

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
1	Page 20 Para 4.6	SUB resident	There are not enough facilities in the village for the current residents, let alone consider 50 dwellings on the land adjacent to the Public House in Stanton-under-Bardon. (Figure 3a – Reserve Site)	Noted. The Housing allocations including the reserve site have been removed from the NP as it is not possible to meet the updated housing requirement of 305 dwellings across the Plan period, especially as the figures proposed by HBBC are indicative at this stage and are likely to change on adoption of the new Local Plan.	Change to be made as indicated.
2	History	Bagworth resident	Should reference be made to the Bier House in Bagworth, since it is joined to a house, to ensure it remains a site of heritage and interest? It would be a shame if a new occupier could affect its existence somehow. Also, should the Bagworth-Thornton incline be protected, since it is notable within railway history?	Do you want to add these to the local heritage assets in Policy Env 4?	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Transport		Cycling – the report notes there was little feedback about this but I think this misses an important opportunity. If the authors want a sustainable future, then safe cycle links and paths which encourage and support all children to walk/cycle to school in our villages should be planned for now. Without these, car and bus numbers will add to congestion outside our schools and generate even more problems. As improving pedestrian and cycle connections is listed in the vision, it is disappointing there are no clear plans to support this.	<p>Policy T1 promotes the creation of footpaths where appropriate.</p> <p>Unfortunately, cycle routes and footpaths can only be secured through placing conditions on development proposals or allocations in the NP.</p> <p>The allocations had conditions to extend footpaths where relevant but have had to be removed as it is not possible to increase the level of housing allocations to the level required by HBBC.</p>	None
	Employment		The draft report recognises the value of local employment facilities to support employment – but the NP as proposed does not offer/facilitate any space for new businesses to develop. There are no allocations for either workspaces or office units. This is evidenced in Bagworth where a local vacuum cleaner business is operating from several of the retail shop areas which are therefore not available to new retailers. Were there to be designated units in all three villages (to spread the load) then this would encourage local employment – rather than relying on workers travelling outside the village.	Noted. The policy is an enabling policy which supports such business development – but no sites were identified in the process of preparing the NP for specific business development.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Housing		I have serious concerns about the outcome of the draft report's recommendations for housing development sites. It seems that many factors have been considered but the resulting decisions appear to conflict with other basic principles in the report. My concern is that Thornton, in particular, is treated more favourably and I do not feel the NP as it stands, will ultimately lead to an equal distribution of new development.	Noted. The allocated sites were selected following a rigorous assessment process. No sites were ideal but in any event they have been withdrawn from the NP as it was not possible to achieve the housing requirement needed by HBBC	Change to be made as indicated.
			In Section 3 of the Exec Summary document, 'locally important issues' are mentioned. I know of no more publicised issue in Thornton than parking, which creates significant difficulties for residents, particularly near the reservoir. The 2 sites identified for development in Thornton	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version. The NP can only consider sites that have been proposed for development by the landowners.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			are either near the reservoir or on a main road, three-way, tight turn junction at the other end of the village. Nowhere in the draft NP is this significant difficulty raised. Yet with cars turning into and from a sight on a tight bend, or visitors filling residents' places on narrow roads, these problems are not raised anywhere. I do wonder if these sites are proposed so they will be ruled out on highways grounds, thus leaving no potential sites at all in the village. Further, I cannot see that the survey carried out by the independent person considers either the Beech Drive plans or any		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>other sites that might be suitable within Thornton. If the Plan only relies on landowners willing to sell, then that is not necessarily the best sites for development. I would have liked to see more consideration of all potential sites within all three villages, for a fairer distribution of new homes. As it is, Bagworth has had close to 80 + new homes in the last year alone (with more in the pipeline near Chestnut Rd etc) but these aren't mentioned anywhere are they?) Similarly, Stanton has had a large expansion in recent years, yet Thornton has had only a few infill sites to my knowledge. In this Plan, Stanton will again bear a large number of new homes, yet Thornton is unlikely to have much development at all. My fear is that unequal lobbying has ensured the nature of Thornton village will be untouched and this is not fair, nor equal treatment of all residents.</p>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Finally, I find the proposed site opposite the Charnwood School premises/grounds equally baffling, since this is another pinpoint for congestion twice a day during term time, as well as lacking any proximity to local facilities. Traffic flow, lack of pedestrian access and lack of public transport all indicate this development would cause many problems for road users if it goes ahead. Again, a willing seller, perhaps, but an isolated site well outwith any village boundary – which will set a dangerous precedent for future building applications perhaps.	Noted. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.
			On a different point, I did not see any references to gypsy and traveller sites, which appear from time to time or can be flexible in their size and location. As there is a proposal for new 'starter homes' on an 'agricultural land/ gypsy site' outside the boundary, would it be helpful for the NP to indicate clearly what land uses there currently are in place around each village as there seems to be a lack of clarity about land designation	The issue of gypsy and traveller sites is a strategic matter which is beyond the remit of a NP. The Settlement Boundary policy (H3) makes it clear that development will be carefully controlled outside of the settlement boundaries and the Environmental Inventory (appendix 5) records all pockets of land in the Neighbourhood Area. The environment section designates this land where appropriate to do so.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Communications		I think more guidance could be given to the location of telecoms sites. For example the new mast in Bagworth is unsightly and located within view of homes and from view points in the village. As it covers a large area, why can't these masts be sited near to industrial areas instead, amongst tall buildings or chimneys where they are less conspicuous? By not making provision in the NP, then providers will impose them wherever they like, to keep costs to linking of utilities low.	Policy CA2 requires such installations to be 'sympathetically located, designed to integrate into the landscape and not be in or near to open landscapes'.	None
	Renewable Energy		It would be helpful to indicate where charging points might be sited, unless I have missed this in the report, as adequate access and provision can be ensured, rather than imposed by willing host sites.	Policy TR2 requires electric vehicle charging points to be provided in residential dwellings and supports communal charging points where they do not impact negatively on existing parking.	None
3		NWLDC	Further to the consultation in respect of the above plan, thank you for consulting North West Leicestershire District Council. I can advise that we have no comments to make on the draft	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
4		Markfield Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council considered your Neighbourhood Plan at its meeting held on 6 April 2021. I have copied the resolution of the Council for your information.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> that the Council is supportive of our neighbouring communities undertaking this work and believe it is the right action to take to prevent speculative housing development. However, the Council does have some reservations at the selection of the site opposite South Charnwood High School on sustainability grounds being in the open countryside.</p> <p>If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	Noted. Noted. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.
5		Borough Councillor Matthew Lay	<p>Thanks for this. The plan all looks ok except for one key problem which is a (major issue which I would object to) site in the preference list. The choice of a site opposite South Charnwood seems totally contrary to national and local planning policies. It is clearly not a sustainable location by any measure. It is not related to any settlement, has no services, has no access to public</p>	Noted. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			transport. It is hard to understand the rational for this and I fear the choice of this site in the NP will lead to its delay and possible (I would say likely) rejection by an inspector. This is unfortunate as without a credible plan compliant with policy, it could lead to Stanton having more housing allocated, not less which for Stanton is not acceptable. Stanton needs to find only a oldest amount of new housing to be compliant and yet it seems to be taking the lions share in allocations? This is worthy of more discussion as I dont want to be publicly critical of the NP work.		
6	General Comments	LCC Highways	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.	Noted	None
			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	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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 conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems.	Noted	None
			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.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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
			The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third-party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third-party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			In regard to Traffic Management any developments in the area would be assessed to mitigate their impact on the highway network. Current problems would assessed within the LCC policies and guidance.	Noted	None
			LCC would support any measures proposed providing there is sufficient data and evidence to warrant any intervention. Any potential solutions would need to be in line with current national and local policy and guidance. The main concerns of speeding and HGV violations should be raised with the police, as they are the only enforcement authority. LCC, as the highway authority can introduce or amend both speed limits and HGV weight limits only.	Noted	None
			Any parking restrictions would require a public consultation before being implemented. The Parish should be aware of the potential displacement of restricting in areas and the issues this may cause. There is also a cost involved in the creating parking restriction, which would need to be funded by a third party should it not meeting LCC's safety criteria. Providing off-street parking is not a highway function.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			The traffic calming measures on Reservoir Road and Markfield Lane need to demonstrate that they are necessary and proportionate to the scale of any developments proposed in the area.	Noted. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.
			Regarding a new vehicular access on Reservoir Road, Meadow Lane, Markfield Lane and Main Street need to ensure the site access will be designed in accordance with the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) to ensure a safe and suitable access can be delivered in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	Noted. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.
			Parking requirements in accordance with the LHDG for dwellings should be: Dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms must have a minimum of 3 spaces Dwellings with 3 or less bedrooms must have a minimum of 2 spaces Dwellings with 2 bedrooms or less must have a minimum of 3 spaces per 2 dwellings	Noted. The parking standards have been enhanced due to the issues in the Neighbourhood Area.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Flood Risk Management		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.	Noted	None
			<p>The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation. • Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development. • Require development to resolve existing flood risk 	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)). • Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map). 	Noted	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding 	Noted	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff. • Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk. 	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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	None
			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	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies.</p> <p>For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning Practice Guidance webpage.</p>	Noted	None
			<p>Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals.</p> <p>Risk of flooding from surface water map: https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Planning		On Page 15, it would be helpful to make specific reference to the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan, rather than refer to it as a 'non-statutory growth plan for Leicester and Leicestershire'. The Strategic Growth Plan is the overarching plan that sets out the aspirations for delivering growth in Leicester and Leicestershire up to 2050. The Strategic Growth Plan has been developed by a partnership made up of Leicester City and Leicestershire County councils, the seven local borough and district authorities (including North West Leicestershire District Council) and the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP).	Noted	Change to be made as indicated.
	Developer Contributions		If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Adopted North Kilworth NP and the Adopted Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances of your community	Do you want to add in a section detailing priorities for infrastructure improvements in the event of future development?	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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 (Leicestershirecommunities.co.uk) Great Glen Adopted Plan (Leicestershirecommunities.co.uk)		
	Mineral & Waste Planning		The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development.	Noted	None
			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.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			You should also be aware of Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan (Leicestershire.gov.uk) .	Noted	None
			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.	Noted	None
	Property Education		Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two-mile (primary) and three-mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places.	Noted	None
			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	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.		
	Strategic Property Services		No comment at this time.	Noted	None
	Adult Social Care		It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and that development seeks to include bungalows etc of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.	This is already referenced in the NP	None
	Environment Specific Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The page numbers are inconsistent and jump from 59 to 81. 	This amendment will be made. How did this come about?	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vision on page 13 could be strengthened, in regard to environmental protection. 	The bullet points refer to protecting important open spaces and enabling access to the countryside and it is considered to be a proportionate and appropriate vision statement.	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 26: Should the sentence (in the 4th paragraph) read 'meaning there are at least two more bedrooms THAN are technically required by the household' rather than 'that'? 	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy H7: Design Standards. This policy is strong but could be further strengthened by mentioning appropriate provisions for the storage of waste and recycling. 	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan does not reference the possible introduction of renewable energy sources (such as wind turbines and solar farms) in the Parish or have a policy regarding this. Other neighbourhood plans we have seen make reference to this 	The group considered this but decided not to have a policy in this area.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	Change to be made as indicated.
	General Comments		With regard to the environment and in line with Government advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of the natural environment including climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land.	Noted. The NP does this.	None
	Climate Change		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	Noted. The NP policy H7 addresses such issues, as well as the environment section.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Landscape		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 environment section addresses this issue through a range of policies.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			LCC would encourage the development of local listings as per the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and LCC have some data on the social, cultural, archaeological and historic value of local features and buildings (https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record)	Noted. The NP addresses this issue in policy Env 4.	None
	Biodiversity		The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, providing net gain for biodiversity, and reducing pollution. Neighbourhood	Noted. The environment section addresses this issue through a range of policies.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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.		
			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.	Noted. These sources have been used	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent Habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme.</p> <p>Contact: planningecology@leics.gov.uk, or phone 0116 305 4108</p>	Noted	None
	Green Infrastructure		<p>Green infrastructure (GI) is a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities, (NPPF definition). As a network, GI includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/ churchyards, allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and in doing so they should ensure that their Neighbourhood Plan is reflective of the relevant Local Authority Green Infrastructure strategy. Through the Neighbourhood Plan and discussions with the Local Authority Planning teams and potential Developers communities are well placed to influence the delivery of local scale GI networks	Noted	None
	Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land		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

