

ROTHLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2019 - 2028

**The Report of the Independent Examiner to Charnwood Borough Council on
the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan**

**Andrew Matheson MSc MPA DipTP MRTPI FCIH
Independent Examiner
8th December 2020**

Summary

I was appointed by Charnwood Borough Council, in agreement with the Rothley Parish Council, in August 2020 to undertake the Independent Examination of the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan.

The Examination has been undertaken by written representations. I visited the Neighbourhood Area on 29th November 2020 after resolving my enquiries of the Qualifying Body.

The Neighbourhood Plan proposes a local range of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the Rothley Neighbourhood Area. There is an evident focus on safeguarding the very distinctive character of the area whilst accommodating future change and growth.

The Plan has been underpinned by extensive community support and engagement. The social, environmental and economic aspects of the issues identified have been brought together into a coherent plan which adds appropriate local detail to sit alongside the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028 Core Strategy.

Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this Report, I have concluded that the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.

I recommend that the referendum should be held within the Neighbourhood Area.

Report Index

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	3
The Role of the Independent Examiner	3
Rothley Neighbourhood Area	4
Consultation	4
Representations Received	6
The Neighbourhood Plan	6
Basic Conditions	7
The Plan in Detail:	7
Front Cover	7
Table of Contents	8
1 Introduction	8
2 How the Plan was prepared	9
3 How the Neighbourhood Plan fits into the Planning System	9
4 The Neighbourhood Plan, its vision and objectives	9
5 About Rothley	10
6 Neighbourhood Plan Proposals and Policies	10
6.1 Housing	10
6.2 Open Spaces and the Environment	15
6.3 Business and Employment	17
6.4 Transport, traffic and parking	18
6.5 Community facilities	19
6.6 Conservation and heritage	20
6.7 Communications infrastructure	21
7 Monitoring and Review	22
8 Appendix – additional maps	22
Other matters raised in representations	22
EU and ECHR Obligations	23
Conclusions	25
Listing of Recommendations	26

Introduction

This report sets out the findings of the Independent Examination of the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan 2019 - 2028. The Plan was prepared and submitted to Charnwood Borough Council by the Rothley Parish Council as the Qualifying Body.

Neighbourhood Plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently incorporated within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012 and this continues to be the principal element of national planning policy. A new NPPF was published in July 2018, updated in February 2019, and it is against the content of this NPPF that the Plan will be examined.

This report assesses whether the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan is legally compliant and meets the 'basic conditions' that such plans are required to meet. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends modifications to its policies and supporting text. This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome, the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan would then be used in the process of determining planning applications within the Neighbourhood Area boundary as an integral part of the wider Development Plan.

The Role of the Independent Examiner

The Examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted Neighbourhood Plan meets the legislative and procedural requirements. I was appointed by Charnwood Borough Council, in agreement with the Rothley Parish Council, to conduct the Examination of the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan and to report my findings. I am independent of both Charnwood Borough Council and the Rothley Parish Council. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.

I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I have over 40 years' experience in various local authorities and third sector bodies as well as with the professional body for planners in the United Kingdom. I am a Chartered Town Planner and a panel member for the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (NPIERS). I am a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

In my role as Independent Examiner I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the Examination:

- the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to a referendum; or
- the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
- the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. If recommending that the Neighbourhood Plan should go forward to referendum, I must then consider whether or not the referendum area should extend beyond the Neighbourhood Area to which the Plan relates.

In examining the Plan, I am also required, under paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to check whether:

- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004;

- the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 Act (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area);
- the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

These are helpfully covered in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement and, subject to the contents of this Report, I can confirm that I am satisfied that each of the above points has been properly addressed and met.

In undertaking this examination I have considered the following documents:

- Rothley Neighbourhood Plan 2019 - 2028 as submitted
- Rothley Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions Statement (2020)
- Rothley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (undated)
- Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report and Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report for the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan (March 2020)
- Content at: www.rothleyparishcouncil.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan1.html
- Representations made to the Regulation 16 public consultation on the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan - as shown at:
www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/rothley_neighbourhood_plan
- Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028 Core Strategy
- Charnwood Local Plan 2004 (Saved Policies)
- Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019 - 36
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019)
- Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (March 2014 and subsequent updates)

I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the Neighbourhood Area on 29th November 2020. I looked at all the various sites and locations identified in the Plan document in their rural and Conservation Areas' context.

The legislation establishes that, as a general rule, Neighbourhood Plan examinations should be held without a public hearing, by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted plan which I felt made their points with clarity, I was satisfied that the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan could be examined without the need for a public hearing and I advised Charnwood Borough Council accordingly. The Qualifying Body and the Local Planning Authority have helpfully responded to my enquiries so that I may have a thorough understanding of the facts and thinking behind the Plan, and the correspondence is included on the Charnwood Borough Council Neighbourhood Planning website for the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan.

Rothley Neighbourhood Area

A map showing the boundary of the Rothley Neighbourhood Area has been provided within the Neighbourhood Plan. Further to an application made by Rothley Parish Council, Charnwood Borough Council approved the designation of the Neighbourhood Area on 21st December 2015. This satisfied the requirement in line with the purposes of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan under section 61G(1) of the Parish and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Consultation

In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, the Qualifying Body has prepared a Consultation Statement to accompany the Plan.

The Planning Practice Guidance says:

“A qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its Neighbourhood Plan [or Order] and ensure that the wider community:

- is kept fully informed of what is being proposed
- is able to make their views known throughout the process
- has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging Neighbourhood Plan [or Order]
- is made aware of how their views have informed the draft Neighbourhood Plan [or Order].” (Reference ID: 41-047-20140306)

The submitted Consultation Statement notes that a Consultation Engagement and Strategy was produced in March 2016. Subsequently, in June 2016, two open events – daytime and evening - were held. The events were widely publicised through a variety of media: letter & leaflet distributed to all properties in Rothley, posters displayed in the village centre and on notice boards, advertisements and articles in the local press and newsletters, through various websites and by email to a wide variety of contacts including the statutory consultees. Over the two events 64 people attended and comments were recorded and collated and considered at workshop meetings of Rothley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. In addition, a small display stand was erected and manned before the start of the Rothley 10K Run. Also, a member of the Steering Group (a retired teacher) arranged to meet two teenage groups from the Church youth club; they ranged from 14 to 17 years old and after an initial discussion and explanation they were asked to rank a variety of village facilities on the basis of 'how important they are to you'. Community comments were used to inform the development of the overall vision and objectives for the plan and guide the structure, format, and content of subsequent consultation and engagement, in particular the questionnaire survey.

The questionnaire survey was undertaken in April/May 2017. The questionnaire was designed by the Steering Group at a workshop facilitated by a consultant who also uploaded the questionnaire to the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan website so that responses could be made on-line. Hard copies were printed and distributed to every residential and commercial building in the Parish, along with a pre-paid, addressed envelope. Further copies were available from the Parish Council office and the Community Library. In total 485 responses were received. A full analysis of responses received both in hard copy and via the website was undertaken by the consultant and a comprehensive report of findings was produced.

A public feedback event was held in November 2017 to provide feedback to residents on the conclusions from the initial open days and the questionnaire survey. The event was publicised by the same comprehensive range of approaches as used for the open events. At the event information was presented to local residents by means of a poster display. The event was attended by 19 residents and those attending were invited to leave comments.

As required by the Neighbourhood Plans Regulations, a pre-submission formal Consultation took place April/May 2019. Through the consultation process the Parish Council publicised the draft Plan to all that live, work, or do business within the Parish, outlined where and when the draft Plan could be inspected, detailed how to make representations, and consulted all statutory consultation bodies including Charnwood Borough Council. All representations received were recorded and summarised. The comments received informed and guided a series of amendments and additions to the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The revised Plan was considered and approved by Rothley Parish Council in January 2020.

Finally, I note that, in acknowledgement of the disruptive effects of the Covid-19 lockdown, the Regulation 16 community consultation was extended to run over a period of 10 weeks to account for any disruption caused. The consultation thus ran from Friday July 24th to Friday

October 2nd 2020. Particularly in the absence of any adverse comments, I am satisfied that this has allowed the consultation to be concluded satisfactorily.

Accordingly, overall I am satisfied that the consultation process accords with the requirements of the Regulations and the Practice Guidance and that, in having regard to national policy and guidance, the Basic Conditions have been met. In reaching my own conclusions about the specifics of the content of the Plan I will later note points of agreement or disagreement with Regulation 16 representations, just as the Qualifying Body has already done for earlier consultations. That does not imply or suggest that the consultation has been inadequate, merely that a test against the Basic Conditions is being applied.

Representations Received

Consultation on the submitted Plan, in accordance with Neighbourhood Planning Regulation 16, was undertaken by Charnwood Borough Council from Friday July 24th to Friday October 2nd 2020 – a period extended in recognition of the hindrance arising from the Covid 19 pandemic and responses to it. I have been passed the representations – 14 in total – which were generated by the consultation. I have not mentioned every representation individually within the Report but this is not because they have not been thoroughly read and considered in relation to my Examiner role, rather their detail may not add to the pressing of my related recommendations which must ensure that the Basic Conditions are met.

