

COLLATION OF RESPONSES FOR PARISH CONSULTATION as of 1606 14/09/2017

POLICY	SUPPORT	SUPPORT WITH CHANGES	DO NOT SUPPORT
S1	13	1 - CBC see P Gilding	
E1	13	1 JP Flood risk not mentioned for current developments, priority should be given to reducing flood risk by any means that respects landscape/env	
E1a	12	1 – EA: greenfield run off rate 5 litres per second <b>per hectare</b>	
E2	14		
E3	14		
E4	11	1 – ECG- Query view from Regent st , add view from Hoby? 2- CBC see P Gilding	
E4a	12		
B1	12		
B2	11	1. EA- cross ref to policy E1 2 - CBC see P Gilding – 2 comments	
H1	11	1- CBC see P Gilding – 2 comments	
H2	11	1-CBC see P Gilding	
T1	12		
T1a	10		3
T2	11	1-CBC see P Gilding	
T2a	12		
T2b	11	1-AS Will this still allow local farms access with hay and straw	
T3	12		
T4	13		
T4a	12	1 DC and JC. Map 3 incorrect	
L1	12		
L2	13		
L2a	12		
L3	12		
L4	12	1. ECG – Add green space at top of Ferneley	
D1	12	1-CBC see P Gilding 2 comments	
D1a	14		
D2	11	1 CBC see P Gilding 2- LN Para 2 “may also be supported” change to “ <b>shall</b> also be supported”	
<b>OTHER</b>			
<b>ADDITIONAL</b>			
MT: Footpath map has incorrect cycle route MT: Do we need demographics? 36 RAT: Road has become single lane due to parked cars. Severn Trent: Look at guidance notes			

Melton: 'Addition of a policy allowing review of the plan every [circa] 5 years to ensure the plan is functioning and/or to respond to strategic changes brought through any of the following scenarios;

A change of Charnwood's development plan, or supporting evidence such as Housing Requirement.

Adoption of the Leicester & Leicestershire Strategic Growth plan and any impact this may bring.

The delivery of proposed 'Six Hills Garden Village', promoted by Gladman which borders the Parish.

An example of this can be found in the nearby Broughton and Dalby Neighbourhood Plan, page 94 at the following link - [https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/d246bd\\_3ce07c8936e04192ab40519cacac8749.pdf](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/d246bd_3ce07c8936e04192ab40519cacac8749.pdf) '

Telephone comment ECG 16/8: Would like to protect two green areas on Ferneley Rise- will add to response form. Note typing error somewhere in next should be the plot

Verbal comment: P Wilcox: Can't add axle weight to foot bridge! Also highlight settlement boundaries

LN Vision and objectives: School and village Hall mentioned. Church is equally important.

VM T1a Public car park no good unless near green – I don't think space exists. Would like to see further action to use vacant residential properties falling into disrepair eg property next to Gingers – compulsory purchase?

CBC Paul Gilding Appendix B Site 10 typo "area" + two locally listed buildings Thrussington Mill and Homestead Farm ... plus....Para 1.3 (pg8) – ". . . alongside the Charnwood Local Plan, and . . ."

As this is the first reference to the Charnwood plan in the document it may be worth using the full title which is the "Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028 Core Strategy".

Para 1.5 (pg8) – "Thrussington is the most easterly Parish within the Borough of Charnwood." Thrussington is "one of" the most easterly parishes, South Croxton is the most easterly parish in the Borough

see CBC comments below. CBC assumed and counted as supports if no other comment.

## CBC P GILDING COMMENTS IN FULL

### Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 14 Consultation Draft)

#### Charnwood Borough Council Comments – June 2017

Thank you for providing an opportunity for Charnwood Borough Council to comment on the Regulation 14 consultation draft of the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan (June 2017). Overall, we feel that the Plan is positively written and provides a sound basis for developing a final version of the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan. This paper provides the response by the Council and comprises potential conformity issues we wish to raise and a separate section which provides comments only which are intended to be helpful to the plan making process.

#### Charnwood Local Plan Conformity Issues

The Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan if it is to meet the basic condition test. The Charnwood Local Plan 2011-2028 Core Strategy was adopted on the 9th November 2015 and provides the strategic policies for delivering growth in the Borough. The Neighbourhood Plan should be in general conformity with this document, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance (NPPF).

The following points have been identified as areas where this general conformity may not be met.

#### S1 – Strategic Policy

The final paragraph of the policy seeks to control development which is outside the parish of Thrussington, "*Schemes which propose development outside of the Parish . . .*" Therefore, the policy is considered to relate to the development and use of land outside the designated Neighbourhood Area and, on that basis, is considered contrary to the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

PROPOSED ACTION: Remove reference to development located outside the parish.