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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
			High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs)		Information for Neighbourhood Planning groups regarding Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) can be found on the Neighbourhood Planning website (www.neighbourhoodplanning.org) and should be referred to. As taken from the website, a Neighbourhood Plan must meet certain basic conditions in order to be 'made'. It must not breach and be otherwise compatible with EU obligations. One of these obligations is Directive 2001/42/EC 'on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment' (Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations, 2004, available online). This is often referred to as the SEA Directive. Not every Neighbourhood Plan needs a SEA, however, it is compulsory to provide when submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority either:	Noted. A SEA was not determined to be necessary.	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of reasons as to why SEA was not required • An environmental report (a key output of the SEA process). 	Noted	None
			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	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Impact of Development on Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC)		Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and Leicestershire County Council. The County's Waste Management team considers proposed developments on a case by case basis and when it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the local HWRC infrastructure then appropriate projects to increase the capacity to off-set the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire's Planning Obligations Policy (2019) and the relevant Legislation Regulations.	Noted	None
	Communities		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;	Noted. The NP addresses these issues.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carry out and report on a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. 2. Set out policies that seek to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect and retain these existing facilities, • support the independent development of new facilities, and, • identify and protect Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations. 3. Identify and support potential community projects that could be progressed. 		
			<p>You are encouraged to consider and respond to all aspects of community resources as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. Further information, guidance and examples of policies and supporting information is available at www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/useful-information</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Economic Development		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	Noted. The NP addresses these issues.	None
	Fibre Broadband		High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a fast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life	Noted. The NP addresses these issues.	None
			All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to ultrafast broadband (of at least 100Mbps) and allow mechanisms for securing a full fibre broadband provision for each premise and business from at least one network operator, provided on an open access basis. Such provider must deploy a Fibre to the Premise (FTTP) access network structure in which optical fibre runs from a local exchange to each premise	Noted. The NP addresses these issues.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Developers should take active steps to incorporate adequate broadband provision at the pre planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure fibre broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete. Where practical, developers should consider engaging several telecoms providers to encourage competition and consumer choice.	Noted. The NP addresses these issues.	None
			The Council supports a 'dig once' approach for the deployment of communications infrastructure and a build which is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Council encourages telecommunications build which does not significantly impact on the appearance of any building or space on which equipment is located and which minimises street clutter.	Noted. The NP addresses these issues.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Equalities		While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council's Equality Strategy 2016-2020 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work. A copy of the strategy can be view at: www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/30/equality-strategy2016-2020.pdf	Noted	None
		Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 13 March 2021.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
		LLR Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs)	<p>We are writing in response to the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Bagworth, Thornton and Stanton Under-Bardon.</p> <p>The LLR Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) are supportive of the vision set out in your draft plan and would want to work collectively with you to understand in more detail how the local NHS can contribute to its delivery.</p> <p>Many of the themes identified in the plan will impact upon the wider determinants of health and as a result population health outcomes. We would therefore welcome working together to maximise the opportunity for health and wellbeing within the vision outlined in section 3 of your plan.</p> <p>In particular we would welcome:</p>	Noted. The respective Parish Councils will be happy to work with you in pursuit of these actions.	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions to support the goal of sustainable development and community identity; maximising opportunities for residents to come together to create community cohesion and support each other, and protection of community facilities 	Noted. The respective Parish Councils will be happy to work with you in pursuit of these actions.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring continued ease of access to the surrounding countryside and green spaces, and protection of natural habitats, which will improve the physical and mental health of residents 	Noted. The respective Parish Councils will be happy to work with you in pursuit of these actions.	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The actions to create and sustain local jobs and opportunities for new ways of working are welcome, as this is a large contributor to people's health and wellbeing 	Noted. The respective Parish Councils will be happy to work with you in pursuit of these actions.	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That future development is designed in such a way to enhance physical and mental health and wellbeing. 	Noted. The respective Parish Councils will be happy to work with you in pursuit of these actions.	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that there are a range of options for travel within the area that enable residents to get to and from work and leisure easily 	Noted. The respective Parish Councils will be happy to work with you in pursuit of these actions.	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designs that support the reduction in carbon emissions, as this has a direct impact on some resident's health 	Noted. The respective Parish Councils will be happy to work with you in pursuit of these actions.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			As well as the above generic comments it is important to note that an increase in the number of new residents in any area will have a direct impact upon local NHS services whether that is primary, hospital or community care. Local primary care services are already under high demand and therefore any additional demand from housing developments will require developer contribution to mitigate this.	Noted	None
			Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your vision and I look forward to working together to make the most of the opportunity and mitigate any impacts from increases in population upon local NHS services.	Noted	None
		Coal Authority	As you will be aware past coal mining activity has taken place in the area and has left a legacy at surface and shallow depth.	Noted	None
			It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan proposes to allocate sites for future development, I have reviewed these against our records and confirm that our information does not indicate that there is any coal mining features present in these area.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			On this basis we have no specific comments to make in respect of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted	None
		Sport England	Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan. Please note our concern with respect to the use of robust and up to evidence below.	Noted	None
			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.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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.	Noted	None
			https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy	Noted	None
			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. https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Sport England has worked with Hinckley and Bosworth BC to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 96 and 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.</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>In this regard Sport England is concerned that the plan appears to only refer to the 'Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation Study', which dates from 2016 and is not the most up to date study with respect to playing fields and sports facilities. If this is the case the studies used are out of date and therefore the plan is not sound. HBBC have also developed the Sport and Facilities Framework 2020 - 2036 Playing Pitch Strategy 2019. The plan should therefore be checked and updated against the above-mentioned evidence.</p>	<p>The 2016 <i>Study</i> is the current relevant HBBC document for planning purposes. If necessary, references and lists of sites will be updated and conformity with H&BBC policies confirmed at the time of Submission.</p> <p>FOR INFORMATION: The <i>Sport and Facilities Framework 2020 – 2036</i> referred to does not appear to be on the HBBC website. The <i>Playing Pitch Strategy</i> is only at the 'vision' stage; the documents available are an initial <i>Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report</i> and a <i>Strategy Action Plan</i>.</p>	Change to be made as indicated.
			<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. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/!</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Housing		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.	Noted. The NP makes no specific residential allocations. HBBC policy will apply with future development activity.	None
			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 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	Noted. The NP makes no specific residential allocations. HBBC policy will apply with future development activity.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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.	Noted. The NP makes no specific residential allocations. HBBC policy will apply with future development activity.	None
			NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
		Historic England	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <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>	Noted	None
			<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</p> <p>(www.heritagegateway.org.uk <http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk)</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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	Noted	None
			Historic England has produced advice which your community might find helpful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:-	Noted	None
			< https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/ >	Noted	None
			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: < http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environmentagency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf >	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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 ">https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/heag074-he-and-site-allocation-local-plans.pdf/>	There are no allocations in the NP	None
		Caddick Land	The following submission is made on behalf of Caddick Land, who represent the owners of land adjacent to the Public House, Stanton-under-Bardon. In particular, this submission relates to the six-week pre-submission consultation of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Bagworth, Thornton and Stanton-under-Bardon	Noted	None
			We thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the NP prior to its submission to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and would welcome the opportunity to work with the Parish Council in the delivery of a high quality and well-integrated extension to Stanton-under-Bardon at the appropriate juncture.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Having reviewed the pre-submission NP, February 2020, alongside the abundance of supporting evidence and site selection assessments we would like to express our general support for the NP in its current form. In particular we support the NP Vision stating:	Noted	None
			<i>Bagworth, Thornton and Stanton-under-Bardon will continue to be attractive and desirable places to live, meeting the housing needs of all ages with a community seeking to provide a good quality of life for all residents in a rural village environment.</i> <i>It will be a thriving and sustainable community, supported by appropriate infrastructure, whilst maintaining green areas that are a haven for wildlife</i>	Noted	None
			The following comments relate solely to the topic of Housing and are set out below	Noted	None
	Housing		The NP reflects the current policies of the Hinckley and Bosworth adopted Development Plan and in turn accepts a draft indicative housing figure for the plan period. Notwithstanding this, the District Council have now begun a review of their Local Plan, which will set a new housing requirement for the district	Noted. The housing chapter has been changed in light of the increased housing requirements.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Housing		We support the NP in that it acknowledges that the full scale of the housing requirement, which may need to be accommodated by the Neighbourhood Plan area over the period 2016-2036, will only be fully established once the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan Review has reached a sufficiently advanced stage. In short, the housing requirement figure may change and there may be a need for additional housing over the timeframe of the Neighbourhood Plan. In turn, identifying a number of suitable housing sites within the NP now, is a sensible course of action, which we fully support.	Noted. However, in the event that the full housing requirement could not be met, the housing allocations have been withdrawn.	Change to be made as indicated.
			Two sites have been identified to meet the housing needs of Stanton-under-Bardon by reference to the existing policies in the adopted Development Plan; namely Site 13: Land off Meadow Lane (12 units) and Site 10: Land opposite South Charnwood High School (45 units). Therefore, exceeding the current target number of residential units for the village (40 units).	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Land adjacent to the Public House in Stanton-under-Bardon, our site, has also been identified as being suitable for housing to accommodate around 50 units, but at this stage it is proposed to be held in reserve, only available for development if it is required to remediate a substantial shortfall in the supply of housing land due to the failure of existing housing sites in Stanton-under-Bardon, or if it becomes necessary to provide for additional homes in accordance with any new Development Plan document that replaces the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan. We support the identification of this site and consider that it represents an appropriate and logical location for residential development, in a sustainable location, adjacent to the settlement limits. As stated above, it is extremely important that the NP identifies housing sites that are considered suitable so that any requirement to identify additional housing sites within the NP area can be informed by the NP.	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			It should be noted that Hinckley and Bosworth Council are currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land, a requirement as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and thus establishing a need for further sites to be identified for housing within the district. As such there is a distinct need for this site, adjacent to the Public House, to be brought forward for development now and not held in reserve.	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>In addition to the above, we are concerned that the identification of Site 10 (land opposite South Charnwood High School, Stanton-under-Bardon) does not represent a sustainable location for residential development. Albeit adjacent to South Charnwood High School, the site is significantly divorced from the settlement of Stanton-under Bardon, limiting access to the services and facilities within the village. In addition, the site does not benefit from links to public transport, with the nearest bus stops, connecting the village with the larger settlement of Markfield and further afield to Leicester and Castle Donington, located some 1.6 km away on Main Street, Thornton and approximately 2.1 km away on Main Street, Stanton-under-Bardon. Site 10 is infact located closer to the services and facilities in Thornton than those within Stanton-under Bardon. Of particular concern, at criterion 13 of the site assessment: "Safe pedestrian access to and from the site?" the assessment states "No existing provision and it is impossible to provide adequate connectivity due to the distance from the current settlement". We have serious doubts that when judged against National and local planning policies, with specific regard to sustainable development, that Site 10 will be considered to be a</p>	<p>Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.</p>	<p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			suitable housing site and therefore we would suggest that it be reconsidered.		
			Notwithstanding the above, we support the Neighbourhood Plan in recognising that a wide choice of high-quality homes of differing tenures should be delivered, which meet identified needs in the Plan area, and assist in developing a sustainable, mixed and inclusive community. This includes a clear need to provide affordable housing.	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.
			I trust that the Parish Council will welcome this contribution to the consultation process and that our comments will be duly considered prior to submission of the Neighbourhood Plan. Should you require anything further, please do not hesitate to be in contact.	Thank you for these comments. It is regrettable that the housing allocations have had to be removed from the NP but it is an inevitable consequence of the dramatic increase in the housing requirement needed by HBBC.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Facilities & Services	Bagworth Resident (McClory)	There are a problematic number of cars in the village due to poor public transport links. This causes frequent and problematic traffic issues. Trips must be accurately timed to meet a late afternoon last bus from the city. The nearest train stations are in Leicester City or Hinckley which limits residents working for large organisations that are based or have London links. The train from Leicester City to London St. Pancras is circa £150 return. The alternative is to drive to Hinckley (25 mins) to switch at Nuneaton or Nuneaton (40 mins) directly at a more acceptable cost of £25 return.	Noted	None
	Traffic & Transport Sections 2 and 3 Bagworth and Thornton Site Selection Framework		Having attended the Housing Theme Group, and I don't believe this was the correct forum to determine scoring or preferred locations for build. Attendance was low and predominantly from outside of the village or from the side next to where other sites were situated.	Noted. It is inevitable that the bulk of the work in preparing the NP would be left to a relatively small number of people, however the process was thorough and endorsed by the Steering Group.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Outcomes were rushed due to personal preference rather than site suitability. Traffic is a serious issue throughout the village. At our end of Main Street, we have cars parked outside of property with people visiting the Reservoir not wanting to be trapped in the parking issues at Reservoir Road. Whilst visitors tend to drive slower nearer the other side of the village, they speed up when they reach our side, despite aforementioned park cars. Many cars go past travelling faster than 30 and we appear to be part of a cut through between Bagworth and Markfield Lane. If additional houses were built, especially family housing, significant traffic calming measure would need to be put in place to prevent injury or worse. There have been 3 accidents since the start of 2021 between the Markfield Road junction turning right onto Main Street. From the start of 2021, I have also had to remove two injured rabbits from the road. Unfortunately with both incidents the animals were fatally injured. To ensure pedestrian safety, a wide pavement would need to be constructed in front of new properties. Currently, we have</p>	<p>We note this observation but refute the suggestion that outcomes were rushed. Nonetheless, all sites have subsequently been withdrawn from the NP.</p>	<p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			people that park on both sides of the road because there are no yellow lines or parking control measures. This is more of an issue for busses or larger vehicles trying to squeeze through but again, would need to be considered as part of any housing plans as individuals may think it is more acceptable to park on both sides		
	Employment & Business Local Economy		We are keen to support the local economy and try to spend money in the local Step In Convenience or Leedham's Dairy. We would have been at a loss through COVID without access to these services. Pre-COVID we would also enjoy a meal in The Bricklayers Arms. We are disappointed in the closure of The Reservoir Inn and the challenges faced by those trying to take on the lease. We have been advised the current lease is charged at £28,000 per annum which far exceeds the £18,000-£22,000 as standard for the area. There is an opinion that the landlord does not want the lease to be taken and would prefer it to be sold. This would be disappointing as it is a fantastic location to pick up trade from Reservoir visitors or locals, many of whom have significant disposable income and can afford to eat out or purchase local produce on a regular basis.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Housing Sections 2 and 3 Bagworth and Thornton Site Selection Framework		<p>As previously mentioned, I am concerned regarding the site selection process and the personal opinions taken into account to determine selected sites. The favoured site is directly opposite my property where there are no current houses. I am concerned previous planning applications for the site were challenged or limited to 8 properties and then suddenly the proposal is for 12 properties to be built. In addition, the Neighbourhood Plan clearly states a requirement for smaller properties to accommodate an aging population (to free up other larger houses in the village) and first time buyers to allow them to stay in the village. The previous planning application for this site is for 3 and 4 bedroomed properties - no bungalows as typically associated with older individuals with potential mobility issues. I am also very concerned regarding the style of the properties. The houses at this end of the village are built in the style of those from 1700s when the farmhouses were built. The quoted 1960s and 1970s style would be incongruous to the setting. My biggest concern in the proposal for these houses is the restriction of light to our (and neighbouring) properties. We live in a three storey house and spend the majority of time during the day on the bottom floor. I worked from home 2 days a week pre COVID and have permanently worked from home</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred sites were selected following an independently led assessment process.</p> <p>However, all allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.</p>	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			through COVID. There is no mention in the proposed documents of any consideration to Daylight and Sunlight access to our properties or the impact of proposed properties restricting this access. There is also no consideration as to how this would be a greater issue from Autumn through Winter and any assessments would need to be made during this time of year for a true representation of impact. Our properties suffer from dampness on the ground floor and again, without access to sunlight, this could become a far more serious issue		
	Housing	Environment Agency	<p>Site 2 – Thornton Nurseries for 21 units of residential accommodation.</p> <p>We acknowledge that this site is a brownfield site and has undergone a site sustainability assessment, as indicated in the submitted documentation. However we wish to make the following comments:</p>	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.
	Policy H1: Residential Site Allocations		The site is immediately adjacent to Thornton Reservoir. The reservoir falls under the ambit of the Reservoirs Act and is owned by Severn Trent Water Limited (the 'owner'). From the proposed plan no 6 (Figure 2 Allocations in Thornton), it would appear that the proposed area for development is on the boundary of the reservoirs primary spillway and within the reservoir flood area	As above	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			If this area of land were to be brought forward as a site for residential development then:		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the proximity of the reservoir, the properties would be highly vulnerable to flooding and possibly damage if the reservoir was to fail. We would strongly recommend that a site specific flood risk assessment is carried out to determine any impacts and what mitigation measures would be required. Any people purchasing properties at the site should be made well aware of any risks. 	As above	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the site could lead to a change in the reservoirs design classification. If this happened then the owner would incur increased design, construction and maintenance costs due to any downstream development. Therefore we consider that any applicant proposing to develop the site will need to consider any financial impacts placed on the reservoir owner. 	As above	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">We strongly recommend that the owner of the reservoir should be consulted on the proposal to bring forward this site as a Housing Allocation.	As above	Na					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">Any development must not inhibit the Environment Agency's ability to access the nearby watercourse for the purposes of maintenance or in the event of an emergency	As above						
		National Grid	Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: Following a review of the above document we have identified the following National Grid assets as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:	Noted	None					
			Electricity Transmission							
			<table><tr><td>Asset Description</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>ZL ROUTE TWR (010 - 108): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: COVENTRY - RATCLIFFE ON SOAR</td><td></td></tr></table>			Asset Description		ZL ROUTE TWR (010 - 108): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: COVENTRY - RATCLIFFE ON SOAR		
Asset Description										
ZL ROUTE TWR (010 - 108): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: COVENTRY - RATCLIFFE ON SOAR										
			A plan showing details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only. As an Appendix to this document	Noted	None					