The Neighbourhood Plan

The Parish Council is to be congratulated on its extensive efforts to produce a Neighbourhood Plan for their area that will guide development activity over the period to 2028. I can see that a sustained effort has been put into developing a Plan guided by a series of objectives set down in section 4 of the Plan and a Vision: “To maintain the character and identity of the village of Rothley within its rural setting and to ensure that development opportunities are appropriate to the scale and nature of this Parish, respecting its rural character”. The Plan document is neatly presented with a combination of text, maps and Policies that are, subject to the specific points that I make below, laid out helpfully for the reader. The Plan has been kept to a manageable length by not overextending the potential subject matter and the coverage of that.

It is an expectation of Neighbourhood Plans that they should address the issues that are identified through community consultation, set within the context of higher-level planning policies. There is no prescribed content and no requirement that the robustness of proposals should be tested to the extent prescribed for Local Plans. Where there has been a failure by the Qualifying Body to address an issue in the round, leading to an inadequate statement of policy, it is part of my role wherever possible to see that the community’s intent is sustained in an appropriately modified wording for the policy. It is evident that the community has made positive use of “direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area” (Planning Practice Guidance Reference ID: 41-001-20140306).

Individually I can see that the Policies address legitimate matters for a Neighbourhood Plan as identified with the community. I will later look at the Policies in turn so as to ensure that the Basic Conditions are met, which include an obligation to be in general conformity with Local Plan strategic policies.

Having considered all the evidence and representations submitted as part of the Examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It works from a positive vision for the future of the Neighbourhood Area and promotes policies that are, subject to amendment to variable degrees, proportionate and sustainable. The Plan sets out the community’s priorities and

establishes a sound basis for proportionate growth whilst seeking to identify and safeguard Rothley's distinctive features and character. The plan-making process had to find ways to reconcile the external challenges that are perceived as likely to affect the area with the positive vision agreed with the community. All such difficult tasks were approached with transparency, with input as required and support from Charnwood Borough Council.

However, in the writing up of the work into the Plan document, it is sometimes the case that the phraseology is imprecise, not helpful, or it falls short in justifying aspects of the selected policy. This is not uncommon in a community-prepared planning document and something that can readily be addressed in most instances. Accordingly I have been obliged to recommend modifications so as to ensure both clarity and meeting of the 'Basic Conditions'. In particular, Plan policies as submitted may not meet the obligation to "provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency" (NPPF para 17). I bring this particular reference to the fore because it will be evident as I examine the policies individually and consider whether they meet or can meet the 'Basic Conditions'.

Basic Conditions

The Independent Examiner is required to consider whether a Neighbourhood Plan meets the "Basic Conditions", as set out in law following the Localism Act 2011; in December 2018 a fifth Basic Condition was added relating to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Plan for the area;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations;
- not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017(d).

The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has very helpfully set out to address the issues in relation to these requirements and has tabulated the relationship between the policy content of the Plan and its higher tier equivalents. I note that the Local Plan is the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028 Core Strategy.

I have examined and will below consider the Neighbourhood Plan against all of the Basic Conditions above, utilising the supporting material provided in the Basic Conditions Statement and other available evidence as appropriate.

The Plan in Detail

I will address the aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan content that are relevant to the Examination broadly in the same sequence as the Plan. Recommendations are identified with a bold heading and italics, and I have brought them together as a list at the end of the Report.

Front cover

A Neighbourhood Plan must specify the period during which it is to have effect. I note that there is a prominent reference to the Plan period 2019 – 2028 on the front cover. Since none of the data in the Plan is 2019 specific and the Plan was not submitted until 2020 that would be the more appropriate start date. The reference to "Submission version approved by Rothley Parish Council January 2020" can now be removed.

Table of Contents

The listings will need to be reviewed once the text has been amended to accommodate the recommendations from this Report.

Recommendation 1:

1.1 Amend the Plan period to '2020 to 2028' throughout the Plan and on the front cover replace "Submission version approved by Rothley Parish Council January 2020" with 'December 2020'.

1.2 Once the Plan text has been amended, review the "Contents" page to accommodate as required the recommended modifications from this Report.

1 Introduction

The following amendments are required for accuracy and clarity where the content has become out of date. The sixth sentence of paragraph 3 is not strictly true; Neighbourhood Plans are required to "have regard to" national policies and guidance rather than "be in general conformity" which only applies to the strategic policies of the Local Plan. Whilst the Plan is required to include a map of the Neighbourhood Area (titled as such), the added detail about Parish boundary changes, as included on the page 3 map, is not relevant to the Neighbourhood Area and therefore should be omitted as it has the potential to confuse the boundary.

Through the Plan document there are a number of document references provided but no indication as to where the referenced document may be found. In general – whether by footnote or in-text referencing – it is better for the references to be to the original source material rather than via a compilation document.

Recommendation 2:

Under the heading "1. Introduction":

2.1 Delete from the first sentence: "is the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan for Rothley which".

*2.2 In the second paragraph replace "civic parish" with 'Parish', "neighbourhood plan area" with 'Neighbourhood Area' and the two document reference numbers with a single link to the related Charnwood Borough webpage as the official source of the record:
www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/rothley_neighbourhood_plan*

2.3 In the third paragraph:

2.3.1 In the first sentence delete: "are a key part of the Government's Localism agenda. They".

2.3.2 Replace the sixth sentence with: 'They must, however, have regard to national policies and guidance, and be in general conformity with Borough-wide strategic policies.'

2.3.3 Delete the seventh and subsequent sentences, except the last.

2.3.4 In the final sentence delete "Borough's own" and "2011 – 2028 Core Strategy" and replace "is in accordance with" with 'has appropriate regard for'.

2.4 On the map on page 3 amend the title to read 'Rothley Neighbourhood Area'; delete the blue line on the map and amend the key to reference only the red line, titled as 'Rothley Neighbourhood Area'.

2. How the Plan was Prepared

For ease of reference it would be helpful if the Plan consistently used paragraph numbering rather than simply numbered headings and, within section 6, sub-headings; the heading and paragraph numbers should interrelate to allow for ready access to the Plan content.

The reference within this section to the use of evidence allows for a single source reference to the gathered evidence to be provided. Where a Plan Policy relies for its understanding and interpretation on specific material (eg a table showing the basis for the designation of Local Green Spaces) then that should be included as an Appendix to the Plan.

Recommendation 3:

3.1 For ease of reference add paragraph numbers throughout the Plan; the heading and paragraph numbers should interrelate to allow for ready access to the Plan content eg 2.11 references the eleventh paragraph of section 2.

3.2 Under the heading “2. How the Plan was Prepared”:

3.2.1 Delete the two document references but replace these after “a wide range of existing documents and data” with a single reference ‘see: www.rothleyparishcouncil.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan1.html

3.2.2 In the last sentence after “Consultation Statement” add ‘which accompanies this Plan’.

3. How the Plan fits into the Planning System

As noted above, the sixth sentence is not strictly true; Neighbourhood Plans are required to “have regard to” national policies and guidance rather than “be in general conformity” which only applies to the strategic policies of the Local Plan. As a general reference to supporting material has now been provided, the document references in this section can be deleted. However, a source reference to the Local Plan here would avoid the need for repeat references later in the Plan.

Recommendation 4:

Under the heading “3. How the Plan fits into the Planning System”:

4.1 Delete the bracketed document references; add a website source reference for the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028 Core Strategy.

4.2 Replace the sixth sentence of the first paragraph with: ‘The Plan must be in general conformity with Borough-wide strategic policies and have regard to national policies and guidance’.

4.3 In the last paragraph, at the end of the fourth sentence replace “statement (see document Mis012)” with ‘Statement which accompanies this Plan’ and delete the sixth and seventh sentences beginning “All supporting documents...”.

4. The Plan, its vision and objectives

As a general reference to supporting material has now been provided, the document references in this section can be deleted. This section could also be more consistent in the use of full stops, in particular at the end of a list and after each Objective.

Recommendation 5:

Under the heading “4. The Plan, its vision and objectives”:

5.1 Delete the bracketed document references as well as the final sentence on page 7.

5.2 Under Topic 3 (page 9) use capital C and capital A for 'Conservation Areas'.

5.3 Review the use of full stops within this section for consistency.

5. About Rothley

It would be helpful if a key to the map on page 12 separately identified the two Conservation Areas.

Recommendation 6:

On the map on page 12, through the use of numbering and a key, distinguish the Rothley Conservation Area from the Rothley Ridgeway Conservation Area.

6. Neighbourhood Plan Proposals and Policies

6.1 Housing

Some amendments are required for accuracy and clarity where the content has become out of date. Whilst it is natural and evident that the community would wish to "have a say in the scale, location and design of any such development" (Plan page 13) it is evident that the Qualifying Body underestimated the task and resources required to objectively assess and select for allocation specific sites suitable for new housing development. Instead the Plan as written adopts a largely reactive stance to developer proposals and, in instances, compromises its own non-site-specific policies as set out at the beginning of this section. In particular, when sites outside the Limits to Development are considered, it is important to show that there is no or no appropriate site within the Limits since the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan Policies R02 and R03 require that approach.