#### H2 – Housing Mix

The policy states that "*Affordable housing (specifically shared-ownership schemes) will be supported in line with Charnwood's Local Plan . . .*" and in the supporting text continues "*Affordable housing will be considered favourably however, a specific type is preferred*". The basis for this focus upon shared-ownership affordable housing has not been explained by way of evidence, or the policy to support shared ownership to the detriment of other types of affordable housing (such as affordable and social rented accommodation) justified. As a result the policy is contrary to Policy CS3: Strategic Housing Needs of the Charnwood Core Strategy which seeks "*an appropriate mix of types, tenures and sizes of homes, having regard to identified housing needs and the character of the area*" to meet the needs of the entire community. Further advice on planning for affordable housing tenures is provided in the Charnwood Housing Supplementary Planning Document. As worded, the policy lacks the flexibility needed to ensure that identified housing needs will be met now and in the future.

PROPOSED ACTION: Revise policy wording and supporting text to enable provision of all types of affordable housing, in accordance with CS3, where need is identified.

#### Policy B2 – New Employment Development

The policy states “*Small scale or rural developments which create new employment uses, (use classes A2 and B1 only) will only be considered on appropriate sites . . .*” Policy CS10: Rural Economic Development of the Charnwood Core Strategy makes no explicit restrictions in the rural areas of the Borough but rather requires a judgement to be made regarding scale, character and any detriment to the countryside. The NPPF says planning should encourage and not act as an impediment to economic growth. Limiting development to use classes A2 and B1 may be considered too restrictive as other uses may also be acceptable, for example small scale B2 or B8 uses. PROPOSED ACTION: Remove restriction on use classes to provide support for economic development and businesses in the parish, provided the relevant criteria are met.

#### Policy D1 – Protection of Heritage Assets

The policy does not accord with paragraphs 133 and 134 of the NPPF which make provision for development which causes harm or loss of a heritage asset, provided this can be demonstrated to be outweighed by the public benefits. The first paragraph seeks to ensure that “*All new development must take account of its impact on heritage assets, both designated and non-designated – seeking to protect and enhance them*”. This is overly restrictive on development which demonstrates public benefits, when taken in the context of national guidance.

PROPOSED ACTION: Revise the policy wording to meet the provisions of the NPPF by not placing undue restrictions upon development of public benefit.

#### Further Comments

Alongside the issues of general conformity raised above, the following points have been identified which may assist in the preparation of the plan. In this respect, they are intended to be helpful in the spirit of cooperation and are not made as objections to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

General Care should be taken to ensure that policies are precisely worded and easily understandable to guarantee that the policy’s intent is understood and translated into the development which occurs on the ground.

Some of the policy requirements appear to lack flexibility; for example, Policy E2 – Green Infrastructure states that “*Any development proposal must demonstrate through a comprehensive landscape plan how existing hedgerows, trees and vegetation have been retained and protected.*” This may prove an unreasonable requirement for some development proposals, such as first floor extensions above an existing ground floor.

Specific

Para 1.3 (pg8) – “*. . . alongside the Charnwood Local Plan, and . . .*”

As this is the first reference to the Charnwood plan in the document it may be worth using the full title which is the “Charnwood Local Plan 2011 to 2028 Core Strategy”.

Para 1.5 (pg8) – “*Thrussington is the most easterly Parish within the Borough of Charnwood.*” Thrussington is “one of” the most easterly parishes, South Croxton is the most easterly parish in the Borough.

Policy E4 – Landscape, Views and Conservation (pg16) – The first sentence in the policy refers to a list of views but this is currently absent from the text.

Policy B2 – New Employment Development (pg18) – The policy uses the phrase “*not impact negatively*” which lacks flexibility as a small negative impact may not always justify a refusal of a planning application. In relation to transport, for example, the NPPF (para 32) advises that “*Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.*” On this basis the lack of flexibility is contrary to the NPPF as it promotes refusal of an application whose impacts are less than severe.

Policy H1 – Infill Development (pg19) – The Borough Council is currently undertaking a review of the Limits to Development for settlements across the Borough, including Thrussington. To inform the process and ensure consistency a set of guidance was produced and circulated to parish councils for their comment. This is now being used to assist the Borough Council in the review of the boundaries. If the Neighbourhood Plan is intending a review of the settlement limits it would be useful if it was similarly informed; a copy of the guidance will be supplied with these comments.