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			National Grid also provides information in relation to its assets at the website below. • www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ Please see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure. Distribution Networks Information	Noted	None
			regarding the electricity distribution network is available at the website below: www.energynetworks.org.uk Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting: plantprotection@cadentgas.com	Noted	None
			Further Advice Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets.	Noted	None
			We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database, if they are not already included:	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
		Severn Trent Water	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation, Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles outlined within the plan, there are a few areas that we feel could be enhanced by the addition of a few minor alteration or where we feel additional information may need to be assessed at the new stage of development, these areas are detailed below.	Noted	None
	Policy H1: Residential Site Allocations Site 1 -The Rear of Main Street, Thornton		Due to the scale of the proposed development, Severn Trent do not anticipate that there will be any significant impacts on the sewerage system as a result of this development, providing surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall rather than the sewerage system. It is noted that there is a watercourse within 200m of the southern boundary of the site, and there is the possibility that there are field boundary ditches running from the site boundary to the watercourse. These surface water options should be investigated prior to any request for a surface water discharge into the sewerage network.	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Site 2 – Thornton Nurseries		Due to the scale of this development it is not anticipated that there will be any significant impacts on the sewerage network, provided surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall instead of the sewerage system.	Noted	None
			This site is located adjacent to Thornton Reservoir and part of the site is bounded by the Spillway for the reservoir, it is vital that any proposed works as part of the redevelopment of this site do not have an impact on the performance of the spillway, to ensure that it's integrity and the integrity of the Reservoir are maintained.	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.
			If any construction works are proposed close to the spillway then we would recommend further consultation is carried out at the relevant stage of design such that the impacts of the proposals can be assessed.	As above	
	Site 3 – Land off Meadow Lane, Stanton Under Bardon		Due to the Scale of the site it is not anticipated that there will be any significant impacts on the performance of the sewer network, providing Surface water is managed and discharged to a sustainable outfall. Surface water Sewer located within Main Street therefore no surface water shall be discharged to the foul sewer network.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Site 3 – Land Opposite South Charnwood High School, Stanton Under Bardon		The location of this site is remote from any existing Sewerage Network, as such there are likely to be additional cost and time constraint to enable sewerage capacity to be provided. We would therefore recommend that early consultation is undertaken with Severn Trent and that the additional time constraints are incorporated into the build out profile.	Noted	None
	Policy H2: Reserve Site Allocation		Severn Trent would recommend that it this site is to be brought forward that early consultation with Severn Trent is undertaken to allow assessments to be undertaken to determine the impact that the development will have on our sewerage network. We do however note that there is a watercourse located on the eastern boundary of the site, therefore no surface water shall be connected to the sewerage networks.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Policy H7: Design Standards		<p>Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to highlight the need for development to incorporate SuDS, Water efficiency and Rainwater Harvesters into the design policy. We would however look to strengthen this section through the addition of further guidance around:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SuDS 2. Water Efficiency 3. Drainage Hierarchy 4. Protection of Watercourses 	Noted	Change to be made as indicated below.
			<p>SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems)</p> <p>Severn Trent note that Planning Policy already requires major development to incorporate SuDS through the written Ministerial Statement for Sustainable Drainage (HCWS 161) and NPPF. However current policy is very flexible on how SuDS can be incorporated into development, by incorporating</p>	Noted	Change to be made as indicated below.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			appropriate references to SuDS in Policy H7, the need for developers to deliver high quality SuDS can be secured. Current Industry Best Practice for SuDS (The SuDS Manual CIRIA C753) highlights the need to consider SuDS from the outset of the design process and not to fit SuDS to the development site post layout. To aid in the delivery of this recommendation we would recommend wording to the effect of:		
			<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>	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			<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>		
			<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>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<i>Where possible, all non-major development should look to incorporate these same SuDS principles into their designs.</i>		
			The supporting text for the policy should also include:		
			<i>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be designed in accordance with current industry best practice, The SuDS Manual, CIRIA (C753), to ensure that the systems deliver both the surface water quantity and the wider benefits, without significantly increasing costs. Good SuDS design can be key for creating a strong sense of place and pride in the community for where they live, work and visit, making the surface water management features as much a part of the development as the buildings and roads.</i>	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			We would also note that as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are the statutory consultee for the planning process in relation to surface water management that they should also be consulted on any wording regarding SuDS.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Water Efficiency</p> <p>Water efficient design and technology is important for ensuring the sustainability of the water supply system for the future, both supporting existing customers and future development. NPPF supports the delivery of sustainable development and the Humber River Basin Management Plan promotes the use of the tighter Water Efficiency Target within Building Regulations Part G. We would recommend that this detailed with Policy H7 so that developers are aware of what is expected of them from the outset of the design process.</p>	Noted	
			To aid with the implementation of the recommendation we have provided some example wording below:	Noted	
			<p>All development should demonstrate that they are water efficiency, where possible incorporating innovative water efficiency and water re-use measures, demonstrating that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day.</p>	Do you wish to include this policy?	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Drainage Hierarchy</p> <p>The drainage hierarchy outlined the principles of where surface water should be discharged, the hierarchy is outlined within Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 80 (Reference ID: 7-080- 20150323). Severn Trent request evidence that the drainage hierarchy has been followed by developers in our conversations, however by raising the expectation at the Neighbourhood Plan stage it consideration can be incorporated into the initial a site designs resulting it better continuity of surface water through development.</p>	Noted	None
			To aid in the interpretation of this request we would recommend that the following wording is incorporated into Policy H7:	Noted	None
			<p><i>All applications for new development shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, in such that a discharge to the public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible.</i></p>	Do you wish to incorporate such a policy? I don't believe it to be necessary as it reflects national policy	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Protection of watercourses</p> <p>Watercourses perform several vital roles from conveying water safely through the natural and built up environment, to providing access to water and habitats for wildlife. It is therefore important that these features are retained and protected from development such that the continuity of the natural water system is maintained. Watercourses also provide a sustainable outfall for surface water flows from developments as outlined in the Drainage Hierarchy. To aid with the implementation of this recommendation we have provided some example wording below:</p>	Noted	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p><i>No development shall prevent the continuation of existing natural or manmade drainage features, where 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>	Do you wish to include such a policy?	
			The supporting text for the policy should also include:		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<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>		
			In relation to bullet point K, whilst water butts are a useful method of harvesting a small amount of rainwater for use within the garden and can be designed such that they are partially empty to attenuate for Storm events, they should not be identified as key SuDS features as they are only retained at the houseowners discretion, and should therefore not be included as part of the SuDS solution, but detailed as part of the potential water efficiency benefits of the properties	Agreed. We will remove reference to water butts	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Policy ENV1: Local Green Spaces		Severn Trent understand the need for Local Green Space and the need for it to be protected, however local green spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes such as flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation schemes can result in additional benefits to the local green space in the form of biodiversity or amenity improvements. We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy ENV1 to support the delivery of flood alleviation projects where required within green spaces.	Noted	None
			<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>	We believe that the current policy allows for such work without amendment.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Policy Env7: Important Open Spaces		Severn Trent understand the need for Important Open Spaces and the need for it to be protected, however open spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes such as flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation schemes can result in additional benefits to the local green space in the form of biodiversity or amenity improvements. We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy ENV7 to support the delivery of flood alleviation projects where required within green spaces.	Noted	None
			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.	Noted. These are not 'Local Green Spaces' so the comment is not appropriate.	None
			Please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice. For your information we have set out some general guidelines that may be useful to you	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<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 issue. Where we consider there may be an issue, we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills.</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Sewage Strategy</p> <p>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.</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Surface Water and Sewer Flooding</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers.</p> <p>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</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>drainage system. More details can be found on our website</p> <p>https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</p>		
			<p>Water Quality</p> <p>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 is not impacted by our or others operations. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safeguarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit as prepared by the Environment Agency.</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Water Supply When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site-specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts,	Noted	None
			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.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Water Efficiency</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We recommend that in all cases you consider:</p>	Noted	None
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres. • Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute. • Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres per minute or less. • Water butts for external use in properties with gardens. 	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>To further encourage developers to act sustainably Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. More details can be found on our website.</p> <p>https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/</p>	Noted	None
			<p>We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day.</p>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			We would also encourage the use of rainwater harvesting on larger developments, either residential or commercial. This helps to reduce the demand on public supply, associated carbon impact of supply and also reduced site run off and sewer flows. Rainwater Harvesting as a development rather than on a property by property basis is more cost efficient and can produce greater benefits.	Noted	None
			Both the River Severn River Basin Management Plan (Page 52) and the Humber River Basin Management Plan (page 46) recommend that Local Plan set out policies requiring homes to meet the tighter water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day as described in Part G of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. As such Severn Trent's recommendation is consistent with wider objectives within our water supply regions.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
		Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Neighbourhood plans are not required to meet the tests of soundness which local plans and other development plan documents must meet. Instead, in order for them to be able to be put to referendum, they must meet the 'basic conditions' set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Those relevant to neighbourhood plans are as follows:	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>(a). having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order (or neighbourhood plan).</p> <p>(d). the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>(e). the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</p> <p>(f). the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</p> <p>(g). prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Order (or plan) and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order (or neighbourhood plan).</p>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			This consultation response aims to highlight where policies of the Bagworth, Thornton and Stanton under Bardon NDP require modification in order to be in full conformity with the basic conditions.	Noted	None
			Points (f) and (g) above relate to certain obligations which plans must adhere to, primarily in relation to habitats and environmental impacts. Some plans require a Strategic Environmental Assessment and/or a Habitat Regulations Assessment. Bagworth Thornton Stanton under Bardon NDP undertook screenings and it was determined that whilst neither a full HRA nor an SEA were required to comply with this basic condition, a Heritage Impact Assessment would be required.	Noted	None
			Comments are provided below on the NDP policies which aim to ensure that the policies in their final form are workable and can be implemented to their full effect, ensuring that they contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	1.1 Why we produced a Plan		Second paragraph of 1.1. Reference to sixteen years. HBBC is planning for the period 2020 – 2039. As we are now into 2021 and the BT&SuB plan has not yet been submitted it would make sense for the neighbourhood plan to also plan for the same period that HBBC is planning for - 2020 – 2039 for consistency.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			Fourth paragraph of 1.1. Ditto regarding plan period to 2036	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
	1.2 How the Plan fits into the Planning System		Third paragraph of 1.1. Reference to HBBC Local Plan should be for the period 2020 – 2039	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
	1.3 The Plan process		Hyperlink to consultation activities needs to be fixed. Details of consultation activities could not be found	Do you wish to retain this link?	
			It is noted that a “Sustainability” theme group was charged with considering employment issues, but there is little evidence of active engagement or consultation with business operators in the NP area, including the part of Bardon Hill industrial estate in the NP area.	Consultation with businesses took place in the early stages of the NP Thereafter consultation was with the community more generally and hampered during the Theme Group stage by the Coronavirus pandemic.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	4.1 Housing Introduction P.14		Fourth Paragraph of 4.1. This detail about the preparation of the NP may appear dated once the NP is “made” Fifth Paragraph of 4.1. Of the key areas the NPPF sets out to address, increasing housing supply generally is a far more explicit priority than increasing affordable housing supply. Suggest re-phrasing accordingly.	The NP will be updated prior to submission as will references to the stage in the process.	Change to be made as indicated.
	4.2 Housing Need PP. 14-15		First Paragraph of 4.2. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) is 4 years old and has been superseded by the Standard Method of calculating local housing requirements as set out in national planning policy. HBBC recommends that this paragraph is deleted.	Reference to the standard methodology will be updated.	Change to be made as indicated.
			Second Paragraph of 4.2. HBBC is planning for the period 2020 – 2039. As we are now into 2021 and the BT&SuB plan has not yet been submitted it would make sense for the neighbourhood plan to also plan for the same period that HBBC is planning for - 2020 – 2039 for consistency. That would mean that outstanding permissions with dwellings uncompleted at 1/4/20 could count towards meeting the housing requirement.	We will change this reference to 2039	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	4.3 Statistical Evidence		First paragraph of 4.3 and table below paragraph 2. This paragraph describes the introduction of the Standard Method setting the borough housing requirement. It then cites an indicative figure of 133 dwellings for the neighbourhood plan area purported to have been provided by the borough. The table apportions the borough housing requirement of 9,460 dwellings according to the Core Strategy apportionment. Since mid-2020 HBBC has been advocating an approach to setting indicative housing figures for parish areas that is based on apportionment of the borough wide figure according to population distribution. This approach was most recently set out to all Parish/ Neighbourhood Plan groups on 6 th November 2020. It uses a borough wide requirement figure of 8,588 dwellings for the 19 year period of 2020 to 2039.	Noted. The updated figures will be used in the NP	Change to be made as indicated.
			The apportionment of the borough requirement to the parishes of Bagworth and Thornton and Stanton-under-Bardon is as follows:	Noted	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment					Response	Amendment
				Pop ul- ation (ON S 2017)	% of HB BC pop ulati on	sha re of nee d	share of need + 10%		
			Bagwor th & Thornto n	2,74 2	2.5	211	233		
			Stanton -u- Bardon	843	0.8	65	72		
			BT&Su B combin ed	3,58 5	3.3	276	305		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>This apportionment by population distribution provides an indicative need figure for BT&SuB for the 2020-39 period of 276 dwellings and a figure of 305 dwellings for increased flexibility. These figures are offered as a starting point. Local circumstances relative to the rest of the borough may give reason to increase or decrease the indicative figures. The type of issues to be considered include how sustainable the villages are to support housing growth including proximity to employment, what level of local infrastructure is available and public transport, and the environmental capacity of the villages to support housing growth including flood risk, the presence of valuable natural habitats, landscape, and the visual and historic value of the existing built form. Availability of suitable sites will be important.</p>	<p>Noted. We understand that the figures are a starting point – we also note that HBBC has said that and variation from these figures is likely to result in the NP failing at examination. For this reason the residential allocations in the NP have been withdrawn.</p>	<p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Second paragraph of 4.3. This paragraph sets out the dwellings permitted or built since 1 st April 2017 for deduction from the housing requirement of 133 dwellings (89 Bagworth and Thornton; 44 for Stanton under Bardon). To be consistent with HBBC's emerging Local Plan, the plan period ought to be 2020 – 2039 and as such, outstanding permissions for dwellings to be deducted from the housing requirement should relate to 1 st April 2020. HBBC records indicate that Bagworth and Thornton had 6 permitted uncompleted dwellings and Stanton under Bardon also had 6 permitted uncompleted dwellings at this point.	These revised figures will be used.	Change to be made as indicated
