

Title of Report	HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON-LE-HEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN	
Presented by	Councillor Robert Ashman Planning and Infrastructure Portfolio Holder	
Background Papers	Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath pre-submission draft Neighbourhood Plan	Public Report: Yes
		Key Decision: Yes/No
Financial Implications	<p>The Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Neighbourhood Plan will incur direct costs to the District Council to support an independent examination of the plan and, should the examination be successful, a local referendum. Grant funding from central government (£30,000 per Neighbourhood Plan) is payable to the authority to support this agenda, but may not meet the costs in full. Any such additional costs would need to be met from the contingency budget held by the Planning Service.</p> <p>Once the Neighbourhood Plan is made it will form part of the Development Plan for North West Leicestershire. Should the document be subject to legal challenge, the District Council will be responsible for meeting such costs. Any such costs would need to be met from the contingency budget held by the Planning Service.</p>	
	Signed off by the Section 151 Officer: Yes	
Legal Implications	<p>Once the Neighbourhood Plan is made it will form part of the Development Plan for North West Leicestershire. This means it will be used to determine planning applications within the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
	Signed off by the Monitoring Officer: Yes	
Staffing and Corporate Implications	<p>Officer time has, and will continue to be, provided to support the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Depending upon the extent of such involvement, this may have implications for other work undertaken by the respective officers.</p>	
	Signed off by the Head of Paid Service: Yes	
Purpose of Report	<p>To agree the District Council's response to the pre-submission draft of the Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Neighbourhood Plan and set out the proposed delegation arrangements for the future stages in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	

<p>Recommendations</p>	<p>THAT THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE;</p> <p>(I) ENDORSES THE SUGGESTED PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) RESPONSE TO HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON-LE-HEATH PARISHCOUNCIL AS SET OUT AT APPENDIX B;</p> <p>(II) AGREES TO DELEGATE ENDORSEMENT OF ANY FURTHER RESPONSE BY OFFICERS AT SUBMISSION (REGULATION 16) STAGE TO THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING & REGENERATION;</p> <p>(III) NOTES THAT ONCE THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN HAS BEEN SUBMITTED THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING & REGENERATION WILL:</p> <p>A) PUBLISH THE PLAN FOR A SIX WEEK PERIOD AND INVITE REPRESENTATIONS;</p> <p>B) NOTIFY CONSULTATION BODIES; AND</p> <p>C) APPOINT AN INDEPENDENT EXAMINER TO CONDUCT THE EXAMINATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN;</p> <p>(IV) NOTES THAT FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF THE INDEPENDENT EXAMINER’S REPORT, THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING & REGENERATION WILL DETERMINE WHETHER THE CONDITIONS HAVE BEEN MET FOR THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TO PROCEED TO REFERENDUM;</p> <p>(V) IF THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO VOTED IN THE REFERENDUM ARE IN FAVOUR OF THE HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON-LE-HEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AND THE DISTRICT COUNCIL DOES NOT CONSIDER THE MAKNG OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TO BE INCOMPATIBLE WITH ANY EU OR HUMAN RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS, AND THAT THERE IS NO AVAILABLE MEETING OF CABINET WITHIN EIGHT WEEKS OF THE REFERENDUM THEN THE DECISION WHETHER TO MAKE THE PLAN BE DELAGTED TO THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING & REGENERATION</p>
-------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Parish Council has published a pre-submission draft (in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) of its Neighbourhood Plan for consultation between 6 November and 18 December 2019.
- 1.2 Because the consultation closed before a meeting of this committee, officers have submitted comments, following discussion with the Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning but on the understanding that they were subject to being agreed by this committee.
- 1.3 The purpose of this report is to agree the Council's response to the pre-submission plan and to agree the approval process for the subsequent stages of the Neighbourhood Plan preparation.

2. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS

- 2.1 Neighbourhood Planning was introduced under the Localism Act 2011 to give local communities a more hands on role in the planning of their neighbourhoods. It introduced new rights and powers to allow local communities to shape new development in their local area.
- 2.2 Neighbourhood Plans can be prepared by a Parish or Town Council (or Neighbourhood Forums in areas not covered by a Parish or Town Council) once they have been designated as a neighbourhood area by the District Council.
- 2.3 Neighbourhood Plans should consider local and not strategic issues and must be in line with higher level planning policy. A Neighbourhood Plan can be detailed or general, depending on what local people want but they must be in line with European Union obligations as incorporated into UK law and human rights requirements; they must have regard to national planning policy and must be in general conformity with strategic policies in the adopted development plan in force for the local area.
- 2.4 The District Council as Local Planning Authority has an important role to play in the Neighbourhood Plan process even though the District Council is not responsible for its preparation. The key stages in producing a Neighbourhood Plan as governed by The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and The Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 together with the District Council's role are summarised in the Table at Appendix A of this report.
- 2.5 At present, there are two 'made' Neighbourhood Plans in the district (Ashby de la Zouch and Ellistown and Battleflat).