Policy H1 – 3rd bullet – the wording “*for conversions of existing buildings (for example former farm buildings), not require substantial extension and/or alteration (where these are not already permitted development)*” – may unintentionally have the effect of meaning that a building couldn’t be converted if it needed a significant extension, which would otherwise be in keeping in scale and character; whilst demolition and erection of a new dwelling would meet the other three bullet points.

Policy T2 – Traffic Calming (pg20) – The policy states “*Where required planning permission will be granted for the delivery of new public realm works*”. The wording as it stands implies that all works will be permitted, even those which are contrary to other policies or material considerations.

Policy D1 – Protection of Heritage Assets (pg25) – The policy requires that “*Development must seek to preserve and enhance the conservation area . . .*” It will not be possible in all instances for development to enhance the conservation area. To recognise this fact the policy wording should be adapted to read “*and where possible enhance*”.

The Borough Council has also identified two locally listed buildings, Thrussington Mill and Homestead Farm buildings, and it may be worth referring to these in the supporting Explanatory text to the Design, Heritage and Character section.

Policy D2 – Design and Development Character (pg26) – The policy refers to “*the relevant section of the Character Assessment*”; it would be useful to identify where the Character Assessment can be found.

Appendix B – Site 10 – Description – Typo – “*Area*”

#### COMMENTS END

We would be more than happy to explain further any of the comments made above and consider alternative wording to overcome the conformity issues r

#### SPORT ENGLAND COMMENTS IN FULL

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan.

Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become

more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.

It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Parts 73 and 74. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Planning Policy Statement: 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England'.

<http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy>

Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/>

Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Part 74 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.

Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.

<http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance>

If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>

Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.

In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.

Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.

NPPF Section 8: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities>

PPG Health and wellbeing section: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing>

Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign>

Emails and contactees.

Jean Thistlethwaite, 20 Regent	<a href="mailto:jeanthistle8@gmail.com">jeanthistle8@gmail.com</a>
Sport England	<a href="mailto:planning.central@sportengland.org">planning.central@sportengland.org</a>
Anthony and Tina	<a href="mailto:belderbos@john-lewis.com">belderbos@john-lewis.com</a>
Daryl Fossick, Severn Trent Water	<a href="mailto:growth.development@severntrent.co.uk">growth.development@severntrent.co.uk</a>
Clive Fletcher, Historic England	<a href="mailto:clive.fletcher@HistoricEngland.org.uk">clive.fletcher@HistoricEngland.org.uk</a>
Sean Mahoney, Natural England	<a href="mailto:sean.mahoney@naturalengland.org.uk">sean.mahoney@naturalengland.org.uk</a>
James Beverley, Melton BC	<a href="mailto:jbeverley@melton.gov.uk">jbeverley@melton.gov.uk</a>
Geoff Platts, EA	<a href="mailto:Geoff.platts@environment-agency.gov.uk">Geoff.platts@environment-agency.gov.uk</a>
Hannah Bevin, National Grid	<a href="mailto:Hannah.bevins@amecfw.com">Hannah.bevins@amecfw.com</a>
(Robert Deanwood, National Grid	<a href="mailto:n.grid@amecfw.com">n.grid@amecfw.com</a>
Spencer Jefferies, National Grid	<a href="mailto:box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com">box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com</a>
B Squires/S Henson	<a href="mailto:bsquires@btinternet.com">bsquires@btinternet.com</a>
E & A Guest	<a href="mailto:ec.guest@icloud.com">ec.guest@icloud.com</a>
Paul Gilding, Charnwood BC	<a href="mailto:localplans@charnwood.gov.uk">localplans@charnwood.gov.uk</a>
Malcolm Heggs	<a href="mailto:Malcolm.heggs@btinternet.com">Malcolm.heggs@btinternet.com</a>
DB and JM Collingham	<a href="mailto:d.collingham048@btinternet.com">d.collingham048@btinternet.com</a>
David Alton	<a href="mailto:d.alton@btinternet.com">d.alton@btinternet.com</a>
Vicky Worthy	<a href="mailto:vicworthy@hotmail.com">vicworthy@hotmail.com</a>
Louise Newcombe	<a href="mailto:leicesterlou@yahoo.co.uk">leicesterlou@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Jan P Leaf	<a href="mailto:jan.leaf@btinternet.com">jan.leaf@btinternet.com</a>
J Pearce	<a href="mailto:windwalkerjp@hotmail.com">windwalkerjp@hotmail.com</a>
A Stanyard	<a href="mailto:nich.stanyard@btinternet.com">nich.stanyard@btinternet.com</a>
Planning Admin Team	<a href="mailto:planning.central@sportengland.org">planning.central@sportengland.org</a>