			It would also be appropriate for a windfall allowance to be made based on past trends of housing delivery from 2006 to 2020 on unallocated sites in BT&SuB. These are as follows	Noted. The windfall allowance becomes irrelevant as the NP is no longer seeking to achieve the housing requirement.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Bagworth: 2006-2020 = 179 completions Allocated Completions = 117 Windfall = 4.4 dwellings per year</p> <p>Thornton: 2006-2020 = 14 completions Allocated completions = 0 (8 allocated were not delivered) Windfall = 1 dwelling per year</p> <p>Stanton under Bardon 2006 – 2020 = 94 completions Allocated completions = 91 completions</p>		
			Windfall = 0.21 dwellings per year		
			This rounds up to a windfall allowance of 5.6 dwellings per year for the whole neighbourhood plan area. Over the 19 year plan period of 2020-39 this would give a windfall allowance of 103 dwellings for Bagworth and Thornton and 4 for Stanton under Bardon, or 107 dwellings for the whole NP area.	Noted	Change to be made as indicated.
			So taking the outstanding permitted dwellings at 1/4/20 and the windfall allowance from the indicative housing need figure would leave 89 – 118 dwellings to be found in housing allocations.	We are not sure how you have arrived at a figure of 89-118. The housing requirement for the neighbourhood area is 305, minus an allowance for windfall of 107 = 198, minus 12 uncommitted dwellings = 186.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<div> <div>Housing Need</div> <div>Base 10% Uplift</div> </div> <div> <div>Bagworth & Thornton Need</div> <div>211</div> </div> <div> <div>233</div> <div>Outstanding PPs</div> <div>6</div> </div> <div> <div>Windfall Allowance</div> <div>103</div> </div> <div> <div>Remainder for allocation</div> <div>102</div> </div> <div> <div>124</div> <div>Stanton under Bardon Need</div> <div>65</div> </div> <div> <div>72</div> <div>Outstanding PPs</div> <div>6</div> </div> <div> <div>Windfall Allowance</div> <div>4</div> </div> <div> <div>Remainder for allocation</div> <div>55</div> </div> <div> <div>62</div> <div>Remainder for allocation</div> <div>157</div> </div> <div> <div>186</div> <div>BT&SuB</div> </div>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	4.4 Local Housing Needs PP. 16-17		Fourth Paragraph of 4.4. The local housing need assessments by the Midlands Rural Housing Trust (MRHT) were based on questionnaire surveys of actual and expected need of local households and concluded with quite specific needs being identified for periods from 2017 to 2023. Whilst robust and valid in their own right, such surveys do not take priority over the housing need established through household projections as embodied in the Standard Method of national planning policy and the plan period of 2020 – 2039 is also much longer than the horizons of the MRHT assessments. Therefore, the statement, “the HTG [Housing Theme Group] decided that no further residential allocations were required in Bagworth for either affordable or market housing” only makes sense when recent housing supply (Dunlop site development and pipeline permissions) are compared against the MRHT assessment of need for the 2017-22 period, which has been well and truly exceeded. However, it is not evident that recent housing supply in Bagworth is sufficient to meet the standard method assessment of need for the period to 2039.	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council’s housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version. It is therefore no longer relevant to consider a deficit in housing requirement	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	4.5 Housing Allocations, Policy H1 and Figures 2 and 3. PP. 17-19		General point. To avoid confusion the numbering of the sites in Policy H1 ought to correspond with the numbers on Figures 2 and 3.	The sites and therefore the policy has been withdrawn.	Change to be made as indicated.
			First Paragraph of 4.5. See comments on the Sustainable Site Assessment under General Comments in the section on Evidence Base below.	These comments are no longer relevant as the NP no longer allocates sites for development	None
			Policy H1. Using the word “about” before number of dwellings” is imprecise and should be reconsidered. To give certainty about the housing supply to meet the housing requirement, the neighbourhood plan should express the dwelling capacities of sites as exact numbers of dwellings where exact numbers are expected, or as minima where there is uncertainty. The supporting text could explain more about the level of confidence in site capacity figures.	Policy H1 has been deleted.	Change to be made as indicated.
			In contrast, the requirements for affordable housing relating to the 4 sites are expressed as minima. There could be inconsistency with the borough local plan requirement for 40% of dwellings to be affordable if fewer total dwellings were proposed on the sites.	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council’s housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			It is not clear whether the Highway Authority has been consulted about the sites. It is essential that the Highway Authority expresses its satisfaction in writing that highway access is realistically achievable to all the sites proposed to be allocated.	Noted. The sites have been withdrawn as allocations. There is no general requirement to receive written approval from the Highways Authority.	Change to be made as indicated.
	Policy H1 second paragraph.		Planning cannot dictate the number of planning applications that can be submitted and cannot prohibit the submission of a planning application for only part of a site. Instead, the policy could set out an expectation for the sites to be comprehensively planned and state that applications for parts of sites will only be permitted where they demonstrate coherence with whole site development, for example through submission of a masterplan, and contribute appropriately to on site requirements such as open space and affordable housing provision	Noted. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.
			Site 1 – the rear of Main Street, Thornton. This site has had planning permission for residential development since 2010 and has not come forward for development. The examiner will need to be convinced that the site has no hidden impediments and is likely to be developed during the plan period	If it has secured a planning consent then this is the best way of demonstrating that there are no impediments. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Site 2 Thornton Nurseries. A planning application for 2 dwellings at the western end of the site was approved in January 2020 but HBBC has no knowledge of development interest for the rest of the site. The plant nursery appears to be operational. Has the owner given any commitment to bringing the site forward for residential development?	Of course – the site came forward as a result of the call for sites! The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.
			Site 3 Land off Meadow Lane, Stanton under Bardon. The site, or at least the western end of the site [it is not possible to tell from the small scale of Figure 3] was subject to planning applications for 3 detached dwellings in 2017 which were refused and dismissed at appeal in May 2018. The Inspector's reasoning was primarily influenced by the site being outside of the Settlement Boundary in the statutory plan and therefore counting as countryside. There do not appear to be any intrinsic reasons why the site would not be suitable in terms of plan-making and it is within the scope of the neighbourhood plan to allocate the site and bring it within a redrawn settlement boundary. However, is 12 dwellings a realistic capacity given that the planning application was only for 3?	Noted. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Site 4 Land Opposite South Charnwood High School. HBBC questions the sustainability of this site given its relative isolation from the village of Stanton under Bardon. By road the site is over 2km from the centre of the village. Residents will be forced to drive for almost all interactions with the village, for employment and other services. One exception is the high school immediately opposite the site, which is equally isolated along with 3 or 4 dwellings on Markfield Lane. The site requirement to make the footpath to Stanton under Bardon all weather would be a significant improvement, but the distance would still be about 1.5km following existing routes and more certainty would be needed about deliverability of an improved path. Even still it would not overcome the fundamentally flawed location of the site. That this site scored	Noted. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.
y			well in the Sustainable Site Assessment raises questions about the soundness of that assessment which are addressed in the General Comments section below.	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP. The comments about the SSA process are noted but refuted.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Figures 2 and 3. These maps serve well to illustrate the location of the sites but they are not of a sufficient scale to see boundaries clearly to know what buildings, boundaries, trees and other physical features are part of the site. Additional maps are needed at a bigger scale, say 1:200 or 1:500	Noted. The sites have been withdrawn as allocations	Change to be made as indicated.
			On paper the total housing capacity of the proposed allocations of 90 dwellings would fall short of the population apportioned net housing requirement of 157-186 dwellings	Noted. The Housing allocations including the reserve site have been removed from the NP as it is not possible to meet the updated housing requirement of 305 dwellings across the Plan period, especially as the figures proposed by HBBC are indicative at this stage and are likely to change on adoption of the new Local Plan.	Change to be made as indicated.
			Site 1 r/o Main Street, Thornton 12 Site 2 Thornton Nurseries 21 Site 3 Meadow Lane, SuB 12 Site 4 opp High School, SuB 45 Total 90	Noted	None
			Given the shortfall, and HBBC's concerns about the suitability of Site 4 (given its isolation from Stanton under Bardon) and developability of other sites it is suggested that alternative sites from the SSA be considered	Noted. The Housing allocations including the reserve site have been removed from the NP	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	4.6 Reserve site. Policy H2. P 20		HBBC has no information about the deliverability of this site. Is there any evidence that the site available for development – for example expression of interest from the landowner? Also, it is not clear whether the Highway Authority has been consulted about the reserve site. It is essential that the Highway Authority expresses its satisfaction in writing that highway access is realistically achievable.	Of course there is an expression of interest from the land owner as the site was proposed through a call for sites. However, the site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated.
	4.7 Settlement boundary. Policy H3. PP. 21- 24		Policy H3 refers to development outside of the settlement boundary being carefully controlled but presumably defers to Policy DM4 of the Borough's Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (SADMP). Policy DM4 has strong detailed criteria for determining the acceptability of development in the countryside, so the policy ought to be cross referenced in Policy H3 or its supporting text.	It is not necessary to cross reference local or national planning policies.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			There are a number of differences between the settlement boundaries set out in Figures 4, 5 and 6 and the settlement boundaries set out in the SADMP. It would help the determination of planning applications that could be made on land that is inside the boundary in one plan but outside in the other if the differences were explained. Obvious differences in the settlement boundaries are set out below under headings of the 3 settlements.	Do we want to retain the settlement boundaries as they are (with the former allocations included within) or revert to HBBC's settlement boundaries?	
			<u>Bagworth</u> . The NP map includes some land within the settlement boundary that is excluded by the SADMP: Land behind 312-322 Station Road; land behind 280-300 Station Road; land behind most northerly house on Park Lane; land behind 86-94 Station Road; and the Paddock to the rear of 15 The Square	As above	
			Conversely, farm plots and buildings are excluded from the settlement south of Main Street that are included in the Local Plan Settlement Boundary.	As above	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			The proposed settlement boundary around the former Dunlop factory redevelopment site (Now Round House Close) includes some of the open space at the rear, which would be better protected from further residential development if it were outside of the Settlement Boundary. Conversely, the proposed boundary excludes the existing industrial buildings to the south of Round House Close. This is clearly urban land forming part of Bagworth and if any alterations or extensions to these buildings were proposed they ought to be determined as such, rather than being considered part of the countryside.	As above	
			There is inconsistency in the treatment of Important Open Spaces. For example, BAG09 is outside where as BAG11 and BAG12 are inside the Settlement Boundary.	This is not critical and is not inconsistent. The Plan defines IOSs as being either within or close to the settlement(s). However, in this NP Area there are also a number of large open spaces in HBBC's OSSR inventory (designated by HBBC as country parks etc.) on old NCB land, which are well away from the settlement boundaries. BAG09, meanwhile, is outside the HBBC Ltd line and BAG11 and 12 are inside it.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Thornton. The NP map includes some land within the settlement boundary that is excluded by the SADMP: Land and buildings forming part of the farmstead behind number 3 Main Street; Land to rear of 22-29 Oakwood Close	<p>Noted. The NP has applied the settlement boundary according to the methodology as indicated in the section on the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The comment seems to imply that the settlement boundary should be the same as in the SADMP which is not the case.</p>	
			There is inconsistency in the treatment of Important Open Spaces. For example, THO07 and THO08/16 are outside where as THO03 – 05 are inside the Settlement Boundary	This is not critical and is not inconsistent. The Plan defines IOSs as being either within or close to the settlement(s).	
			Domestic rear gardens of 183-193 Main Street and properties behind 301 Main Street are excluded from the settlement of the NP which are included in the SADMP.	Noted. The NP has applied the settlement boundary according to the methodology as indicated in the section on the settlement boundary.	
			Should the church and its curtilage not be part of the settlement? The church and its setting will be highly protected as a listed building; there is no danger of inappropriate development as a result of being within the Settlement.	To discuss	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Stanton under Bardon. The NP map includes some land within the settlement boundary that is excluded by the SADMP: Large rear garden at 294 Main Street	Noted. The NP has applied the settlement boundary according to the methodology as indicated in the section on the settlement boundary.	
			To reiterate; it will help with determining planning applications on land that is inside the settlement boundary in one plan and outside in another for each case in the neighbourhood plan to be explained	Noted. The NP has applied the settlement boundary according to the methodology as indicated in the section on the settlement boundary.	
	4.8 Housing mix. Policy H4 P25		Policy H4 states that development should deliver more than 60% of units as 3 bedroom or fewer. It does not make clear what "more than" means. Would "at least" be better wording?	It is clear what 'more than' means.	None
			Figure 3 of HBBC's Housing Need Study 2019 suggests 80% of new market dwellings across the borough need to be of 1-3 bedroom size (85-95% for new affordable dwellings) so 60% is insufficiently challenging particularly if BTSuB needs to address a historic imbalance in the existing stock	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
	4.9 Affordable housing. Policy H5. PP 25-26		In this section there is no reference to the Local Plan having a policy to require provision of affordable housing.	It is not necessary to reference specific Local Plan policies	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			It is agreed that there is a need for smaller affordable dwellings but Policy H5 is vague in specifying the mix of affordable dwellings that will be expected. The Borough's emerging local plan will be setting target requirements for housing mix for both affordable and market housing based on Figure 3 of HBBC's Housing Need Study 2019	We not consider it to be vague but flexible in being able to meet a future housing need when precise figures change.	None
	4.10 Windfall development. Policy H6. P27		Second Paragraph of 4.10. Reference to 2036 as the end of the plan period ought to be 2039 to be consistent with the Local Plan	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
			Policy H6 criterion a) refers to Policy H2 as the Housing Mix policy. Should be Policy H4	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
	4.11 Design standards. Policy H7. PP 27-29		Policy H7. Is design policy also needed for developments involving uses other than residential? Or will the neighbourhood plan defer to Local Plan policy in this regard? The supporting text ought to clarify.	The policy will apply to development other than dwellings. The text will make this clear.	Change to be made as indicated
			Criterion a). All planning applications have to be accompanied by scale drawings that need to be sufficiently detailed to illustrate proposed development, so this criterion is not necessary. It is not clear what is meant by "advanced" in terms of architectural drawings	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Criterion b). "Enhancement" is a standard national requirement for conservation areas, but may not always be necessary, particularly in locations lacking in existing visual and historic character, where a development would maintain or not harm existing character.	We would like all development to be of a sufficient standard to enhance the area in which it is situated.	None
			Criterion c). As per comment on Criterion a), all planning applications have to be accompanied by scale drawings to illustrate the impact of proposed development on the character of surroundings, so the first sentence of Criterion c) is not necessary. The second sentence could be more succinct and clearer if it stated "...development does not harm views of the street scene or wider landscape."	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Criterion d). 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). Requiring 3 spaces for 4+ bedroomed dwellings may not be necessary for larger schemes where on street or visitor car parking areas can provide extra capacity. Other exceptions ought to be considered such as historic village cores where small infill developments may not have land for parking spaces and where the visual appearance of car parking could detract from the street scene. Supporting evidence (Appendices 3b and 3c) puts ownership of 3 or more cars higher than average but still quite low at 12.7% of households in Bagworth and Thornton and 18% in Stanton under Bardon.</p>	<p>Noted however this situation will be exacerbated with new development and given the problems experienced it is considered appropriate to retain additional parking standards for new development.</p>	None
			<p>Criterion e). There is duplication with criterion b) and second sentence of criterion c). Could there be one consolidated criterion that covers impact of development on visual and historic character?</p>	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
			<p>Criterion g). How would high standards be measured?</p>	By incorporating the features identified	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Criterion i). Could the “curfew” hours be explained in the supporting text to save people having to look up the guidelines in the 2014 LRERC document? Presumably LRERC stands for Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre? This should be set out in full.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
	5.1. The Environment Introduction. P30		Sub Heading. Should be 5.1, not 5.9?	It says 5.1?	None
			First Paragraph of 5.1. Some people use the web version of the NPPF which does not have page numbers, so it would be better to refer to NPPF paragraph numbers 7-14.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
			Second paragraph of 5.1. It is not clear how 13% of open land is protected according to the figures in the table?	As described in the table, 225ha (areas protected by the Neighbourhood Plan, i.e. <i>not</i> in National Forest or Country Parks, =450ha) of all the open and undeveloped land (1716ha) is protected. 225 is 13% of 1716.	None
	5.1.4 Existing Environmental Designations P. 33		There are five listed buildings within the Plan area, rather than three as mentioned in the text	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	5.1.5 Environmental inventory PP. 34-35		Fig 8 (scoring system) does not need to be in the NP; it would fit better within the Environmental Inventory evidence (Appendix 5).	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
	5.1.6 Sites qualifying for more than one designation P36		Second Paragraph of 5.1.6. The acronym OSSR is used without its full title.	OSSR is referenced in full in 5.5. We will bring this description forward.	Change to be made as indicated
	5.3 The natural environment		The section number should be 5.3 not 5.11	It should be 5.3	None
	5.3 2 Biodiversity protection and enhancement. PP43-44		Second paragraph of p. 44. Reference to Charnwood Borough Council policies. Should be Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council policies	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
	5.4 1 Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monument. P44		There are 6 buildings and structures that are statutorily designated within the plan area (five listed buildings and one scheduled monument), so the number needs amended to six in this paragraph. The omission is Stanton war memorial which is a grade II listed building, this needs to be added to the list below the paragraph: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1467317 (it is a relatively new listing so I can see how it might have been missed).	Agreed	Changes to be made as indicated – list and map, figure 13, both p.45