3.0 THE HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON-LE-HEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 3.1 The Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Neighbourhood Plan area covers the parish of Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath and was designated on 7 June 2017.
- 3.2 At this stage the role of the District Council is as a consultee (See Appendix A for details of each Neighbourhood Plan preparation stage).

- 3.3 The draft Neighbourhood Plan sets out policies under seven headings:
- General
 - Housing
 - Natural and Historic Environment
 - Transport and Access
 - Community facilities and amenities
 - Employment
 - Developer Contributions
- 3.4 In addition to the draft document there are a number of supporting documents which have been produced, including a Housing Needs Report and an Environmental Inventory.
- 3.5 In making comments officers have assessed the proposed plan against the adopted Local Plan and any relevant national policies to ensure that it is consistent with both of these. The comments are set out at Appendix B of this report.
- 3.6 The comments made are with the intention of assisting with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan rather than seeking to be critical. The District Council as the Local Planning Authority will be required, if the plan is 'made', to use the plan in determining planning applications. It is important to ensure, therefore, that policies are as clear as possible to avoid any confusion at a later date. Where possible suggestions have been made as to how the plan could be amended to address any potential concerns.
- 3.7 At this stage none of the issues raised are considered to be such that the plan is likely to be at risk.

4.0 NEXT STEPS

- 4.1 Once the current consultation period ends, the Parish Council will have to consider all of the comments received, including those provided by the District Council. Following any changes to the Neighbourhood Plan that they believe are necessary, the Parish Council will then submit a revised version to the District Council.
- 4.2 As set out at Appendix A, the District Council's role at submission stage is firstly to be a consultee - but to also arrange for a further round of consultation, subject to the Neighbourhood Plan meeting the various legal requirements. The District Council is also required to appoint an independent examiner (with the agreement of the Parish Council) who will examine the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the technical / procedural nature of these various tasks, it is recommended that they be delegated to the Strategic Director of Place, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning – in line with the procedure undertaken for both Ashby de la Zouch and Ellistown and Battleflat Neighbourhood Plans.
- 4.3 Following receipt of the independent examiner's report, the District Council must formally decide whether to send the Neighbourhood Plan to referendum (with or without modifications proposed by the examiner or NWLDC). Reg 17A(5) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 as added by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016 gives the District Council 5 weeks from receipt of the examiner's report to decide whether to proceed with the referendum or not. Given the short timescale, the Strategic Director of Place, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning will exercise the executive power of making this decision

as delegated to them in the Constitution (paragraph 5.2.1 of the Scheme of Delegation).

- 4.4 Should the Neighbourhood Plan be sent to referendum, and the referendum declares in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan, then the District Council is required to make (i.e. adopt) the Neighbourhood Plan within 8 weeks of the referendum (Reg 18A(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 as added by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016). The decision to 'make' a Neighbourhood Plan is an executive decision. However, it may be necessary, depending upon the timing of any referendum and dates for any Cabinet meeting, for a decision to 'make' the Neighbourhood Plan to be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning. This is allowed for in recommendation (v).

Policies and other considerations, as appropriate	
Council Priorities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support for businesses and helping people into local jobs - Developing a clean and green district - Local people live in high quality, affordable homes - Our communities are safe, healthy and connected
Policy Considerations:	Policies in the adopted Local Plan as highlighted in the report
Safeguarding:	No issues identified
Equalities/Diversity:	No issues identified
Customer Impact:	No issues identified
Economic and Social Impact:	No specific impacts identified
Environment and Climate Change:	No specific impacts identified
Consultation/Community Engagement:	Other Council services have been consulted in drawing together the proposed response. The draft Neighbourhood Plan is subject to public consultation undertaken by Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Parish Council.
Risks:	The ultimate decision on how to proceed in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan rests with Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Parish Council. Officers will work with the Parish Council to seek to minimise risks to the Neighbourhood Plan if so requested.
Officer Contact	Ian Nelson Planning Policy Team Manager 01530 454677 ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A – TABLE HIGHLIGHTING STAGES OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PREPARATION PROCESS