Whilst Neighbourhood Plans may allocate sites for housing development, if a community chooses to do this, it must:

- work from appropriately applied, proportionate evidence (NPPF para 31), and
- at least meet the objectively identified local housing requirement (Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 103 Reference ID: 41-103-20190509).

In relation to the latter, over the Neighbourhood Plan period to 2028 there is no unmet objectively assessed requirement (other than the use of suitable "windfall" sites) arising from the Charnwood Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2028 Core Strategy. Indeed, that Plan includes for a strategic and significant Garden Suburb that will encompass part of the Rothley Parish to the south. There are indications that the new Draft Local Plan may include an additional requirement for the Rothley Settlement Area, but an early review of the Neighbourhood Plan in the light of the Local Plan, when adopted, could address this. Meanwhile, generic policies can set out certain principles against which all housing development proposals can be fairly assessed.

In the light of the shortcomings with the site-specific policies and in the absence of an urgent or specific need for the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate land for housing, the Qualifying Body agreed that the Plan should proceed on the basis of reviewed and, if needs be, improved generic policies but with the site-specific policies removed. In place of the policies, that section of the Plan will simply review the sites put forward during the public consultations so that they may be picked up within the Local Plan context as housing requirements are resolved and reviewed. The alternative approach of improving the site-specific policies would have involved significant further work and almost certainly a further round of community consultation before the Examination could have concluded. The recommendations that follow are therefore based on the agreed approach.

Recommendation 7:

7.1 Under the heading "Neighbourhood Plan Proposals and Policies" delete the second sentence as this effectively duplicates the first sentence.

7.2 Under the heading "6.1 Housing":

7.2.1 In the second sentence, replace the general source reference to the Local Plan (which was provided earlier at the first reference to it) with a paragraph specific reference – ‘para 4.19’ and replace “some development” with ‘at least 3000 new homes’ (for consistency with the Local Plan Policy CS1).

7.2.2 Replace the last sentence of the third paragraph (page 14): “Policy RO9 below is proposed and relates specifically to Broadnook” with ‘Rothley Parish Council will seek through the use of Section 106 Agreements (in accordance with the statutory requirements set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010) to bring additional benefits for the community of Rothley Parish from the planning consents that will deliver the Broadnook Garden Suburb.’

7.2.3 Amend the map on page 15 to remove the reference to and the outlines of the “Areas of Separation” as these will be addressed later.

7.2.4 Delete the first paragraph on page 16 since that is now out of date.

7.2.5 Delete the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 16: “Only two very minor changes to the settlement boundary are proposed as shown in the map on page 38 and referred to in policies R06 and R08.”

Policy R01 Rothley limits to development

There are a number of issues with this Policy as written:

i) As the representation from the local authority notes, the emerging Preferred Options Local Plan (October 2019) will make a significant amendment to the “Limits to Development” boundaries in Rothley. The Neighbourhood Plan does not acknowledge this but, in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance, that new boundary will supersede the Neighbourhood Plan boundary when the new Local Plan is adopted (PPG Paragraph: 044 Reference ID: 41-044- 20190509). The most apparently significant of the changes is the exclusion of the “Rothley Ridgeway” and the areas of open space around Rothley Brook. In the light of Neighbourhood Plan Policies R12 and R22 in particular, the Qualifying Body indicated that it was supportive of these proposed boundary changes.

ii) To be defensible within planning decisions, Limits to Development should follow a “set of assessment principles and criteria to provide a methodical approach and ensure that the draft settlement limits have been prepared in a clear, transparent and objective manner” (Charnwood Settlement Limits Draft Assessment 2018). The proposed changes to the “Limits to Development” are not justified with evidence that relates to a set of assessment principles and criteria. The Charnwood methodology says at Principle 1 that “The boundary will tightly define the settlement by enclosing the established, cohesive built form.”

iii) It is unclear why the first paragraph of Policy R01 was not incorporated within Policy R02, which takes a more detailed approach, and the Qualifying Body agreed that the two Policies should be merged.

Recommendation 8:

Delete Policy R01 (and see below Recommendations for Policy R02 relating to its partial incorporation there).

Policy R02 Development within Rothley Village

The general policy approach is consistent with Charnwood Local Plan Policy CS1. On my first reading of this Policy I imagined that “Rothley Village” was a sub-area of the Rothley Limits to Development but on second reading, and in the absence of a map defining a sub-area (and in the light also of the local authority comments) I concluded that for “Rothley Village” I should read ‘Rothley Limits to Development’. It is not stated why “up to 9 dwellings”

had been selected to define “small scale” for Rothley; the Qualifying Body has subsequently clarified: “Charnwood BC’s current Local Plan refers to allowing only small developments of up to 9 dwellings in ‘service centres’ such as Rothley and our wish is to support and continue this limit”. In fact, neither the current or Draft Local Plans specifies “small scale” in terms of a number of dwellings. The current Local Plan says that Service Centres “provide a sustainable location for a smaller scale of development, appropriate in size to their character and the services and facilities they contain”; accordingly, in the absence of other evidence, that is what the Neighbourhood Plan Policy should say.

As not every development proposal is likely to affect the open spaces, heritage assets or Conservation Areas, elements iv) and v) need to be qualified with ‘where appropriate’.

As noted above this Policy is now to incorporate the reference to the Rothley Limits to Development from Policy R01 and the Policy numbering needs to be amended accordingly. For information, the supporting paragraphs need to be supplemented with references to the related content in the existing and Draft Charnwood Local Plans as appropriate. For format consistency with (most) other Policies the supporting statements ought to precede rather than follow the Policy boxes.

Recommendation 9:

9.1 On page 17 replace the section heading “Development within Rothley Village” with ‘Development within Rothley Limits to Development’ and

9.1.1 Delete Policy box R01.

9.1.2 Add an additional paragraph as follows:

‘This Neighbourhood Plan recognises the Limits to Development from the Charnwood Local Plan 2004 (see map included in the Appendix to this Plan). However, the emerging Preferred Options Local Plan (October 2019) indicates a significant amendment to the “Limits to Development” boundaries in Rothley. The most significant of the changes is the exclusion of the “Rothley Ridgeway” and the areas of open space around Rothley Brook. The Qualifying Body is supportive of these proposed boundary changes.’

9.2 Within the Policy R02 box:

9.2.1 Renumber and reword the Policy as: ‘Policy R01 Development within Rothley Limits to Development’; renumber subsequent Policies accordingly.

9.2.2 Delete from the opening sentence “of up to 9 units within the defined Rothley village limits will be supported provided that the proposals meet the other policies of this Neighbourhood Plan and” and replace with ‘within the Rothley Limits to Development (see map included in the Appendix or subsequent revisions) will be supported’.

9.2.3 Replace element i) with ‘Appropriate in size to the character, services and facilities of Rothley’.

9.2.4 Combine within element iv) the related part of the (now deleted) Policy R01 so as to read: ‘Does not result in the loss of an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value and, where appropriate, addresses their distinctive qualities.’

9.2.5 Add at the beginning of element v) ‘Where appropriate,’ and amend “Area” to ‘Areas’.

9.2.6 Ensure clarity for element vi) by rewording as: ‘Does not adversely affect neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion and noise, or by loss of privacy, daylight or amenity.’

9.2.7 Add at the end of every element: ‘; and’ except the last which should be concluded with a full stop.

9.3 After the Policy box renumbered as Policy R01 delete the two sentences beginning “This Neighbourhood Plan”.

As amended and renumbered Policy R01 meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy R03 Development outside Settlement Boundary

The general policy approach is consistent with Charnwood Local Plan Policy CS1. As noted in the local authority comments, the reference to “Settlement Boundary” should in fact read ‘Limits to Development’. The reference here to Policies R06 and R08 is no longer relevant since the site-specific Policies are to be removed. The local authority has also noted discrepancies between the Policy wording and the related NPPF paragraphs which necessitate corrections.

Recommendation 10:

Within the Policy box R03 (now renumbered as R02):

10.1 Replace the title and opening sentence with:

‘Policy R02 Development outside the Limits to Development

With the exception of development sites allocated in the Local Plan, proposals for development outside of the ‘Limits to Development’ boundary (see adjacent map or subsequent revisions) must be for either:’

10.2 Replace element i) with: ‘A rural housing exception scheme; or’.

10.3 Replace element ii) with: ‘Homes in the countryside set out at paragraph 79 of the NPPF; or’.

10.4 Replace element iii): ‘Rural or agricultural business development in accordance with paragraph 83 of the NPPF.’

10.5 Delete element iv).

10.6 Move the map of the “Rothley Limits to Development” from the Appendix to be adjacent to the Policy. On the map delete the areas marked red and delete the key; add the source reference for the map.

As amended and renumbered Policy R02 meets the Basic Conditions.