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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. In HBBC's opinion the wording of this sentence should be amended to: " <i>The Neighbourhood Development Plan lists them for reference and notes that proposed development is required to take into account the direct impact upon their significance and also the effects upon their setting.</i> "	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	5.4 2 Local Heritage Assets. P46		The first paragraph identifies that seven buildings and structures are judged to be of local significance. On page 33 the text refers to eight such buildings and structures. Eight buildings or structures (with LCC Historic Environment Record reference numbers) are identified within Fig 14. Five buildings and structures are then listed at the end of Policy ENV4: Local Heritage Assets. HBBC suggests that the number of assets referred to be consistent throughout the document – please note the comments about assets identified in the policy below, which will likely reduce the number of assets identified in this section	Agreed	Changes to be made to text and list. Fig 14 is correct

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>The first paragraph states that the buildings and structures are of local significance for historic, architectural or social reasons. In the Policy ENV4 it states the sites, buildings and structures are of high local significance for historic, architectural and/or built environment reasons. What does built environment mean in this context? There should be consistency in the categories of heritage value referred to in the supporting text and policy. Are the specific heritage reasons why each of the assets have been identified articulated in the plan (other than that they are on the LCC Historic Environment record) – for example how is Thornton Water Mill (taken as the first site on the list) of historic, architectural or social significance?</p>	Agreed	Change to be made to policy ENV 4

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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 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): "Inclusion in the Plan records them in order that any effects upon their significance arising from a development proposal are a material planning consideration."	Agreed	Changes to be made to text as suggested