Regulation	Stage of Neighbourhood Plan process	District Council role
Reg 6A	Designating a neighbourhood area	To agree to the designation of a neighbourhood area
	Preparing a draft Neighbourhood Plan	To provide advice and assistance
Reg 14	Pre-submission publicity & consultation	To be a consultee
Reg 15	Submission of a neighbourhood plan to the local planning authority	<p>Ensure that the submitted draft Neighbourhood Plan is accompanied by the following</p> <p>(a) a map or statement which identifies the area to which the proposed neighbourhood development plan relates;</p> <p>(b) a consultation statement;</p> <p>(c) the proposed neighbourhood development plan; and</p> <p>(d) a statement explaining how the proposed neighbourhood development plan meets the “basic conditions” (requirements of paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act). Basic conditions are:</p> <p>(a) That it has regard to national policies and advice;</p> <p>(b) That it contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;</p> <p>(c) That it is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the local Development Plan;</p> <p>(d) That it is compatible with EU obligations; and</p> <p>(e) That it is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site</p>
Reg 16	Publicising a plan proposal	Organise and undertake consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan for a 6 week period
Reg 17	Submit the draft plan for independent examination	Arrange for an independent examination including the appointment of an examiner in

		consultation with the Parish or Town Council.
--	--	-----------------------------------------------

**NWLDC OFFICER RESPONSE TO PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT
HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON LE HEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

Plan Section/Policy Number (Page Number in brackets)	Officer Response
Section A General	
General (page 16) 3 rd paragraph under methodology	Might be appropriate to quote what the NPPF says (page 49). NPPF refers to valued landscapes and recognising the “intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside” rather than protecting the countryside per se.
Figure 2a Limits to development (page 17)	It would help if this showed all of the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan. The inclusion of additional land south of The Green Donington Le Heath which has planning permission and is not included in the adopted Local Plan is noted.
South East coalville Deelopment Scheme (page 17)	Planning permission is in place for all of south east Coalville. The latest housing trajectory identifies that 2,236 dwellings will be built by 2031. It is not clear if the reference to 1,900 dwellings is only that part of the site that is within the plan area?
Policy G2 (South East Coalville Development Scheme) (page 19)	The reference to figure 2b is slightly misleading as it suggests that all of the area shown on figure 2b is in the plan area. It would be helpful to delineate in some way that part that is within the plan area.
Policy G3 (Design) (pages 20/21/22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Provision of insulation is not a matter considered through the planning system b) The requirement for a Design and Access Statement for all developments of more than 1 dwelling conflicts with the Planning Practice Guidance. Such a requirement only applies in areas designated as a World Heritage Site or conservation area (see link below). d) would it be worthwhile also including links to Bardon employment area? h and i) Are these the same points expressed differently? p) Is the reference to two bed properties necessary as they are also caught by being in the “three bedrooms or less “ category in the second part of this criteria. q) First part does not make sense as worded. Should the last word be ‘supported’ rather than ‘promoted’? r) The aspiration for this is supported, but there is currently no national requirement for universal vehicle charging points. It is also not clear as to whether this is technically feasible at the present time. <p>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-an-application#Design-and-Access-Statement</p>

The approach to future residential growth (page 20, 1 st paragraph)	Unclear what the Leicester Housing Market Assessment (2017) is.
Section B Housing	
Policy H1 (Housing Mix) (page 23)	<p>4th paragraph. It would be helpful to also include the HEDNA recommendations for the mix of affordable housing alongside the market housing mix rather than later on.</p> <p>The housing needs report which accompanies the Neighbourhood Plan identifies (Table 5) that the proportion of 4 or more bedroomed properties (20.4%) are somewhat greater than the North West Leicestershire average (23.5%). Whilst it is recognised that there is some evidence of under occupancy, it is considered that the evidence does not support the approach set out in respect of larger homes.</p> <p>It would be helpful if some support was to be given for the provision of 1-bed market properties as well, otherwise developers assume they can provide them as affordable units only. This would provide a better mix as suggested in the HEDNA.</p> <p>It is not clear what is meant by the term “any single site” in the policy. Does it refer to an application site? What if the application site is a phase of part of a larger development?</p>
Policy H2 (Affordable Housing) (page 24)	<p>3rd paragraph – the Local Plan requirement for affordable housing in Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath is 20% as they fall within the Coalville Urban Area.</p> <p>5th paragraph – since the HEDNA was produced a new NPPF has been published which includes a requirement that 10% of new homes be available for low cost home ownership (paragraph 64). Presumably this 10% requirement would form part of the 20% ‘low cost starter homes or other home ownership products’ quoted in the policy. The use of the term ‘intermediate housing’ no longer appears in the definition of affordable housing in the NPPF glossary. It is noted that the proposed policy does not use this term, but it would be useful to explain why this is.</p> <p>It should be noted that for the South East Coalville development area, the provision of affordable housing has already been agreed. The policy could only be applied to any additional development that comes forward within the parish.</p>
Policy H3 (Windfall Sites) (Page 25)	<p>In g) it would be helpful to make it clear that it is the occupiers of the “proposed dwelling” which is being referred to.</p> <p>It would be useful to consider including a further requirement as there may be instances where a site of up to 5 dwellings satisfies the floorspace requirement of the adopted Local Plan policy. Suggest something like <i>“where the requirement for an affordable housing contribution is triggered against the local plan affordable housing policy, that such provision is to be made”</i></p>