Design Principles

Policy R04 Design Principles

The general policy approach is consistent with Charnwood Local Plan Policy CS2. I note that most if not all of the content of this Policy is repeated in the individual Policies that follow whereas this Policy should be the repository for all the guidance that is not site-specific. To be effective, the guidance needs to have clarity and be evidently rooted in the area to which it relates. It would have been helpful to have some photographic illustrations of the factors that distinguish local built form.

On the matter of clarity, the local authority has commented that it ought to be clear that the guidance relates to extensions to existing buildings as well as new construction. They also

suggest that “[not harm the] visual integrity of the settlement” might be more clearly expressed as ‘[show regard for the] prevailing design and vernacular of the surrounding area’. It is not explained why it is an expectation that rooflines in all locations should be uniform nor to what “area” density considerations should relate.

Recommendation 11:

Within the Policy box R04 (now renumbered as R03):

11.1 Replace the introductory sentence with:

‘Development proposals for new buildings and extensions should meet the following local design principles.’

11.2 Replace element ii) with ‘The prevailing design and vernacular of the surrounding area should be respected’.

11.3 Replace element iii) with ‘The prevailing scale and height of adjacent buildings should be respected.’

11.4 Replace element iv) with ‘Building density should be appropriate to a rural location and respectful of the density in the surrounding area.’

11.5 Add in the following generic elements from the site-specific and other policies:

v) The provision of car parking should be designed to minimise its visual impact on the street scene and neighbourhood.

vi) A suitable scheme of landscaping should ensure that the natural setting is respected.

vii) The natural movement of wildlife should be accommodated including, where appropriate, through the creation of or links to existing wildlife corridors.’

As amended and renumbered Policy R03 meets the Basic Conditions.

Specific proposals

As noted above, the site-specific Policies are to be removed from the Plan and the remaining text should therefore be explanatory of the approach taken by the Qualifying Body. The following Recommendations therefore follow that approach. The local authority has provided a map to illustrate the locations of the sites and this would be a helpful addition provided that its index is matched with the numbering of the sites within the Plan.

Recommendation 12:

Under the heading “Specific proposals”:

12.1 In the opening paragraph replace “also document Mis008” with ‘adjacent map illustrating locations’; insert the map (as provided by Charnwood BC) within the text ensuring that the locations are accurate and the text numbering and the map index are matched.

12.2 As a map is now included, the (unexplained) references – such as “ref: PSH377” should be omitted.

12.3 Amend the paragraph immediately preceding site i) to read:

‘A further proposal was submitted from Pegasus Group in response to a public consultation and this was the subject of a planning application to Charnwood BC ref: P/20/0610/2.’

12.4 Immediately after the listing of site i) replace all the subsequent text with:

‘Further consideration of these sites revealed that sites a), b), f) and i) had already been included within the sites for evaluation within the preparatory work for the Draft Local Plan and site c) was adjacent to such a site; sites b) and e) were both taken forward to be evaluated as “Possible Option Sites”. Site b) lies within the Rothley Limits to Development and could therefore already come forward as a ‘windfall’ site. Site g) had been allocated for

housing in the current Local Plan and is now the subject of a planning application. Site h) has subsequently been granted a planning consent. Site a) has been twice refused a planning consent and site i) has recently been refused a planning consent. Therefore, only sites c), d) and e) are new, previously unevaluated proposals; all these sites lie within a Conservation Area and would need specific evaluation in that context. The Parish Council felt they had insufficient detail to evaluate site d). Site e) relates to only a single house (although other commercial proposals were included).

Having regard to all these factors, the Neighbourhood Plan does not include any specific allocation of land for housing but all new proposals will be evaluated in line with all the generic Policies designed specifically for Rothley (as well as the Local Plan Policies). As part of the Parish will form part of the Broadnook Garden Suburb it will thus make a significant contribution toward meeting local housing requirements. If and when additional housing requirements are established, then the Parish Council is of the view that sites b), c), d), e) and f) could merit further detailed consideration for allocation by the Borough Council or within a review of the Neighbourhood Plan.'

12.5 Renumber subsequent Policies accordingly.

6.2 Open Spaces and the Environment

6.2.1 Public Open Spaces

As the local authority has noted, this Policy lacks the level of supporting evidence for what it is said to be wanting to achieve. 'Local Green Space' designation gives a high level of protection but is designed for local spaces evidenced as being of "particular" significance. I therefore suggested to the Qualifying Body that there were two options, both of which required mapping detail sufficient to identify the boundary of each site without ambiguity:

- i) Designate the spaces identified as 'Public Open Space' (as the title suggests) and for which descriptive evidence would suffice; or
- ii) Tabulate Local Green Space evidence against the NPPF criteria (NPPF paras 99 – 100) including (as per the Planning Guidance) consideration as to whether the designation will provide additional protection beyond what already exists and whether the designation can endure beyond the Plan period (the latter may involve consultation with the landowner where that is not the Parish Council).

Between these two options the Qualifying Body chose option i) and therefore the Recommendations below follow that approach.

Recommendation 13:

13.1 Under the heading "6.2.1 Public Open Spaces" delete the text paragraph.

13.2 Within the Policy box R11 (now renumbered R04) reword the Policy as:

'The public open spaces listed below and identified on the adjacent map are important community spaces and therefore protected from development unless that development is consistent with the function or enhancement of the open space:

A: Library play area, tennis club and bowls club

B: Fowke Street play area

C: Bunney's Field

D: Donkey Field

E: Town Green Street play area

F: Saxon Way play area

G: Warren Way play area.'

13.3 Replace the map in the Appendix to the Plan with that provided by Charnwood BC (retitled as "Rothley Public Open Spaces") and position it adjacent to the Policy. Alter the map's content and index to be consistent with the list in the Policy – as above - and add a brief description of each space derived from document Mis003.

As amended and renumbered Policy R04 meets the Basic Conditions.

6.2.2 Other open spaces and the environment

Because there are numerous references to them, the Local Plan and the Draft Local Plan need only be source referenced once. However, other supporting documents, such as the Green Wedges etc Report, ought to be referenced to their source, rather than the Plan evidence base, since they may be reviewed or updated from time to time.

Recommendation 14:

Under the heading “6.2.2 Other open spaces and the environment”:

14.1 Amend the cross-reference to other Policies at the end of the first paragraph from “R01 – R03” to ‘R01 & R02’

14.2 Add the source reference (www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/greenwedge_als) in place of the evidence base reference for the Green Wedges etc Report at the beginning of the third paragraph.

14.3 Delete the source reference for the Draft Local Plan toward the end of the third paragraph along with “which is open for consultation at the time of writing”.

Policy R12 Provision of areas of local separation

The local authority, whilst supportive of the principle of this Policy, notes that there are discrepancies between the areas identified on the map on (wrongly referenced) page 15 and those included in the Draft Local Plan. Discrepancies are also noted in the representation from the Pegasus Group. As the Policy wording acknowledges, Areas of Separation at the scale indicated are a strategic matter and therefore it would be expected that, even if a current change might be justified with proportionate evidence, the Draft Local Plan would soon take precedence (PPG Paragraph: 044 Reference ID: 41-044-20190509). The Qualifying Body subsequently confirmed their wish to follow the boundaries of the Areas of Separation in the Draft Local Plan, for which the local authority has provided an evidenced methodology.

The local authority also noted some wording changes that could clarify the intent of the Area designations. A representation notes that part of the purpose of this Policy is stated as the protection of Rothley Park but this reference fails to mention another proposal in the Plan that may affect the integrity of the Park; that proposal has now been addressed, as above. The representation from Mountsorrel Parish Council suggests that an additional Area of Separation ought to be recognised and designated between Rothley and Mountsorrel and they suggest that this would be consistent with stated strategic Local Plan policy. The representation includes a map of a suggested Area of Separation, but as this was not included in the Regulation 16 public consultation, its subsequent addition would entail a further round of consultations which the Qualifying Body did not wish to pursue.

Recommendation 15:

Within the Policy box R12 (now renumbered as R05):

15.1 Reword the Policy as:

‘Policy R05 Areas of Local Separation

A strategic approach is supported to the protection of the countryside and maintaining and enhancing the separation between the existing village of Rothley and neighbouring settlements. In line with the evidence supporting the Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019 – 2036 two Areas of Local Separation are designated as identified on the adjacent map.

Development that enhances the Area of Local Separation and reflects the surrounding scale and design, including sports and leisure facilities, will be supported.'

15.2 Add an adjacent map that identifies only the Draft Local Plan Areas of Separation and the Neighbourhood Area.

As amended and renumbered Policy R05 meets the Basic Conditions.

6.3 Business and Employment

Policy R13 Proposals for developments for B1 office accommodation

Rothley is identified in the Local Plan as a "Service Centre" which are "all home to at least 3,000 people and the good range of services and facilities and good transport links allow them to provide for the daily needs of the people living there as well as supporting nearby communities" (Charnwood Local Plan 2011 - 2028 Core Strategy para 4.44). Therefore, Rothley would be an appropriate location for appropriately scaled office development.