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Bagworth War Memorial (listed in the policy and on the map – Fig. 14) and Stanton under Bardon war memorial (on the map – Fig.14 only) are both grade II listed buildings. They have more local heritage interest through their statutory designation so their identification within this policy is not required. The remaining farm buildings at Battleflat Lodge Farm, Victoria Road (on the map – Fig.14 only as MLE23211) may have been demolished as part of a recent construction of a warehouse. This should be clarified and if demolished they should no longer be identified within this policy.	Agreed	Changes to be made as recommended. MLE23211 to be checked on-site and deleted if destroyed
	Policy ENV5 Protection of Sites of Historical Environmental Significance Figure 15		In HBBC's opinion the last sentence of this policy (<i>Development proposals that would have a detrimental impact on the earthworks, buried archaeology or features present will not be supported unless the need for and benefits arising from development in that location clearly outweigh the loss</i>) 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	We believe that this does reflect unweighted balance and is a form of words used in Made neighbourhood plans at Quorn, Wymondham and Edmondthorpe and Broughton and Old Dalby	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			DPD as it does not instigate an unweighted balanced approach when assessing the significance of the non-designated heritage asset against the benefits of the proposal. To accord with the NPPF and SADMP DPD HBBC would strongly suggest that this last sentence is amended so an unweighted 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 4: Local Heritage Assets in this Plan		
			Figure 15 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 identified by the policy within the Policy wording and providing simple information such as the site address/location and the reasoning as to why each site is of significance.	We will add the sites to the policy but do not feel it necessary to provide descriptions as to why the sites are significant as this is provided for in the Environmental Inventory.	Change to be made as indicated.
			The clarity of Figure 15 is poor so it is difficult to determine the physical extent of each site	High resolution images will be provided with the submission version. This was always intended to be the case	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	5.13 Important open spaces. Policy ENV7 and Figure 18.1		List of protected sites 1.1 Bagworth. Sites A, B and C should be deleted as they duplicate sites BAG05, BAG06 and BAG07 in HBBC's Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (SADMP)	Agreed, duplicated in error	Change to be made as indicated – list and map (fig 18.1)
			Figure 18.1. Sites A, B and C are protected in HBBC's SADMP and should be referenced as such to avoid confusion. Site A is part of BAG05; Site B is BAG06 and Site C is BAG07	See previous	Change to be made as indicated
	5.14 Important views. Figure 20. Policy ENV8		Fig 20 and Policy ENV8. The description of panoramic view number 7 in the Policy does not tally with the arrow symbol on Fig 20. The description refers to a southerly view whereas the symbol points north, east and west but not south.	Agreed. The view description should refer to a northerly component toward Bardon Hill	Change to be made as indicated
	6.1.1.1 Community Assets of Stanton under Bardon		The Old Thatched Inn. Text is missing explaining what 90% of respondents said	This text is not in the pre-submission version	None
			War memorial. The first sentence lacks description of the cross in front of the Church	The description of the cross is not essential.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	6.1.1.2. Bagworth community centre		Third paragraph of 6.1.1.2. This paragraph repeats the findings of community consultation for the NP area set out in the 5 th paragraph under 6.1.1 "Character and histories of the three main settlements". These findings repeated under the sub-heading of Bagworth imply that the responses were unique to Bagworth. It is suggested this paragraph be deleted.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			Merry Lees. Inclusion of the description of Merry Lees within section 6.1.1.2 on Bagworth implies that Merry Lees is part of Bagworth rather than a free standing business area / settlement to the south of the NP area. Suggest relocating the paragraph	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Education. Primary. For those unfamiliar with the area it would be worth giving Nailstone as the location of Dove Bank school. The wording describing the percentage of Bagworth's primary school children going to different schools should be clarified. It is assumed that 52% go to Dove Bank, Nailstone 15% to Thornton Primary, and the remainder (33%) to other schools but the wording "52% of those who responded in the survey" ought to clarify that this means respondents from Bagworth with primary school children. The year of the survey would be helpful for when the NP is used years in the future	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			If an aspiration of Bagworth is to have its own primary school, could the NP provide any guidance on potential locations for a future primary school?	No. No suitable sites were identified in preparing the NP.	None
			The grammar switches to the first person plural ("our" and "us") at the end of the first paragraph, which is out of kilter with the third person used elsewhere.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	6.1.1.3 Thornton		The Fuchsia Centre (Thornton Nurseries). Is there a contradiction in allocating the Thornton Nurseries site as a housing site but also listing it as a community facility, which under the second paragraph of the opening section (6.1.1), "...make a significant contribution to its vitality and sense of community," and under Policy CA1, its development for housing would be subject to criteria? It is assumed that criteria a) and b) concerning need, demand and viability of the facility would not give reason to allow housing development, which leaves criterion c) which expects new development to provide for satisfactory re-location of the facility. If there is a plan for the nursery to be relocated as part of housing development, could the NP provide guidance on options for relocation?	Noted. The site has been withdrawn as an allocation.	Change to be made as indicated
	Policy CA1 Community Facilities and Amenities		The policy offers useful criteria for considering planning applications which would either result in the loss of community facilities or result in the improvement or provision of community facilities. However, the preceding sections on the settlements of the NP area reveal needs and aspirations for new facilities (eg primary school in Bagworth, GP	Do you want to include a section on infrastructure priorities?	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			surgeries, shops and other supporting infrastructure), and for transport controls and improvements which are unlikely to be delivered unless proactive measures are taken. There is potential for NPs to address these needs in two ways:		
			<p>i) Seeking infrastructure improvements on the back of major development. Particular requirements could be added to site allocations and/or a separate policy could be set out that applies to all major developments. Such requirements would have to be subject to development viability, and it has to be remembered that major developments are already subject to local plan requirements for costly benefits such as affordable housing and open space. So it would be better to prioritise key needs rather than set out a lengthy list</p>		
			<p>ii) fully accessible to people Set out community aspirations that would be met through interventions not involving planning control. For example, campaigning for</p>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			infrastructure spending of public bodies such as the health authority or pressing for introduction of speed and other traffic restrictions		
			Criterion iv could be strengthened by expecting that development will be with disabilities where possible.	Don't understand the comment	None
	Broadband and Mobile Phone Infrastructure and Policy CA2		Mobile phone masts for 5g are currently being rolled out across England. The supporting text could acknowledge that this is likely to improve reception, but bring questions concerning the appropriate location of new masts.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
	6.2 Transport and Traffic and Policy TT1		Similar to HBBC's comment on community facilities above, the section on Transport and Traffic contains a number of local community concerns which are expressed, for example speeding cars and HGV violations, but no solutions are offered.	The NP cannot resolve existing problems, but it can seek to prevent the situation getting worse, which Policy TT12 seeks to do.	None
			Thornton potential parking solutions. These suggestions are left hanging with no indication of who or how they will be taken forward	Do you want to add 'these issues will be taken forward by the PC as necessary?	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Policy TT1 needs a cross reference with Policy H7. which sets minimum car parking spaces for new dwellings. Criterion e) could be expressed more strongly, perhaps using wording "Make provision for..." instead of "Consider..."	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
	6.2 Electric vehicles		The UK government has brought forward the ban on sales of new petrol and diesel cars to 2030	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			Policy TT2. The policy could go further in not only requiring 7kw cabling but requiring at least one charging point? Cabling and charging points may need to extend into the garden, so could say "...to the most practical point of the curtilage of the home...."	Charging points will vary according to the make of vehicle, so it is impractical to include charging points in the design of homes. The policy is considered sufficient.	None
	6.2 Bus service		Does the NP have any proposals that could improve the poor bus service of Stanton under Bardon?	This would not be a planning policy.	None
	6.2 Rail service		The opening of the paragraph needs to mention that a railway line passes through the NP area which is currently only used for freight	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	6.3 Business and Employment		Policy BE1. Further explanation is needed of what is meant by land that provides future employment opportunities. Without clarification, this could include any land at all. For example, supporting text could clarify that this means land allocated for future employment use, or undeveloped land that is within existing employment areas, or land with extant planning permission for employment uses?	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			Regarding the part of the policy that says, "Applications for a change of use to an activity that does not provide employment opportunities will only be supported...", consideration should be given to what is meant by uses that do not provide employment opportunities. This would clearly include housing, but there may be uses that employ people but are not traditional business typified in the list of local businesses set out in the supporting paragraph. If you want to exclude any uses they will need to be specified.	The policy is not intended to be prescriptive. The change of use can apply to activities not referenced in the supporting paragraph. The policy does not require this.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Policy BE2. This section should have regard to the importance of the Bardon Hill industrial estate which is predominantly within North West Leicestershire borough but which has a large extension within the neighbourhood plan area. This includes the allocation for employment Interlink Park, Beveridge Lane (ref STA20) and is one of the few opportunities for modern new employment premises to be provided in the area. The area should be shown on a map with consideration given to potential to extend the allocation which is being built out	We will reference the industrial estate as proposed	Change to be made as indicated.
			Policy guidance is also required specific to land adjoining this industrial area to deal with any planning applications. It does not appear that criterion a) of Policy BE2 has been drafted with this industrial area in mind	We will include reference to the industrial area. Land outside the area will be treated as countryside. Are you OK with this?	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Also regarding criterion a) how will decision makers know what is small scale and whether commercial development is appropriate to a countryside location? Could the supporting text provide guidance?	<p>This will need to be determined at planning application stage. Appropriate to a countryside location means just that! Giving a list of criteria would be too prescriptive.</p> <p>'Appropriate to a countryside location' is also in the Desford NP which has been Made by HYBBC so is already in the development plan.</p>	None
			Policy BE4. Regarding criterion a) can further guidance be given on judging what is an appropriate use for a rural location?	<p>The definition of appropriate will depend on the application and its location.</p> <p>'Appropriate to a rural location' is also in the Desford NP which has been Made by HYBBC so is already in the development plan.</p>	
	7 Monitoring and Review		HBBC recommends a plan period of 2020 – 2039 to be consistent with the Borough's local plan	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			Consideration should be given to setting a time period for review. As a comparative bellwether, national planning policy expects local plans to be reviewed at least every 5 years	Section 7 sets timescales for a review of the NP.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	General comments Treatment of Bagworth		Have the challenges of Bagworth's changing historical circumstances been fully addressed in the neighbourhood plan? The description of Bagworth in section 2.2 describes the losses of buildings because of subsidence and bemoans the loss of facilities and businesses, with residents having to travel outside of the village for shops, schools, GP surgery and churches. On the positive side, it concludes by saying there is a real appetite to put Bagworth back	Noted. Without significant development, the NP cannot address the issues raised by inadequate infrastructure.	None
	Treatment of Bagworth		together and recover much of what has been lost. However, the NP does not follow this up. The vision makes no distinction for Bagworth to recover what has been lost and the plan lacks policy or other interventions to deliver community infrastructure. The lack of a primary school is a particular example. There is good evidence to support the case for a primary school: it is raised as an issue by residents in the consultation exercise; Bagworth has by far the biggest population of the three settlements at 2605 people (2011 Census) and has a higher proportion of children than the other settlements		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			The NP is silent on how new community infrastructure could be provided. There are certain planning interventions that could be considered. One would be seeking contributions toward infrastructure from development, although problems with this approach are that considerable housing development has already occurred in Bagworth with little or no contribution made and the appetite for further housing development is limited. Another approach could be for the NP to seek to identify appropriate locations or allocate land for new facilities. Non-planning interventions can also be considered such as lobbying public service providers for investment	Noted. The Qualifying Body has decided against large scale development which would open the door to	
	Presentation / Layout		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. In the pre-submission draft plan the section numbering is sometimes out of kilter with sub-heading numbering	It is not essential. It may be helpful to the LPA but it is not essential.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Duplication of Policy Requirements		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. 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.	Noted – however comments from HBBC earlier propose cross referencing Local Plan policies. HBBC comment above says 'Policy DM4 has strong detailed criteria for determining the acceptability of development in the countryside, so the policy ought to be cross referenced in Policy H3 or its supporting text'. Which is it?	None
	Evidence base		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