<p>Policy H4 (Support to be given to brownfield sites) (Page 25)</p>	<p>What is meant by redundant land? Would it include land no longer used for agricultural purposes? The policy could include a cross reference to the definition of previously developed land as set out in the NPPF. For example,</p> <p>“Within the Limits to Development, proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of redundant land or buildings <u>(which satisfies the definition of previously developed land as set out in the NPPF or any successor document)</u> will be supported, unless it conflicts with policies in the Development Plan”.</p>
<p>Section C Natural and historic environment</p>	
<p>Environmental Inventory (Page28)</p>	<p>Last sentence on page 28 refers to ‘<i>National Planning Policy Framework 2018</i>’ should this be 2019?</p>
<p>Environmental Inventory (Page 29)</p>	<p>The use of a scoring system to assess sites for designation as Local Green Space is questioned.</p> <p>In particular in assessing Accessibility as the Planning Practice Guidance states that land can be considered for designation as Local Green Space even if there is no public access. Therefore, sites with public access should not score higher than those with no public access.</p> <p>Also in terms of the ‘bounded’ criteria this appears to consider whether sites have some form of boundary i.e that they are not extensive tracts of land. In terms of the criteria set out in the NPPF there is no requirement for sites to have a specific boundary. This criteria may need re-wording.</p>

<p>Policy ENV1: Protection of Local Green Space (Page 30)</p>	<p>A scoring system has been used to assess green spaces within the Neighbourhood Plan Area that could be designated as Local Green Space. The scoring system is based on the Local Green Space criteria as set out in the NPPF. The six sites included in Policy ENV1 are those with the highest overall score.</p> <p>Our interpretation of paragraph 100 of the NPPF (2019) is that sites only need to meet one of the criteria: beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of its wildlife. The scoring system used appears to require sites to meet a number of the criteria in order to achieve a high overall score. This would appear to be more onerous than the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy ENV1 identifies 6 sites that are to be designated as Local Green Space. Appendix 5 appears to suggest that sites which score 24 or more should be designated as Local Green Space. However, Appendix 5 details numerous additional sites that score 24 or more and would therefore meet the scoring requirement to be designated as Local Green Space. It is not clear as to why these other sites have been excluded.</p> <p>These 'other' high scoring sites have been identified in Policies ENV2 and ENV3 which appears to create a hierarchy of protected sites based on what Local Green Space criteria they score the highest in. The methodology could be better explained and this approach may be overly complicated and add unnecessary tiers of designations.</p> <p>Unclear what "<i>exceptional circumstances</i>" might be, therefore it may be worth detailing what is meant by this.</p> <p>Table 2 Page 31 Hugglescote Cemetery, there is an additional 3 in the History criteria column.</p>
<p>Sites of environmental significance (page 35)</p>	<p>See the comment under EV1 re the scoring system for the Local Green Space designation</p>
<p>Figure 7.1 (page 36)</p>	<p>The key is not clear in the title for the figure, it would be easier to see if it followed the format of figure 7.2</p> <p>The purple features are very difficult to see unless very zoomed in, if this is being used as a paper copy then it could help the reader to label the features .</p>
<p>Important Open Space (page 37)</p>	<p>Sentence states that 'This policy is in general conformity with NWLDC Adopted Local Plan (2017) Policy IF3 (4-6)' - unsure if this sentence is needed as only part of the Neighbourhood Plan Policy refers to the Loss of Open Space which is what is referred to in the Local Plan Policy IF3 parts 4-6.</p>

