend that para 6.20.1 be amended to read as follows: "Given the level of support for this site at the initial consultations and again <del>and</del> at the early consultations for the emerging modified Neighbourhood Plan the Design Brief..."
30	5.2.80	As I have indicated elsewhere in this report, I consider it would be helpful to any user of the Revised NP to use direct links to the document mentioned, ie the Station Field Design, particularly as this has been updated and older versions may be in circulation. The QB may wish to consider this.	N/A	N/A, please see earlier modification references.
31	5.2.83	...I also suggest that the QB includes a date and direct links to the 'Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of Local Value'. This would assist any user of the NP and avoid any confusion with older documents.	<i>"...the QB includes a date and direct links to the 'Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of Local Value'"</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendations. HBBC recommend that any reference to the <a href="#">Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of Local Value</a> document is dated and linked throughout the document.
32	5.2.84	While I appreciate that (with the assistance of a direct link) cross reference will be able to be made to the evidence base document, I advocate inserting a map indicating the extent of designated and non-designated heritage value either after the formal policy or in the appendices.	<i>I advocate inserting a map indicating the extent of designated and non-designated heritage value either after the formal policy or in the appendices</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendations to a certain extent. As per previous modification references, the insertion of links to documents throughout the plan is being recommended, as a result the ease of reading and cross-referencing will be increased. The Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of Local Value document shall be clearly highlighted as a core supporting document via links and the website, to ensure that the link to maps are clear and can be found easily.  As stated above, HBBC will work with the QB to ensure that the end result is as the Examiner intends.
33	5.2.85	POLICY BD4: HERITAGE ASSET PROTECTION  5.2.85 As such I recommend that the policy be modified as follows;  Proposals that will result in harm to, or unnecessary loss of, an asset of local heritage value as listed below and referenced within the 'Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of Local Value' (insert electronic direct link), will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that, on balance, the overall benefit outweighs any harm or loss.	<i>As such I recommend that the policy be modified as follows;  Proposals that will result in harm to, or unnecessary loss of, an asset of local heritage value as listed below and referenced within the 'Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of Local Value' (insert electronic direct link), will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that, on balance, the overall benefit outweighs any harm or loss.</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendations. HBBC recommend that Policy BD4: Heritage Asset Protection is amended as follows: "Proposals that will result in harm to, or unnecessary loss of, an asset of local heritage value as listed below and referenced within the 'Review of Designated Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Assets of Local Value' (insert electronic direct link), will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that, on balance, the overall benefit outweighs any harm or loss."
34	5.3.1 – 5.3.4	5.3.1 I note the update on a range of aspirational projects in Section 7 of the Revised NP and the identification of three further initiatives. As the LPA and the QB will be aware, most if not all of these projects are beyond the remit of the NP in that they address highway and traffic management strategies, mobile phone connectivity and high-speed broadband provision, and the improvement of GP facilities.	<i>5.3.4 If this section is to remain within the Revised NP, I recommend that an introductory paragraph is inserted at the beginning to read;  A number of Aspirations Projects are presented below. These have been identified as being of importance to the</i>	Agree with Examiner's recommendations. HBBC recommend that, prior to section 7.1, a paragraph is inserted to read as follows: "A number of Aspirations Projects are presented below. These have been identified as being of importance to the local community but are not subject to any formal NP policy. They are discussed in this section of the NP for information purposes only."