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			The following comments relate to particular pieces of evidence:	<p>These comments are incredibly detailed and in our view beyond the scope of a formal response by a Local planning Authority at Regulation 14.</p> <p>It is inevitable that there will be elements of interpretation but the forensic analysis of each SSA report is, in our view, unnecessary.</p> <p>The removal of the allocations in the NP render these comments unnecessary.</p>	Change to be made as indicated.
			<u>Housing Site Selection</u> Appendix 4 is the Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA)		
			The second paragraph of the introduction refers to a housing net minimum number of additional dwellings being 12 for Bagworth and Thornton and 40 for Stanton under		
			Bardon. This is consistent with the draft Plan, but not consistent with the population apportionment recommended by HBBC which generates housing need figures for the period 2020 – 2039 of 211 dwellings for Bagworth and Thornton and 65 dwellings for Stanton under Bardon, with a combined total of 276 dwellings. If allowance is made for outstanding permissions and future windfall, net minimum additional dwellings for allocation would be 34 dwellings for Bagworth and Thornton and 55 dwellings for Stanton under Bardon, with a combined total of 89 dwellings.		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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		
			: 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 also possible for smaller parcels of larger sites to be considered which can improve the rating of this criterion, and sometimes other criteria.		
			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		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			7. Site availability. Whilst the number of site ownerships provides some theoretical measure of site availability, evidence of active development activity and of a willing landowner are far more determinant of whether a site will be available for development during the plan period.		
			16. Safe access to public transport. Unclear why this SSA uses <100m for green, 101-200m for amber and >200m for red, whereas the Barlestone SSA used <250m for green, 251-500m for amber and >500m for red?		
			17. Distance to village centre. Ditto 16 above. Also, treating the junction of Reservoir Road and Merrylees Road as the centre of the village has to be questioned. It is a very southern locus at the bottom of the linear village with the vast majority of existing housing being north of this point. Most of the key facilities likely to generate visits are located more centrally including the primary school, village shop, Bricklayers Arms pub, community centre, recreation ground and church and would justify a more northerly point along Main Street being regarded as the centre of the village		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			18. Distance to primary school. Ditto 16 above		
			21. 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		
			25. 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.		
			Comments on individual site assessments		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			1. Bagworth Lane, Thornton. If the site was reduced in size to include only land east of the electricity wires it would remove several of the red ratings: size of site, impact on vehicular traffic, electricity transmission network and nuisance from quarry trains. It would also negate the flood issues around the stream / pond.		
			2. Main Street, Thornton. The question is raised why housing development has not taken place despite planning permission being available since 2010?		
			3. Beech Drive Extension, Thornton. If the site were reduced in size to land on the village side of the newly planted line of trees, this would improve ratings in terms of size of site, impact on vehicular traffic, electricity transmission and nuisance from quarry trains. The centre of the site would be closer to the village improving the rating for distances to bus stop, primary school and centre of the village. It seems harsh to expect relocation of a grazing field and score current use amber rather than green. The amber rating for ridge and furrow appears at odds with Figure 17 of the draft neighbourhood plan which records this field (ref 319) as having no visible signs		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			4. Rear of Main Street, Thornton. If the site were reduced in size to land closest to the village, this would improve ratings in terms of size of site, impact on vehicular traffic, electricity transmission and nuisance from quarry trains. The centre of the site would be closer to the village improving the rating for distances to bus stop, primary school and centre of the village. Also, a smaller site could avoid the requirement for relocating the right of way footpath. It seems harsh to expect relocation of a grazing field and score current use amber rather than green. The green rating for ridge and furrow appears at odds with Figure 17 of the draft neighbourhood plan which records these fields (refs 320 – 324) as having some visible signs.		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			5. Land adjacent to St Peters close. If the site were reduced in size to land closest to the village, this would improve ratings in terms of size of site, impact on vehicular traffic, electricity transmission and nuisance from quarry trains. The centre of the site would be closer to the village improving the rating for distances to bus stop, primary school and centre of the village. It seems harsh to expect relocation of a grazing field and score current use amber rather than green.		
			6. Thornton Nurseries. The ranking of Current Use as amber appears contrary to the guidance in the assessment framework (Table 1) which expects loss of important local asset to be ranked as red. The pre submission NP records Thornton Nurseries as a facility to be protected under Policy CA1 of the neighbourhood plan for its significant contribution to the community. It also appears inconsistent with amber ratings given for agricultural land.		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			There are questions over the ranking of Adjoining Uses as Green. The guidance in the assessment framework says that extensions beyond the village envelope should be ranked red. The most determinate measure for village envelope is the settlement boundary of HBBC's Site Allocations and Development Management plan 2016 which excludes Thornton Nurseries from the settlement. This would tend toward ranking this site red, or at least amber. An amber ranking would be consistent with Site 12 which adjoins the Settlement Boundary of Stanton under Bardon.		
			The ranking of availability of this site as green is questioned as the nursery business is long established and appears healthy.		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			In terms of topography, is the field so steeply sloping to be classed as an amber constraint? In terms of impact on listed buildings or other important heritage assets, the site will be very visible from the reservoir water treatment works which is proposed to be a local heritage asset (ref MLE 21527) in the draft neighbourhood plan. Whilst the impact may be slight, the fact that it will need to be investigated could warrant an amber, rather than a green ranking. Regarding distance to the village centre, the green ranking comes from the questionable decision to regard the village centre as the junction of Reservoir Road and Merrylees Road which is literally right next to this site		
			7. Off Thornton Lane, Stanton. In terms of current use, it seems harsh to expect relocation of an arable field and score this amber rather than green. In terms of topography, is the field so steeply sloping to be classed as an amber constraint? Regarding Ridge and Furrow Figure 17 of the draft neighbourhood plan records this land (ref 232) as having well preserved signs, which could justify a red rather than amber ranking?		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			8. Land opposite white house farm, Stanton. Unlike other housing sites considered in HBBC's Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) 2018 which are mapped through the SHELAA, there is no location map for this site. From references in the assessment it is assumed this is land parcel 202, which is shown on Figure 17 of the draft neighbourhood plan. The site is isolated so scores badly on a number of criteria.		
			9. Markfield Lane. HBBC was provided with a site map in the last week of Regulation 14 consultation. The site is isolated so scores badly on a number of criteria. In terms of the red ranking of Current Use it is not clear why the fields of this site are regarded as an important local asset whereas the fields of other sites are not?		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>10. Land opposite Charnwood High School. In terms of isolation this site is very similar to site 9 which it shares its northern boundary with but the scoring is quite different. Regarding Adjoining Uses Site 9 scores red for being fully removed from the current built form. The description says it is almost wholly surrounded with fields and forestry. In fact Site 9 adjoins the rear of a ribbon of residential and business properties on Markfield Lane. That is comparable to the extent of connection with adjoining urban uses that Site 10 has which is also surrounded with fields and forestry and only has minimal connection with the school across Markfield Lane, yet is ranked amber.</p>		
			<p>In terms of the Relationship with existing pattern of development, Site 9 scores red for being fully removed from the current built form and having no relationship to it, whereas Site 10 scores amber when its relationship to the existing pattern of development is practically the same. Explanatory text about Site 9 being more visually prominent is more a factor for considering visual impact on the landscape rather than relationship with pattern of development.</p>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Regarding impact on existing vehicular traffic, Site 9 scores red and Site 10 scores amber. Other sites have tended to score red with dwelling capacities of less than 50. Site 1 is scored red with 40 dwellings, Site 3 red with 45 dwellings, Site 4 red with 37 dwellings, Site 5 red with 42 dwellings, Site 7 red with 42 dwellings and Site 13 red with 12 dwellings. So why should Site 10 score amber for 50 dwellings?		
			Regarding nuisance, why is road noise mentioned for Site 9 (amber rating) but not for Site 10 (green rating) when site 10 has a long road frontage?		
			Site 11 rear of 5 Thornton Lane, Stanton. Regarding Current Use, the current use a large domestic garden will not need to be relocated. The existing dwelling will operate with a smaller garden.		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Site 12 side of public house, Stanton. Regarding Current Use it seems harsh to rank the site amber based on an expectation that arable fields have to be relocated. Regarding Adjoining Uses, the site falls outside of the Settlement Boundary similar to Site 6 (Thornton Nurseries). Regarding safe pedestrian access there is a public footpath running north-south through the site which could provide access into Stanton via Meadow Lane, rather than via Main St. As such, this criterion ought to be ranked green.		
			Site 13 Land adjacent to Luke Jackson Way. Is a red ranking justified for Impact on existing vehicular traffic? Similar sized site 2 in Thornton was ranked amber.		
			Mapping. It needs to be possible to see the location and size of the sites assessed.		
			<u>Housing Mix</u>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>Appendices 3a, 3b and 3c have useful evidence showing that all three settlements in BTSuB have a higher than average stock of 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings (B&T 37.6%, SuB 28%, H&B 21.8 and England 18.8) and a lower than average stock of 1 bed dwellings. The under-occupancy of larger houses by elderly people provides evidence that there may be opportunities to promote down-sizing. The need for downsizing is demonstrated in the Housing Need Surveys (appendices 3d, 3e and 3f) where the housing need of several households is that their current dwelling is too big and unmanageable). This is all useful evidence to inform the housing mix policy in the NP</p>	Noted	None
			<p>Appendix 3a. Discrepancy between explanatory text on p.14 and graph <i>Fig 8 Build Period of Property</i>. The peak period of building in Bagworth and Thornton was 2000-09 according to the graph, but 1993-99 in the text</p>	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			<u>Environmental Inventory</u>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Appendix 5 provides a list of parcels of land assessed for environmental qualities. It needs a map to see the exact location of the parcels of land	Noted. It is not necessary to provide a map to understand the polices	None
			<u>Heritage Impact Assessment</u>		
			The preparation and submission of a HIA considering the impact of the Manor Farm (Thornton) housing allocation upon heritage assets is welcomed and in the opinion of HBBC demonstrates that the Plan will have no adverse impacts upon heritage assets. For the record, HBBC believes that the need for undertaking a HIA was arrived at in an appropriate and procedurally correct manner.	Noted. The Qualifying Body remain concerned that HBBC received recommendations from the consultation bodies that NO SEA was required, and then spoke to Historic England and persuaded them to require a HIA, which was then the determination of HBBC without any discussion with the QB. We do not consider this to be an appropriate intervention.	None
			Mapping		
			Generally the maps are of a good standard and an appropriate scale for their purpose. Some specific comments are made about individual mapping issues above	High resolution versions of the maps will be available on submission. This is standard practice.	None
			Document Accessibility		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			As per the new Accessibility Act, all documents published on publically accessible websites must comply with the Website Accessibility Directive (2018).	PC to discuss and agree approach.	
			The Borough Council now has to comply with this directive, and this means that 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 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 it is the responsibility of the author to create an accessible document.		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			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.		
			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.		


Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
		Boyer	This letter is to accompany the response form in respect of the Bagworth, Thornton and Stanton under-Bardon Neighbourhood Plan (hereafter referred to as the emerging Neighbourhood Plan) Regulation 14 Pre-Submission consultation.	Noted	
			The representation has been prepared by Boyer on behalf of Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) who have an interest in 'Land at Bagworth', as is shown on the below image (Figure 1). The site extends to approximately 7.1 hectares, is irregularly shaped and generally slopes in a north-east to south-west direction.	Noted	None
			Vegetation provides clear boundaries to the west, south and east, whilst the site wraps around existing built form along the north and north-eastern boundaries. Immediately to the west and south are fields in agricultural use, with several ponds located further away to the south-west.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			 <p>Figure 1: Land at Bagworth – Location Plan</p>		
			Before providing commentary to individual draft policies, it is worthwhile reiterating the requirements of Paragraph 37 of the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			(2019). The Paragraph states that <i>Neighbourhood Plans must meet certain 'basic conditions' and other legal requirements</i> in order for them to proceed to Referendum and ultimately form part of the Development Plan. Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as applied to neighbourhood plans by Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act sets out the 'basic conditions'. They are as follows:		
			<i>a. having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order (or neighbourhood plan).</i>	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p><i>b. having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order. This applies only to Orders.</i></p> <p><i>c. having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, it is appropriate to make the order. This applies only to Orders.</i></p> <p><i>d. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</i></p> <p><i>e. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</i></p> <p><i>f. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</i></p> <p><i>g. prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Order (or plan) and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the</i></p>		


Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<i>proposal for the order (or neighbourhood plan).</i>		
			Following this consultation, the emerging Neighbourhood Plan will likely go to Regulation 16 'Submission Draft' consultation. We consider there to be a number of draft policies which require amendment in order to demonstrate that the document has been positively prepared and seeks to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development, in line with the NPPF (2019), and thereby enabling the emerging Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to Independent Examination and Referendum.	Noted	None
	Open Spaces & Environment				

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	<i>ENV1: Local Green Spaces</i>		Part of the site as shown in Figure 1 is proposed for designation under draft Policy ENV 1: Local Green Spaces, which designates land parcels using the criteria for Local Green Space as contained in Paragraph 100 of the NPPF (the page/Paragraph number has been missed off in the draft document). For clarity, the extent of the site proposed for designation under draft Policy ENV 1 is shown in Figure 2 overleaf:	Noted	None
			 <p>Figure 2: Partial draft Policy ENV 1 designation within site edged in green</p>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			The draft Policy refers to the proposed designation as both 'the Durham Walk Recreation Area' (in Table 5.2.1) and also as the 'Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park'. For the avoidance of doubt, the document should be updated with one or the other name for the area selected. For the purposes of this Representation, we shall refer to the land as the Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park.	Agreed	Name change to be made for consistency to Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park in table, p.37
			The Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park contains a number of inventoried parcels of land which are individually assessed in the Environmental Inventory contained in Appendix 5 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. It is not clear in the information available what the precise boundaries of each inventoried parcel is, with the Plan contained in Table 5.2.1 only providing a vague indication of the general area of the inventoried parcels which make up the Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park. This should be remedied and a Plan showing the boundaries produced and included in the subsequent draft version of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan so that policies are clear. Policies should be <i>clearly written and unambiguous</i> as is stated in Paragraph 16d of the NPPF.	The boundaries of the individual inventory parcels of which the LGS is comprised have no effect on the status of the designation, which is of the whole area shaded green in fig. 10	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Paragraph 100 of the NPPF (2019) sets out a clear criteria for Local Green Space designations and the proceeding section of this representation will consider the proposed Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park Local Green Space against the criteria. The Paragraph states that <i>the Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is</i>	Noted	None
			<i>a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</i> - The proposed Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park is within reasonably close proximity to the community it serves.	Noted	None
			<i>b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</i>	Noted	None
			- Appendix 5 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan (Environmental Inventory) contains the Local Green Space scoring matrix, wherein inventoried parcels of land are assessed with some proposed as Local Green Space designations.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>- The broad locations of inventoried parcels (number 710, 711 and 712) which are shown to potentially be both located within the land edged green in Figure 2 and within Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park score unremarkably (8, 10 and 13 out of 25 respectively). The inventoried parcel (number 750) that forms the main body of Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park, and which is outside of the boundary of the land shown in Figure 1, scores notably better (18 out of 25). This demonstrates that the single key inventoried parcel of Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park which contributes the most towards the proposed Local Green Space designation is Parcel 750.</p>	<p>The LGS designation is based on the scores given when the whole site is evaluated under para 100 criteria (as in the LGS table, pp.37-38). The internal boundaries become irrelevant if the whole area is recognised and managed for community amenity, biodiversity, etc. It is already used and valued by local residents as one coherent site.</p>	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			- The inventoried parcels were assessed utilising both a desk-based review of information as well as fieldwork site visits. For the purposes of assessing the 'richness of wildlife/biodiversity' of each parcel, it should be made clear when the most recent habitat survey was conducted by a suitably qualified professional. In the event that there has never been a habitat survey conducted on the parcel, this should be made clear as a caveat to the score provided.	Para 013 of PPG 2014 on Local Green Space ' <i>Whether to designate land [as LGS] is a matter for local discretion</i> '. There is no requirement in the NPPF of PPG for a Neighbourhood Plan Qualifying Body to include a professional ecological survey	None
			- We consider that the proposed designation seeks to include land that is not demonstrably special to the local community, as is confirmed in the published evidence base. It is also considered that inventoried parcels numbers 710, 711 and 712 do not hold sufficient local significance for the designation of Local Green Space to be justified and accordant with Paragraphs 99 and 100 of the NPPF.	As above	None
			<i>c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</i>		