The local authority noted some wording changes that could better serve the intent of the Policy, particularly in the light of recent changes to the Use Classes. I commented to the Qualifying Body that there is no Policy pre-amble to explain why a general invitation for office development/conversion might not detract from the value of Rothley Lodge as a location for commercial enterprise where, perhaps, the associated traffic and parking might be better catered for. Traffic consequences are an apparent concern expressed in the representation from Mountsorrel Parish Council. The Qualifying Body responded: "at present it seems more likely that existing small-scale commercial sites close to the village centre might be redeveloped for housing. One site ('Lazarus Court') already has planning permission for such redevelopment. Any proposal would need to be considered on its individual merits and perhaps our plan needs to include some additional caveats?"

Recommendation 16:

Within the Policy box R13 (now renumbered as R06) reword the Policy as:

'Policy R06 Office Space

Development proposals for the provision of additional office space will be supported provided that:

- i) The site is within the Rothley Limits to Development or reuses appropriate brownfield land; and*
- ii) The site is well located in relation to the transport infrastructure and existing commercial and retail centres; and*
- iii) The scale of the development is appropriate to its location; and*
- iv) The buildings are designed sympathetically with their surroundings and do not result in significant harm to heritage assets including the Conservation Areas; and*
- v) The infrastructure for high speed broadband is provided.*

As amended and renumbered Policy R06 meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy R14 Rothley Lodge

As the local authority noted, a map is needed to identify the Lodge site and define the boundary of the area encompassed by this Policy. The Qualifying Body has confirmed that this Policy is not intended to extend the existing commercial area.

Recommendation 17:

Within the Policy box R14 (now renumbered as R07):

17.1 Reword the Policy as:

'Commercial development at Rothley Lodge (within the employment areas identified on the adjacent map) will be supported provided that:

- i) *The scale and location of buildings respect the amenities of existing users and are appropriate to the transport infrastructure; and*
- ii) *New buildings are designed sympathetically with the site as a whole; and*
- iii) *There are adequate parking and other appropriate facilities for delivery vehicles, employees and, where relevant, customers.*

17.2 Add an adjacent map showing the extent of the existing Rothley Lodge commercial area as supplied by Charnwood BC.

As amended and renumbered Policy R07 meets the Basic Conditions.

Policy R15 Future business and commercial provision

The general policy approach is consistent with the Charnwood Local Plan Policy CS9. As the local authority notes, the term “village hub” is unexplained and undefined. The Qualifying Body has confirmed that this is intended to be the same area as the Local Centre defined within the Local Plan.

Recommendation 18:

Within the Policy box R15 (now renumbered R08) reword the Policy as follows: ‘Within the Rothley Local Centre (as designated in the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 - 2028 Core Strategy) the retention of existing businesses, and proposals for new business and commercial premises will be supported. Proposals for banking services within the Local Centre are particularly supported’.

As amended and renumbered Policy R08 meets the Basic Conditions.

6.4 Transport, traffic and parking

Policy R16 Traffic Calming

This would not appear to be a land use issue but rather one that is being pursued in the everyday business of the Parish Council. Issues such as these could be brought together as a non-Policy section the nature of which is clearly identified (in accordance with the PPG expectation: “Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non land use matters should be clearly identifiable. For example, set out in a companion document or annex.” Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 41-004-20170728). However, the representation from Leicestershire County Council notes “The village has previously benefitted from the introduction of traffic calming features; it is unlikely that further measures would be funded by the County Council; the full whole life costs of any additional measures would need to be funded by the Parish Council or third party contributions in their entirety.”

Recommendation 19:

Either delete paragraph 6.4.1 and Policy R16 or move the appropriate parts of the content to be a Parish Council ambition in a separate Annex of the Plan document; renumber subsequent paragraphs and Policies accordingly.

Policy R17 Car Parks

Although the allocation of land for car parking is a land use issue, the Traffic Regulations – as referenced inaccurately in the preamble to this Policy – are outside the scope of planning. The local authority noted some wording changes that could clarify the intent of the Policy.

Recommendation 20:

20.1 Within paragraph 6.4.2 (now renumbered as above) delete the first sentence.

20.2 Within the Policy box R17 (now renumbered as R09):

20.2.1 Reword the opening sentence of the Policy as: ‘Proposals will be supported that will enhance the use of the existing car parks and at least retain or, wherever possible, add to the existing number of parking spaces’.

20.2.2 In the second paragraph add ‘off street’ between “adequate” and “provision” and, at the end, add ‘in accordance with the local authority adopted standards’.

As amended and renumbered Policy R09 meets the Basic Conditions.

6.5 Community Facilities

6.5.1 Doctors’ Surgery

Policy R18 Health Care Facilities

Rothley is identified in the Local Plan as a “Service Centre” which are “all home to at least 3,000 people and the good range of services and facilities and good transport links allow them to provide for the daily needs of the people living there as well as supporting nearby communities” (Charnwood Local Plan 2011 - 2028 Core Strategy para 4.44). Therefore, Rothley would be an appropriate location for appropriately scaled health care facility. An update was provided by the Qualifying Body as follows: “discussions between a local consortium of GPs and the parish council have recently begun, at the GPs’ request, with a view to building a health centre on the site of the Rothley Sports & Social Club with some improvements also provided to the club. The GPs have identified funding for this. It may be too early to refer to this proposal specifically in the neighbourhood plan but we would wish our policies to be enabling.” The local authority has noted some wording changes that could clarify the intent of the Policy.

Recommendation 21:

Within Policy box R18 (now renumbered as R10) reword the Policy as: ‘Proposals for health care facilities, particularly within a multipurpose or shared/flexible use building or site will be supported, subject to design considerations (see Policy R03) and the proposal making appropriate parking provision’.

As amended and renumbered Policy R10 meets the Basic Conditions.

6.5.2 The Rothley Centre

Policy R19 The Rothley centre

Rothley is identified in the Local Plan as a “Service Centre” which are “all home to at least 3,000 people and the good range of services and facilities and good transport links allow them to provide for the daily needs of the people living there as well as supporting nearby communities” (Charnwood Local Plan 2011 - 2028 Core Strategy para 4.44). Therefore, Rothley is a suitable location for appropriately scaled community facilities. The local authority noted some wording changes that could clarify the intent of the Policy.

Recommendation 22:

*Within Policy box R19 (now renumbered as R11) reword the Policy as: ‘Policy R11 The Rothley Community Centre
Development proposals to improve the viability of the Rothley Community Centre and associated car park by way of alterations and extensions for improved or additional community, sport and recreation uses will be supported provided that:*

- i) Alterations and extensions respond to the setting and character of the location;
and*
- ii) The impact on the amenity of adjoining properties is assessed and addressed;
and*
- iii) Appropriate parking provision at the Centre is retained or added.*

As amended and renumbered Policy R11 meets the Basic Conditions.

6.5.3 School Places for Local Children

Policy R20 Provision of school places

Representations comment that this Policy achieves little since it is not established that the school could expand on the existing site (apparently, unless there is co-operation by other landowners) or that a relocation of the whole school would be feasible. The representation by the Headteacher on behalf of the Rothley Church of England Academy School notes the “problems we face from September 2021 and further exacerbated with a huge increase of live births already recorded on our pupil forecast for 2022”. In response to my enquiries the Qualifying Body commented: “The planning application for a housing development linked to the proposed school extension has been refused by the local authority since we submitted our draft plan. We do not wish there to be planning obstacles to a school extension and support the principle that the school should be able to accommodate all children living in the parish but we do not wish such an extension to be linked to a substantial housing development.” The local authority commented: “A new 3 form entry primary school is proposed at Broadnook. This will have capacity to provide for up to 630 places but the yield of children from the Broadnook development itself will mean that there will only be limited spare capacity to accommodate pupils from elsewhere including Rothley. Charnwood Borough Council is in discussions with Leicestershire County Council to determine how best the educational needs of Rothley can be provided for in future. The two authorities are aware of forecast capacity issues in Rothley and are working collaboratively to bring forward a sustainable solution which can accommodate both existing and any new needs arising from growth in the Local Plan.” Accordingly, it is appropriate that there should be an enabling Policy in the Neighbourhood Plan. The local authority also noted some wording changes that could clarify the intent of the Policy.

Recommendation 23:

23.1 Under the heading “6.5.3 School Places for Local Children” amend the reference to “Policies R01 – R03” to read ‘Policies R01 & R02’.

23.2 Within the Policy box R20 (now renumbered as R12) reword the Policy as: ‘In order to ensure the accommodation of children living within the Parish, the extension of the Rothley Church of England Academy School or the relocation of facilities will be supported in principle as required.’

As amended and renumbered Policy R12 meets the Basic Conditions.