Modification Ref.	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	Examiner's recommended modification	HBBC Response and Action
		<p>5.3.2 The identification of a BMX and skateboarding facility and the provision of electric vehicle charging facilities could have been the subject of specific land-based policies, but these have not been presented to me.</p> <p>5.3.3 I accept that aspirational projects are of importance to the community and hence updates are important. However, I question whether the Revised NP is the correct vehicle to discuss these. Given the anticipated timescale of the Plan, much of the context and commentary could be deemed out of date, relatively quickly.</p>	<p><i>local community but are not subject to any formal NP policy. They are discussed in this section of the NP for information purposes only.</i></p>	
35	5.3.5 – 5.3.6	<p>5.3.5 Even with this addition, I have concerns with the last sentence of para 7.2.4 which addresses improved GP facilities may be misleading. The last sentence appears to require all planning decisions to consider the impact of any increase in potential patients using the extant GP facilities, as a result of new development. While I understand the approach taken, the presentation of this 'requirement' is not in a form that complies with the basic conditions.</p> <p>5.3.6 Hence, I recommend for the avoidance of any confusion that the last sentence concludes as follows;</p> <p>The community believe that without significant collaboration between the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board and Hickley and Bosworth Borough Council, to increase patient capacity of the surgery within the Town centre, sustainability of medical care within the community is at a significant risk.</p>	<p><i>I recommend for the avoidance of any confusion that the last sentence concludes as follows;</i></p> <p><i>The community believe that without significant collaboration between the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board and Hickley and Bosworth Borough Council, to increase patient capacity of the surgery within the Town centre, sustainability of medical care within the community is at a significant risk.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Examiner's recommendations.</p> <p>HBBC recommend that the last sentence of para 7.2.4 is amended to read as follows:</p> <p><i>"The community believe that without significant collaboration between the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board and Hickley and Bosworth Borough Council, to increase patient capacity of the surgery within the Town centre, sustainability of medical care within the community is at a significant risk and further development of dwellings which increase the number of patients using this service must be considered in all planning decisions."</i></p>

**Table 2: Other general comments**

Ref	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	HBBC Response and Action
A	Para's 3.4 – 3.7	<p><i>The Plan Period</i></p> <p><i>Any Neighbourhood Plan, as originally proposed or in amended form, must specify the period during which it is to have effect. The Revised NP states on its front cover and in its introductory sections that it addresses the period between 2020 and 2039. While an amended timeframe is appropriate, I note that the LPA has confirmed that the emerging LP may now run until 2041. Given that the revised NP has been prepared to reflect the timescale of the emerging LP, I consider that this extended time period may be more appropriate, ie for the NP to reflect the extended timeframe of the LP.</i></p> <p><i>While this nominal extension would have little impact on most of the proposed policies within the Revised NP, I am conscious that the evidence base, included the housing needs assessment undertaken on behalf of the QB by AECOM. This used the end date of 2039.</i></p> <p><i>I see little problem in the timescale for the Revised NP remaining as indicated in the draft document before me but equally have no issue should the QB and LPA align the revised NP timescale to the proposed for the emerging local plan.</i></p> <p><i>Providing the timeframe for the Revised NP is clearly indicated and is consistent throughout the document, the plan will be compliant.</i></p>	<p>HBBC are inclined to agree with this section of the report.</p> <p>Due to the evidence base and contents of the plan relying on a 2020 - 2039 plan period, I'm inclined to say that it would be inappropriate and complex to amend the plan period to 2041 at this late stage. However HBBC do suggest that moving forward, the neighbourhood plan should be reviewed further to align with Local Plan timeframes. This will ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency with the Local Plan</li> <li>• Longevity over a longer time period, ensuring the neighbourhood plan stays up to date for as long as possible to assist in determining planning applications; and</li> <li>• The neighbourhood plan reflects relevant and up to date housing targets, and national policy/targets</li> </ul> <p>Therefore HBBC agree that no modifications should be made to the plan period at this stage, but the LPA recommend another review of the plan to address this, and officers will support the QB when needed if a further review was to be pursued.</p>

Ref	Page & Para Numbers of Report	Extract from the Examiner's Report	HBBC Response and Action
B	Para 6.5.8	Not within the Examiner Report, however since preparation, heritage assets that were listed on the Heritage Gateway website are now hosted on the Historic England website. Propose changing the final sentence to reflect this.	HBBC recommend a slight change to wording and adding a link at para 6.5.8 to read "The specific assets are listed on the <a href="#">Historic England website</a> ".
C	Various paras, see modification references 21 and 22 above.	Since the completion of the Examiner's Report, it has come to light through discussions with the Parish Council that there is a slight typographical error in the neighbourhood plan; the figure of 117 dwellings in para 6.14.3 should read 107. The commitments/completions that make up this figure will be included in the plan, as per modification reference 22.	Following discussions with the Parish Council, HBBC recommends the figure 117 in paragraph 6.14.3 be amended to 107, and the commitments/completions that make up that figure be included as per modification reference 22.