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<p>- The Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park proposed for designation as a Local Green Space covers approximately 15.91 hectares of land, and is by a considerable margin the largest of the proposed Local Green Spaces in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Although the national guidance is clear that there is no defined upper limit to the scale of Local Green Spaces, the combination of a number of inventoried parcels to form a single 'Local Green Space' creates an area that is clearly not local in character due to its scale.</p>	<p>a) The site's larger size than others in the Plan Area is immaterial (there has to be a 'largest' LGS in any Plan designating more than one). b) The site is demonstrably 'local in character', being part of (and remembered by local ex-mining families as) 'the old Bagworth Colliery'. c) PPG para 015 'How big can a Local Green Space be?': the only firm criterion is that designation as LGS should not be a 'back door way' to Green Belt designation. The Bagworth proposal does not do this. d) Local Green Spaces of similar size to this one have been designated in other Neighbourhood Plans and would draw attention to the Broughton and Old Dalby NP where a field of over 18 ha was approved at examination in a village. Similarly in Hungarton in Harborough District, a LGS of 8.97ha was approved at examination. Each village in the Neighbourhood Area is much larger than Hungarton (121 dwellings). We do not believe, therefore, that the size of this LGS is disproportionate.</p>	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			- It is noted in Fig 8 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan that in order for a site to justifiably form a Local Green Space, it should be <i>a single bounded parcel of land, or a small, coherent group (evidence-based, with shared characteristics and in single ownership)</i> .	The several separate areas numbered and mapped for the inventory process were so outlined in advance, for ease of survey, because they have somewhat different habitat and topographic characteristics; their boundaries are not necessarily shown as lines on the Ordnance Survey map. One of the outcomes of the inventory process (applying all the NPPF criteria, but using the explanatory examples as in the notes in Fig. 8 devised by the Consultants employed by the QB for the convenience of local volunteer inventory surveyors) was to show that these areas naturally cohere to constitute a candidate for LGS designation.	None
			- It is contended that the proposed Local Green Space at Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park is neither 'small' nor does it contain shared characteristics, consisting of several open space typologies as defined in the Open Space and Recreation Study (2016).	The parts of the proposed LGS that are also (current Local Plan DPD) recognized by HBBC as open spaces share the important characteristic of being OSSR sites. It is in our view essential for LGS eligibility that a site shows a diversity of values – without this richness, a site would only be a candidate for a single-criterion (e.g. heritage asset, children's play area) policy.	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			- In addition to this, the land is under more than one ownership with the land shown in Figure 1 being in a different ownership to inventoried parcels 701, 702, 703, 704 and the non-wooded parts of 750 (which are in the ownership of the Parish Council). In the light of this, the boundary of the proposed Local Green Space designation for Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park requires revision in order to accord with the definitions contained in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and meet criteria C of paragraph 100 of NPPF (2019).	Paragraph 100 criterion C of NPPF does not refer to ownership.	
			As is stated in Paragraph 99 of the NPPF, <i>designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services</i> . It is contended that the proposed inclusion of the land edged green in Figure 2 within the Local Green Space would negatively impact upon the achievement of sustainable development.	We disagree. A number of potential residential development sites were proposed during the preparation of the NP and the sites in question are not required individually to deliver sustainable development. The statistics (table, p.30) demonstrate that land protected by the Neighbourhood Plan (i.e. excluding existing National Forest and Country Park designations) for environmental reasons is only 13% of the Plan Area's open land. This proportion is entirely consistent with the concept of sustainable development	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			In order to be compliant with Paragraphs 99 and 100 of the NPPF, it is proposed that the boundary defined for the Bagworth Colliery Local Country Park 'Local Green Space' be amended to remove the land edged in green in Figure 2, for the reasons stated above.	As above	None
	<i>ENV7: Important Open Spaces</i>		We are in agreement with the proposed Policy ENV7: Important Open Spaces.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Housing <i>H1: Residential Site Allocations</i>		By January 2022 the Housing Needs Survey (2017) will be out of date, as the <i>aim of the surveys was to provide a projection of affordable and market housing need for the next five years.</i> Given the probable timeframes of the delivery of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, it is likely that by the time the document is able to go to Referendum and potentially be formally 'made', a key pillar of the evidence base could be out of date. As is stated in Paragraph 31 of the NPPF, <i>the preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals.</i> As such, we recommend that the Survey be updated accordingly so that the housing needs of the Neighbourhood Area are suitably addressed.	Noted. The Housing allocations including the reserve site have been removed from the NP as it is not possible to meet the updated housing requirement of 305 dwellings across the Plan period, especially as the figures proposed by HBBC are indicative at this stage and are likely to change on adoption of the new Local Plan.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Nonetheless, the emerging Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that the Housing Needs Survey identified Bagworth as having the highest level of need, and that it should be seen as a priority for residential development. There are clear benefits to directing development towards Bagworth which are consistent with Paragraph 8 of the NPPF. This includes the safeguarding and potential improvement to the service and facility base of the village through increased usage and footfall, as well as the short-term economic benefit in the form of jobs associated with the construction phase.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Also, development of the land would support a vibrant and inclusive community by sustainably growing the most in demand location in the Neighbourhood Plan area, as established in the most recent Housing Needs Survey (2017). The forthcoming planning application for Land at Bagworth would deliver a policy-compliant quantum of affordable housing to meet established local needs. Further to this, the site could be developed to meet the demand for smaller homes of one or two bedrooms, as well as three bedrooms and above, as is identified in the Parish Housing Needs Survey (2018) and sought in draft Policy H4.	Noted, however the QB has decided to remove allocations from the NP as it could not achieve the numbers needed to satisfy HBBCs housing requirement.	

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			It is contended that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan has not been prepared positively nor in accordance with the aspiration to achieve sustainable development by excluding Bagworth from the call for sites process, thereby preventing logical and meritorious sites, such as that shown in Figure 1, from being appropriately considered for allocation. In its current form, the proposed Policy fails to accord with 'Basic Condition D' (as defined earlier in this letter) and the provisions of the NPPF by limiting or restricting the contribution of the Neighbourhood Plan area to achieve sustainable development.	<p>We disagree as the NP met the housing requirement in place at the time it was under preparation.</p> <p>The later increase in housing requirement left the QB with no alternative than to remove all allocations from the NP.</p>	Change to be made as indicated.
			The Dunlop site in Bagworth, as referenced in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, achieved detailed consent in 2017 and has since been built out. As such, the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should consider additional sites in Bagworth being mindful of the future needs of the village, beyond 2022, and also the requirement to provide an appropriate quantum of housing land in the emerging Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan.	Noted. There are no allocations in the NP.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			The emerging Neighbourhood Plan provides a <i>guide figure of a minimum of 133 dwellings... for the Neighbourhood Plan</i> . It is important to emphasise that this is a minimum and does not account for the revised housing needs as will be defined by the emerging Local Plan, nor does it factor in the potential to assist in addressing the unmet need of Leicester. The preparation of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should be mindful of the requirements of emerging local planning policy, to ensure the longevity of the document once it has been 'made' and that it retains relevance.	Agreed. It has taken the decision to remove all allocations from the NP.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			In March 2021, Boyer undertook an assessment of the five-year housing land supply position of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council. It was discovered that the Council are only able to demonstrate a 4.13-year supply of housing land, which therein renders the policies related to limiting residential development to be out-of-date, triggering the 'tilted balance' as contained in Paragraph 11d of the NPPF. As is stated in the Paragraph, for decision-taking this means that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole.	Noted	None
			This demonstrates that additional deliverable sites, such as that shown in Figure 1, should be allocated so as to support the housing land supply and protect the Borough from the possibility of numerous speculative planning applications should the five-year housing land supply continue to under-deliver.	Noted – however the leap from the original housing requirement to the new one introduced last year is too great for the NP to deliver, therefore the decision was taken to remove the allocations from the NP.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			As such, it is appropriate for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan to consider additional sites within the Neighbourhood Plan area in order to meet the aspiration of Chapter 5 of the NPPF, which seeks to significantly boost the supply of homes in suitable, desirable locations such as Bagworth.	It did consider the possibility of additional sites but there were too many constraints on the sites identified in the NP as raised by HYBBC that it was not possible for the NP to achieve the target required.	Change to be made as indicated.
			Nonetheless, it is acknowledged that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan could have to be reviewed should it not be <i>sufficiently flexible to respond to a changing housing requirement established through the borough-wide local plan</i> . We would reiterate the importance of this in order to meet the aspirations of Paragraph 29 of the NPPF, which states that <i>Neighbourhood Plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies</i> .	The NP will be reviewed at the earliest opportunity and housing assessments will be undertaken at that time, once the housing requirement is confirmed.	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			In conclusion, it is recommended that emerging Policy H1 be updated to include the land shown in Figure 1 as a residential allocation, in order to protect the housing land supply of the Borough and of the Neighbourhood Plan area. The residential development of the land would see sustainable growth in the highest demand location in the Neighbourhood Plan area (as established in the most recent Housing Needs Survey (2017), with the site having the potential to achieve the three overarching objectives of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) as defined in Paragraph 8 of the NPPF.	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.
	H3: Settlement Boundary		It is acknowledged in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan that settlement boundaries ensure that sufficient land to meet residential and commercial need is available in the right locations. The settlement boundary for Bagworth, as is proposed in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, has been drawn tightly around the settlement	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			This therefore serves to restrict the future sustainable growth of the village, which would restrict the capacity for the village to deliver an appropriate quantum of housing in the event that the housing land requirements are increased, and therefore would be in opposition to the aspiration to significantly boost the supply of homes, as contained in Chapter 5 of the NPPF.	The Settlement Boundaries are closely aligned to HBBC's and therefore in general conformity with the Local Plan.	None
	H4: Housing Mix		We are in agreement with the general thrust of proposed Policy H4: Housing Mix. Nonetheless, we recommend the amendment of the wording of part of the Policy to the following:	Noted	None
			- <i>Development should deliver more than 60% of the units as 3-bed or fewer, <u>unless an alternative mix is justifiable</u></i> (underlined wording denotes amends/additions)	Noted. We have agreed to change this mix to require 80% 1-3 bed dwellings.	Change to be made as indicated.
	H5: Affordable Housing Provision		We are in agreement with the proposed Policy H5: Affordable Housing Provision	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	H7: Design Standards		We are in agreement with the proposed Policy H7: Design Standards, although Criterion D should be amended to read <i>a minimum of two car parking spaces per two bedroomed house and above</i> . Requiring three parking spaces per three bedroomed house and above is excessive and would result in development sites being dominated by car parking measures. Adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2016) Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards states that <i>all proposals for new development will be required to provide an appropriate level of parking provision justified by an assessment of the site location, type of housing, other modes of transport available (e.g. public transport and cycle provision) and appropriate design</i>	Noted. We believe that the local conditions in the Neighbourhood Area warrant a higher standard of parking.	None
			As such, we propose that Criterion D be amended to state the same. This will ensure that appropriate car parking measures are delivered, with the quantum being selected on a site-by-site basis.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
	Conclusion		This representation has highlighted a number of instances whereby the Plan has not been positively prepared and does not seek to contribute towards achieving sustainable development in line with the NPPF (2019).	Noted	None
			It is also worth noting that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan incorrectly refers to an out of date version of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018). The emerging Neighbourhood Plan should be having regard to the Revised NPPF which was published in February 2019.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
			Accordingly, the Bagworth, Thornton and Stanton-under-Bardon Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet all the 'basic conditions' required by Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and therefore should be amended before it proceeds to a Regulation 16 consultation.	The NP will be amended in line with comments received through this consultation.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
		Highways England	Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission version of the Bagworth, Thornton and Stanton-under-Bardon Neighbourhood Plan (BT&SuB NP), which has been produced for public consultation and covers the Plan period of 2019 to 2036. The document provides a vision for the future of the Plan area and sets out several key objectives and planning policies that will be used to help determine planning applications.	Noted	None
			Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the BT&SuB NP, our principal interest is in safeguarding the M1 Motorway, which routes within 1km to the east of the Plan area. It is noted that M1 Junction 22 lies approximately 100m away from the northeast corner of the Plan area.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to conformity with the relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the BT&SuB NP is required to conform with the adopted and emerging Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan, and this is acknowledged within the document. It is noted, however, that the plan period for the emerging Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan has recently been revised to 2039 and we therefore recommend the timescales for the BT&SuB NP are also updated to mirror that of the emerging Local Plan.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
			The BT&SuB NP states that, in advance of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan's adoption, there are uncertainties in establishing housing requirements for Bagworth, Thornton and Stanton-under-Bardon, and that a review of the Neighbourhood Plan may be necessary should a different housing requirement be established through the Borough-wide local plan. We acknowledge this point.	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			We also understand that the housing provision currently planned for in the BT&SuB NP is based on an indicative figure provided by the borough, which amounts to 133 dwellings to be delivered over the period of 2016 to 2036. Considering completions and commitments, the residual housing requirement to be delivered in Bagworth and Thornton Parish and Stanton-under-Bardon Parish by 2036 equates to 12 and 40 additional dwellings respectively.	Noted	None
			We note that the housing provision planned for in the BT&SuB NP, within <i>Policy H1: Residential Site Allocations</i> exceeds the residual requirement set out above and makes provision for 90 dwellings to be met through the allocation of four housing sites, as follows:	Noted. All allocated sites have been withdrawn from the Submission version of the NP as it is not possible to achieve the Borough Council's updated housing requirement which would have resulted in significantly more allocations than in the pre-submission version.	Change to be made as indicated.

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 1 – The rear of Main Street, Thornton, for approx. 12 dwellings; • Site 2 – Thornton Nurseries, for approx. 21 dwellings; • Site 3 – Land off Meadow Lane, Stanton-under-Bardon, for approx. 12 dwellings; • Site 4 – Land opposite South Charnwood High School, Stanton-under-Bardon, for approx. 45 dwellings. 	Noted	None
			<i>Policy H2: Reserve Site Allocation</i> also makes provision for a reserve site for approximately 50 additional dwellings on land adjacent to the Public House in Stanton under-Bardon, should it be needed during the duration of the Plan either due to an increase in housing demand or the inability of the designated sites to provide the required scale of housing.	Noted	None
			We note that no employment sites have been allocated in the BT&SuB NP. However, existing and new opportunities within the parishes' limits of development are supported within <i>Policy BE1: Support for Existing Businesses & Employment Opportunities</i> and <i>Policy BE2: Support for New Businesses and Employment</i> .	Noted	None

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
			Although we would not expect impacts on the SRN by individual developments to be significant, considering the close proximity of the Plan area to the M1, there may be some cumulative impacts at M1 Junction 22 as a result of the total level of growth proposed across the Plan area through Policies H1 and H2. We would expect such impacts to be considered as part of the development management process, in order for their impacts to be appropriately assessed.	Noted	None
			We have no further comments to provide and trust the above is useful in the progression of the BT&SuB NP	Noted	None