6.6 Conservation and Heritage

6.6.1 Protection of Historic Buildings and Structures

Policy R21 Conservation and Design

Whilst it is evident that the listed buildings within the Rothley Neighbourhood Area are valued, the local authority notes that Policy R21 “effectively duplicates in less detail the [national] policy approach to be taken toward heritage assets, as set out in section 16 of the NPPF”. National protections may be considered robust and sufficient to retain listed buildings according to their significance. The Qualifying Body responded: “We recognise that some of our policies may duplicate policies at a higher level. However, we are conscious that our plan needs to pass a referendum and we feel that residents will expect to see certain policies in the plan and may be unaware of existing protections.” Accordingly, so as to avoid policy confusion arising from wording differences but in order to ensure that the appropriate information is available, I recommend that additional text is provided. Policy R22 addresses some relevant local detail.

Recommendation 24:

Under the heading “6.6.1 Protection of Historic Buildings and Structures” delete Policy R21 and add the following text to paragraph 6.6.1:

'The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 184 acknowledges: "Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations." The Charnwood Local Plan 2011 - 2028 Core Strategy Policy CS14 applies that recognition locally, including Conservation Areas. Historic England establishes the national list of Listed Buildings scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, and battlefields. Charnwood Borough Council uses Listed Building Consent to make decisions that balance the site's historic significance against other issues, such as its function, condition or viability. There is therefore no requirement for an additional Policy in this Neighbourhood Plan.'

6.6.2 Protection of the Views of the Countryside and the Landscape

Policy R22 Setting of listed buildings within the conservation areas and protection of vistas

It is helpful that the Policy wording here acknowledges that views cannot be protected from all change but rather development proposals must assess and address their impact on the important local vistas. But, as a representation notes, that is then also an expectation of policies within the Neighbourhood Plan. The cross references to the Conservation Area Appraisal documents are also helpful (although these should be to the actual source locations) but, as the local authority notes, the inclusion within the Plan of a map depicted the vistas combined from the two Appraisals could be more helpful. In response the Qualifying Body agreed to provide a map supported by photographs illustrating the nature of the views.

Recommendation 25:

25.1 Under the heading "6.6.2 Protection of the Views of the Countryside and the Landscape" amend the Conservation Area Appraisal document reference to provide links to the source websites.

25.2 Within the Policy box R22 (now amended to R13):

25.2.1 In the title and the Policy use capital letters for "Listed Buildings" and "Conservation Areas".

25.2.2 Add a comma between "Conservation Areas" and "developments".

25.2.3 Between the words "views" and "have been" add '(as identified on the adjacent map and illustrated with accompanying photographs)'.

25.2.4 Number the views so that they can be cross-referenced to the accompanying map.

25.3 Add after the Policy box a map identifying the views in a manner comparable to the Conservation Area Appraisal and cross-referenced to both the Policy and the accompanying photographs.

As amended and renumbered Policy R13 meets the Basic Conditions.

6.6.3 Environmental Action

As the local authority has noted, bullet points 2 and 3 do not relate to planning/land use policy. Bullet point 1 has earlier been included within Policy R03. The other content here may be another element of the Community Aspirations/Action section as suggested above under Policy R16.

Recommendation 26:

Under the heading “Environmental Action”, the first Policy bullet point having been moved to Policy R03 as above, delete paragraph 6.6.3 and Policy R23 or move the content as a Parish Council ambition to a separate Annex of the Plan document as suggested above; renumber subsequent paragraphs and Policies accordingly.

6.7 Communication & Infrastructure

Although I understand the concerns of the community here, I cannot see that Policy R24 can add any urgency or weight to the existing national policies and funding that support the roll out of high-speed broadband and upgrading of mobile networks. The use of the related reference in Policy R03 may be more relevant. As the Policy provides no indication of the bases for support (it is the supporting text that notes “providing they are sympathetic to their surrounding”) and as there is no local detail in the Policy, my conclusion is that national and local Policies are sufficient and the text alone can provide sufficient detail for the referendum.

Recommendation 27:

Under the heading “6.7 Communication & Infrastructure” delete Policy R24 or move the content as a Parish Council ambition to a separate Annex of the Plan document as suggested above (and in so doing remove the document reference to Mis004 or replace it with a link to the source webpage).

7. Monitoring and Review

The local authority has requested the removal of “in conjunction with Charnwood Borough Council”. They note that “The Council is supportive of ongoing monitoring but cannot commit to undertaking this function on behalf of qualifying bodies”. It was also unclear why the “proposal for 151 new houses on land at and adjacent to Woodcocks Farm in the southeast of Rothley” would necessitate “a revision of this Neighbourhood Plan”. Since the Plan period only runs to 2028 it is probable that any further major development would be within a future Plan period. The Qualifying Body agreed that this reference should be removed.

Recommendation 28:

Under the heading “7. Monitoring and Review”:

28.1 In the first paragraph delete “in conjunction with Charnwood Borough Council”

28.2 Delete the second paragraph.

Appendix Maps – ‘Limits to development’ for Rothley and Rothley: various open spaces and outdoor leisure areas

Recommendation 29:

29.1 Delete the “Limits to Development” map since it has been moved to be adjacent to Policy R02.

29.2 Delete the “Rothley: various open spaces and outdoor leisure areas” map as its replacement is now adjacent to Policy R04.

Other matters raised in representations

Some representations have suggested additional content that the Plan might include. However, given that the Neighbourhood Plan sits within the Development Plan documents as a whole, keeping content pertinent to identified priorities for Rothley is entirely appropriate. As noted within the body of this Report it is a requirement that a Neighbourhood Development Plan addresses only the “development and use of land”. Even within this restriction there is no obligation on Neighbourhood Plans to be comprehensive in their

coverage – unlike Local Plans - not least because proportionate supporting evidence is required.

Severn Trent made a number of suggestions regarding Policy wording but as these stemmed from existing national guidance and are not related to particular issues in Rothley – or are related to Policies now recommended for deletion – I have not picked them up individually in my Report.

Some representations indicate support for all or parts of the draft Plan and this helps in a small but valuable way to reassure that the extensive public consultation has been productive.

I have not mentioned every representation individually but this is not because they have not been thoroughly read and considered in relation to my Examiner role, rather their detail may not add to the pressing of my related recommendations which must ensure that the Basic Conditions are met.

European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) Obligations

A further Basic Condition, which the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan must meet, is compatibility with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations.

There is no legal requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan to have a sustainability appraisal. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report & Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening Report was prepared by Charnwood Borough Council for the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan in March 2020. On the matter of the SEA the Report concluded: “The evidence which is provided in this report and the responses received from the statutory environmental consultation bodies has determined that a full environmental assessment is not considered necessary”. On the HRA the Report noted: “An HRA Screening Report was undertaken for the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028 Core Strategy which concluded that, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects; it would not be likely to have a significant effect upon any European site. As the scale of development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan is small scale, it is not considered that there will be any further affect upon any European site; therefore, it is considered that an Appropriate Assessment is not required”.

In making their determination, Charnwood Borough Council had regard to Schedule 1 of the Regulations and carried out consultation with the relevant public bodies which concurred with the conclusion of the Assessment. I can therefore conclude that the SEA and HRA undertaken were appropriate and proportionate, and that the Plan has sustainability at its heart.

The Basic Conditions Statement submitted alongside the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan does not specifically address the European Convention on Human Rights, and therefore does not specifically confirm that the Plan has been prepared with full regard to national statutory regulation and policy guidance and in full consultation with the local community. However, the commitment to and extent of community consultation is illustrated in the Consultation Statement submitted alongside the Plan. I can therefore conclude from that Statement that the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan has regard to fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the ECHR and complies with the Human Rights Act 1998. No evidence has been put forward to demonstrate that this is not the case.

Taking all of the above into account, I am satisfied that the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with EU obligations and that it does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with, the ECHR.

Conclusions

This Independent Examiner's Report recommends a range of modifications to the Policies, as well as some of the supporting content, in the Plan. Modifications have been recommended to effect corrections, to ensure clarity and in order to ensure that the Basic Conditions are met. Whilst I have proposed a significant number of modifications, the Plan itself remains fundamentally unchanged in the role and direction set for it by the Qualifying Body.

I therefore conclude that, subject to the modifications recommended, the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan:

- has regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Plan for the area;
- is compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations;
- does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017(d).

On that basis I *recommend* to the Charnwood Borough Council that, subject to the incorporation of modifications set out as recommendations in this report, it is appropriate for the Rothley Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to referendum.

Referendum Area

As noted earlier, part of my Examiner role is to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. In considering this matter I noted that, since the Neighbourhood Area was designated, a small area to the north of the Parish has been moved to the neighbouring Mountsorrel Parish since the boundary previously cut through a continuous built up area. However, the Neighbourhood Area designation was not revisited and since it is not within my powers to reduce the area for referendum – only to extend it - I must conclude that the boundary change is not a matter of consequence here. I consider the Neighbourhood Area to be appropriate and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore ***recommend*** that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the Neighbourhood Area as approved by the Charnwood Borough Council on 21st December 2015.

Recommendations: (this is a listing of the recommendations exactly as they are included in the Report)

Rec	Text	Reason
1	<p>1.1 Amend the Plan period to '2020 to 2028' throughout the Plan and on the front cover replace "Submission version approved by Rothley Parish Council January 2020" with 'December 2020'.</p> <p>1.2 Once the Plan text has been amended, review the "Contents" page to accommodate as required the recommended modifications from this Report.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
2	<p>Under the heading "1. Introduction":</p> <p>2.1 Delete from the first sentence: "is the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan for Rothley which".</p> <p>2.2 In the second paragraph replace "civic parish" with 'Parish', "neighbourhood plan area" with 'Neighbourhood Area' and the two document reference numbers with a single link to the related Charnwood Borough webpage as the official source of the record: www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/rothley_neighbourhood_plan</p> <p>2.3 In the third paragraph:</p> <p>2.3.1 In the first sentence delete: "are a key part of the Government's Localism agenda. They".</p> <p>2.3.2 Replace the sixth sentence with: 'They must, however, have regard to national policies and guidance, and be in general conformity with Borough-wide strategic policies.'</p> <p>2.3.3 Delete the seventh and subsequent sentences, except the last.</p> <p>2.3.4 In the final sentence delete "Borough's own" and "2011 – 2028 Core Strategy" and replace "is in accordance with" with 'has appropriate regard for'.</p> <p>2.4 On the map on page 3 amend the title to read 'Rothley Neighbourhood Area'; delete the blue line on the map and amend the key to reference only the red line, titled as 'Rothley Neighbourhood Area'.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
3	<p>3.1 For ease of reference add paragraph numbers throughout the Plan; the heading and paragraph numbers should interrelate to allow for ready access to the Plan content eg 2.11 references the eleventh paragraph of section 2.</p> <p>3.2 Under the heading "2. How the Plan was Prepared":</p> <p>3.2.1 Delete the two document references but replace these after "a wide range of existing documents and data" with a single reference 'see: www.rothleyparishcouncil.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan1.html</p>	For clarity and accuracy

	3.2.2 In the last sentence after “Consultation Statement” add ‘which accompanies this Plan’.	
4	<p>Under the heading “3. How the Plan fits into the Planning System”:</p> <p>4.1 Delete the bracketed document references; add a website source reference for the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028 Core Strategy.</p> <p>4.2 Replace the sixth sentence of the first paragraph with: ‘The Plan must be in general conformity with Borough-wide strategic policies and have regard to national policies and guidance’.</p> <p>4.3 In the last paragraph, at the end of the fourth sentence replace “statement (see document Mis012)” with ‘Statement which accompanies this Plan’ and delete the sixth and seventh sentences beginning “All supporting documents...”.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
5	<p>Under the heading “4. The Plan, its vision and objectives”:</p> <p>5.1 Delete the bracketed document references as well as the final sentence on page 7.</p> <p>5.2 Under Topic 3 (page 9) use capital C and capital A for ‘Conservation Areas’.</p> <p>5.3 Review the use of full stops within this section for consistency.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
6	On the map on page 12, through the use of numbering and a key, distinguish the Rothley Conservation Area from the Rothley Ridgeway Conservation Area.	For clarity and accuracy
7	<p>7.1 Under the heading “Neighbourhood Plan Proposals and Policies” delete the second sentence as this effectively duplicates the first sentence.</p> <p>7.2 Under the heading “6.1 Housing”:</p> <p>7.2.1 In the second sentence, replace the general source reference to the Local Plan (which was provided earlier at the first reference to it) with a paragraph specific reference – ‘para 4.19’ and replace “some development” with ‘at least 3000 new homes’ (for consistency with the Local Plan Policy CS1).</p> <p>7.2.2 Replace the last sentence of the third paragraph (page 14): “Policy RO9 below is proposed and relates specifically to Broadnook” with ‘Rothley Parish Council will seek through the use of Section 106 Agreements (in accordance with the statutory requirements set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010) to bring additional benefits for the community of Rothley Parish from the planning consents that will deliver the Broadnook Garden Suburb.’</p> <p>7.2.3 Amend the map on page 15 to remove the reference to and the outlines of the “Areas of Separation” as these will be addressed later.</p>	For clarity and accuracy

	<p>7.2.4 Delete the first paragraph on page 16 since that is now out of date.</p> <p>7.2.5 Delete the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 16: “Only two very minor changes to the settlement boundary are proposed as shown in the map on page 38 and referred to in policies R06 and R08.”</p>	
8	Delete Policy R01 (and see below Recommendations for Policy R02 relating to its partial incorporation there).	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
9	<p>9.1 On page 17 replace the section heading “Development within Rothley Village” with ‘Development within Rothley Limits to Development’ and</p> <p>9.1.1 Delete Policy box R01.</p> <p>9.1.2 Add an additional paragraph as follows: ‘This Neighbourhood Plan recognises the Limits to Development from the Charnwood Local Plan 2004 (see map included in the Appendix to this Plan). However, the emerging Preferred Options Local Plan (October 2019) indicates a significant amendment to the “Limits to Development” boundaries in Rothley. The most significant of the changes is the exclusion of the “Rothley Ridgeway” and the areas of open space around Rothley Brook. The Qualifying Body is supportive of these proposed boundary changes.’</p> <p>9.2 Within the Policy R02 box:</p> <p>9.2.1 Renumber and reword the Policy as: ‘Policy R01 Development within Rothley Limits to Development’; renumber subsequent Policies accordingly.</p> <p>9.2.2 Delete from the opening sentence “of up to 9 units within the defined Rothley village limits will be supported provided that the proposals meet the other policies of this Neighbourhood Plan and” and replace with ‘within the Rothley Limits to Development (see map included in the Appendix or subsequent revisions) will be supported’.</p> <p>9.2.3 Replace element i) with ‘Appropriate in size to the character, services and facilities of Rothley’.</p> <p>9.2.4 Combine within element iv) the related part of the (now deleted) Policy R01 so as to read: ‘Does not result in the loss of an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value and, where appropriate, addresses their distinctive qualities.’</p> <p>9.2.5 Add at the beginning of element v) ‘Where appropriate,’ and amend “Area” to ‘Areas’.</p> <p>9.2.6 Ensure clarity for element vi) by rewording as: ‘Does not adversely affect neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion and noise, or by loss of privacy, daylight or amenity.’</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 and 3

	<p>9.2.7 Add at the end of every element: ‘; and’ except the last which should be concluded with a full stop.</p> <p>9.3 After the Policy box renumbered as Policy R01 delete the two sentences beginning “This Neighbourhood Plan”.</p>	
10	<p>Within the Policy box R03 (now renumbered as R02):</p> <p>10.1 Replace the opening sentence with: “With the exception of development sites allocated in the Local Plan, proposals for development outside of the ‘Limits to Development’ boundary (see map included in the Appendix to this Plan or subsequent revisions) must be for either:’</p> <p>10.2 Replace element i) with: ‘A rural housing exception scheme; or’.</p> <p>10.3 Replace element ii) with: ‘Homes in the countryside set out at paragraph 79 of the NPPF; or’.</p> <p>10.4 Replace element iii): ‘Rural or agricultural business development in accordance with paragraph 83 of the NPPF.’</p> <p>10.5 Delete element iv).</p> <p>10.6 Move the map of the “Rothley Limits to Development” from the Appendix to be adjacent to the Policy. On the map delete the areas marked red and delete the key; add the source reference for the map.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1 and 3
11	<p>Within the Policy box R04 (now renumbered as R03):</p> <p>11.1 Replace the introductory sentence with: ‘Development proposals for new buildings and extensions should meet the following local design principles:’</p> <p>11.2 Replace element ii) with ‘The prevailing design and vernacular of the surrounding area should be respected’.</p> <p>11.3 Replace element iii) with ‘The prevailing scale and height of adjacent buildings should be respected.’</p> <p>11.4 Replace element iv) with ‘Building density should be appropriate to a rural location and respectful of the density in the surrounding area.’</p> <p>11.5 Add in the following generic elements from the site-specific and other policies: v) The provision of car parking should be designed to minimise its visual impact on the street scene and neighbourhood. vi) A suitable scheme of landscaping should ensure that the natural setting is respected. vii) The natural movement of wildlife should be accommodated including, where appropriate, through the creation of or links to existing wildlife corridors.’</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1 and 3

12	<p>Under the heading “Specific proposals”:</p> <p>12.1 In the opening paragraph replace “also document Mis008” with ‘adjacent map illustrating locations’; insert the map (as provided by Charnwood BC) within the text ensuring that the locations are accurate and the text numbering and the map index are matched.</p> <p>12.2 As a map is now included, the (unexplained) references – such as “ref: PSH377” should be omitted.</p> <p>12.3 Amend the paragraph immediately preceding site i) to read: ‘A further proposal was submitted from Pegasus Group in response to a public consultation and this was the subject of a planning application to Charnwood BC ref: P/20/0610/2.’</p> <p>12.4 Immediately after the listing of site i) replace all the subsequent text with: ‘Further consideration of these sites revealed that sites a), b), f) and i) had already been included within the sites for evaluation within the preparatory work for the Draft Local Plan and site c) was adjacent to such a site; sites b) and e) were both taken forward to be evaluated as “Possible Option Sites”. Site b) lies within the Rothley Limits to Development and could therefore already come forward as a ‘windfall’ site. Site g had been allocated for housing in the current Local Plan and is now the subject of a planning application. Site h) has subsequently been granted a planning consent. Site a) has been twice refused a planning consent and site i) has recently been refused a planning consent. Therefore, only sites c), d) and e) are new, previously unevaluated proposals; all these sites lie within a Conservation Area and would need specific evaluation in that context. The Parish Council felt they had insufficient detail to evaluate site d). Site e) relates to only a single house (although other commercial proposals were included).</p> <p>Having regard to all these factors, the Neighbourhood Plan does not include any specific allocation of land for housing but all new proposals will be evaluated in line with all the generic Policies designed specifically for Rothley (as well as the Local Plan Policies). As part of the Parish will form part of the Broadnook Garden Suburb it will thus make a significant contribution toward meeting local housing requirements. If and when additional housing requirements are identified then the Parish Council is of the view that sites b), c), d), e) and f) could merit further detailed consideration for allocation by the Borough Council or the Neighbourhood Plan may be reviewed in the light of those requirements.’</p> <p>12.5 Renumber subsequent Policies accordingly.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1, 2 & 3
13	<p>13.1 Under the heading “6.2.1 Public Open Spaces” delete the text paragraph.</p> <p>13.2 Within the Policy box R11 (now renumbered R04) reword the Policy as: ‘The public open spaces listed below and identified on the map and description in the Appendix to this Plan are important community spaces and therefore protected from development unless that</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1

	<p>development is consistent with the function or enhancement of the open space: A: Library play area, tennis club and bowls club B: Fowke Street play area C: Bunney’s Field D: Donkey Field E: Town Green Street play area F: Saxon Way play area G: Warren Way play area.’</p> <p>13.3 Replace the map in the Appendix to the Plan with that provided by Charnwood BC (retitled as “Rothley Public Open Spaces”) and position it adjacent to the Policy. Alter the map’s content and index to be consistent with the list in the Policy – as above - and add a brief description of each space derived from document Mis003.</p>	
14	<p>Under the heading “6.2.2 Other open spaces and the environment”: 14.1 Amend the cross-reference to other Policies at the end of the first paragraph from “R01 – R03” to ‘R01 & R02’</p> <p>14.2 Add the source reference (www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/greenwedge_als) in place of the evidence base reference for the Green Wedges etc Report at the beginning of the third paragraph.</p> <p>14.3 Delete the source reference for the Draft Local Plan toward the end of the third paragraph along with “which is open for consultation at the time of writing”.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
15	<p>Within the Policy box R12 (now renumbered as R05): 15.1 Reword the Policy as: ‘Policy R05 Areas of Local Separation A strategic approach is supported to the protection of the countryside and maintaining and enhancing the separation between the existing village of Rothley and neighbouring settlements. In line with the evidence supporting the Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019 – 2036 two Areas of Local Separation are designated as identified on the adjacent map.</p> <p>Development that enhances the Area of Local Separation and reflects the surrounding scale and design, including sports and leisure facilities, will be supported.’</p> <p>15.2 Add an adjacent map that identifies only the Draft Local Plan Areas of Separation and the Neighbourhood Area.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1, 2 & 3
16	<p>Within the Policy box R13 (now renumbered as R06) reword the Policy as: ‘Policy R06 Office Space Development proposals for the provision of additional office space will be supported provided that: i) The site is within the Rothley Limits to Development or reuses appropriate brownfield land; and</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1, 2 & 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) The site is well located in relation to the transport infrastructure and existing commercial and retail centres; and iii) The scale of the development is appropriate to its location; and iv) The buildings are designed sympathetically with their surroundings and do not result in significant harm to heritage assets including the Conservation Areas; and v) The infrastructure for high speed broadband is provided. 	
17	<p>Within the Policy box R14 (now renumbered as R07):</p> <p>17.1 Reword the Policy as: ‘Commercial development at Rothley Lodge (within the employment areas identified on the adjacent map) will be supported provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The scale and location of buildings respect the amenities of existing users and are appropriate to the transport infrastructure; and ii) New buildings are designed sympathetically with the site as a whole; and iii) There are adequate parking and other appropriate facilities for delivery vehicles, employees and, where relevant, customers. <p>17.2 Add an adjacent map showing the extent of the existing Rothley Lodge commercial area as supplied by Charnwood BC.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1 and 3
18	<p>Within the Policy box R15 (now renumbered R08) reword the Policy as follows: ‘Within the Rothley Local Centre (as designated in the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 - 2028 Core Strategy) the retention of existing businesses, and proposals for new business and commercial premises will be supported. Proposals for banking services within the Local Centre are particularly supported’.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1 and 3
19	<p>Either delete paragraph 6.4.1 and Policy R16 or move the appropriate parts of the content to be a Parish Council ambition in a separate Annex of the Plan document; renumber subsequent paragraphs and Policies accordingly.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
20	<p>20.1 Within paragraph 6.4.2 (now renumbered as above) delete the first sentence.</p> <p>20.2 Within the Policy box R17 (now renumbered as R09):</p> <p>20.2.1 Reword the opening sentence of the Policy as: ‘Proposals will be supported that will enhance the use of the existing car parks and at least retain or, wherever possible, add to the existing number of parking spaces’.</p> <p>20.2.2 In the second paragraph add ‘off street’ between “adequate” and “provision” and, at the end, add ‘in accordance with the local authority adopted standards’.</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
21	<p>Within Policy box R18 (now renumbered as R10) reword the Policy as:</p>	For clarity and to meet

	<p>'Proposals for health care facilities, particularly within a multipurpose or shared/flexible use building or site will be supported, subject to design considerations (see Policy R03) and the proposal making appropriate parking provision'.</p>	Basic Condition 1
22	<p>Within Policy box R19 (now renumbered as R11) reword the Policy as: 'Policy R11 The Rothley Community Centre Development proposals to improve the viability of the Rothley Community Centre and associated car park by way of alterations and extensions for improved or additional community, sport and recreation uses will be supported provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Alterations and extensions respond to the setting and character of the location; and ii) The impact on the amenity of adjoining properties is assessed and addressed; and iii) Appropriate parking provision at the Centre is retained or added. 	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
23	<p>23.1 Under the heading "6.5.3 School Places for Local Children" amend the reference to "Policies R01 – R03" to read 'Policies R01 & R02'.</p> <p>23.2 Within the Policy box R20 (now renumbered as R12) reword the Policy as: 'In order to ensure the accommodation of children living within the Parish, the extension of the Rothley Church of England Academy School or the relocation of facilities will be supported in principle as required.'</p>	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
24	<p>Under the heading "6.6.1 Protection of Historic Buildings and Structures" delete Policy R21 and add the following text to paragraph 6.6.1: 'The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 184 acknowledges: "Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations." The Charnwood Local Plan 2011 - 2028 Core Strategy Policy CS14 applies that recognition locally, including Conservation Areas. Historic England establishes the national list of Listed Buildings scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, and battlefields. Charnwood Borough Council uses Listed Building Consent to make decisions that balance the site's historic significance against other issues, such as its function, condition or viability. There is therefore no requirement for an additional Policy in this Neighbourhood Plan.'</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1
25	<p>25.1 Under the heading "6.6.2 Protection of the Views of the Countryside and the Landscape" amend the Conservation Area Appraisal document reference to provide links to the source websites.</p> <p>25.2 Within the Policy box R22 (now amended to R13):</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet

	<p>25.2.1 In the title and the Policy use capital letters for “Listed Buildings” and “Conservation Areas”.</p> <p>25.2.2 Add a comma between “Conservation Areas” and “developments.”</p> <p>25.2.3 Between the words “views” and “have been” add ‘(as identified on the adjacent map and illustrated with accompanying photographs)’.</p> <p>25.2.4 Number the views so that they can be cross-referenced to the accompanying map.</p> <p>25.3 Add after the Policy box a map identifying the views in a manner comparable to the Conservation Area Appraisal and cross-referenced to both the Policy and the accompanying photographs.</p>	Basic Condition 1
26	Under the heading “Environmental Action”, the first Policy bullet point having been moved to Policy R03 as above, delete paragraph 6.6.3 and Policy R23 or move the content as a Parish Council ambition to a separate Annex of the Plan document as suggested above; renumber subsequent paragraphs and Policies accordingly.	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
27	Under the heading “6.7 Communication & Infrastructure” delete Policy R24 or move the content as a Parish Council ambition to a separate Annex of the Plan document as suggested above (and in so doing remove the document reference to Mis004 or replace it with a link to the source webpage).	For clarity and to meet Basic Condition 1
28	Under the heading “7. Monitoring and Review”: 28.1 In the first paragraph delete “in conjunction with Charnwood Borough Council” 28.2 Delete the second paragraph.	For clarity and accuracy
29	29.1 Delete the “Limits to Development” map since it has been moved to be adjacent to Policy R02. 29.2 Delete the “Rothley: various open spaces and outdoor leisure areas” map as its replacement is now adjacent to Policy R04.	For clarity and accuracy