Policy ENV3: Important Open Spaces (page 37)	<p>Policy ENV3 refers to the loss of open space. This is already included in Policy IF3 of the adopted Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan is not required to repeat this.</p> <p>The wording of Policy ENV3 could be made clearer. The Policy identifies sites that are to be protected as Important Open Spaces therefore it is unclear what is then meant by 'through confirmation as existing or designation as new, Open Space, Sport and Recreation (OSSR) sites in appropriate typologies'. Unclear as to what the typologies are and how they have been applied as they have not been applied to all of the sites. An explanation in the supporting text would be useful.</p>
Biodiversity and habitat connectivity (page 44)	<p>The third paragraph states there has been an 'observed 70% decline' what is the source for this claim?</p> <p>The following paragraph has a ' mark before embed which seems to suggest it is a quote, but there is no end to the quote and nor is it clear where it comes from.</p>
Local Wildlife Corridor (page 44)	The cross reference needs to be completed, at present to refers to Policy ENV xx
Figure 13 (page 45)	<p>It is not clear on the choice for the green habitat sites supporting the wildlife corridor. When compared with figure 7.2 it would appear the some but not all of various types of site of natural significance have been used to create one linear corridor. Indeed there are areas of land which are not identified in figure 7.2 being used.</p> <p>What is the justification / assessment for including sites in this policy and why is the map focussing on a single line of corridor and not connecting to the other sites identified in figure 7.2?</p>
Policy ENV 6 (page 45)	<p>In the second paragraph it states "<i>In cases where the development is determined...</i>"</p> <p>This is a bit ambiguous as to what is acceptable to outweigh the the biodiversity loss is it the scale / type / benefits of the development?</p>
Section D Transport and Access	
Policy T1: Transport Assessment for new Housing Development (Page 48)	<p>It is assumed that the role of this policy is not to require the submission of Transport Assessments. Rather it details what sort of the information should be submitted, in the instances that a Transport Assesment is required. The Leicestershire County Council Highway Design Guide identifies the circumstances a Transport Assessment is required, which is determined by the size and type of development. It maybe useful to refer to this document in order to provide clarity.</p> <p>Point e refers to NP policy H8 however, there are only 4 housing policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Policy T2: Residential and Public Car Parking (page 49)	<p>With respect to the parking standards proposed for 4+bedroom dwellings, this aspect of the policy would not comply with the North West Leicestershire Local Plan, the district's Design SPD nor the parking standards set out within the Leicestershire County Council Highway Design Guide. These only require the provision of 3 spaces per dwelling for four or more bed properties.</p>

Policy T3: Leicester to Burton Railway Line (page 49)	<p>It is not clear as to what exactly is meant by “Proposals that threaten...”. Suggest that it be reworded to state “Proposals for development within the plan area that threaten ...”</p> <p>At the current time there are no proposals to reopen the line and nor have any potential station sites. What happens if land between the Bardon Grange development and the railway line is not available, but land elsewhere in the plan area is? It might be better to state “Development of a new station and associated infrastructure within the plan area will be supported...”</p>
Section E Community Facilities and Amenities	
Community Facilities and Amenities (page 50)	<p>Should the reference to the Working Mens Club be changed to the Social Club?</p> <p>There only appears to be one shop (McColls with Post Office) if the second shop is the Central Stores, this was converted in 2016. If the second shop is not either of the two above then it may help to include the road they are on. Similarly, it would help to identify the location of many of these facilities and/or their name.</p>
Policy CF1: Community Facilities and Amenities (pages 50-51)	<p>Point d refers to policy G2 (SE Coalville) is this correct? Should it be G3 the general design policy?</p> <p>Point f refers to “unacceptable traffic movements” how will these be quantified? We suggest this include reference to the standard of the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>Points e and f are partly repetitive and can be joined together.</p>
Policy CF3 Doctors Surgery (page 52)	<p>Point a refers to “unacceptable traffic movements” how will these be quantified? We suggest this include reference to the standard of the Local Highway Authority.</p>
Policy CF4 Noisy Sports (page 52)	<p>It is not clear as to how in determining a planning application, the areas in point a would be defined and how excessive noise in point b should be interpreted?</p>
Section F Employment	
POLICY E1: Support for existing employment opportunities (page 53)	<p>The general principle of the policy is supported – however it is not clear if both bullet points need to be demonstrated (i.e. if there should be an ‘and’ between them) or whether only one needs to be demonstrated (so there should be an ‘or’ between them).</p> <p>Also, is the 12 months in bullet point a) additional to or concurrent with the six months marketing included in bullet point b).</p> <p>Does the employment-generating uses in bullet point b) relate only to B-class uses or any employment generating uses?</p>
POLICY E2: New small-scale employment (page 53)	<p>The policy states that small scale employment needs to comply with the provisions of Policy.... – which Policy is this?</p>
POLICY E3: Working from home (page 54)	<p>In bullet point 3, it might be useful to reference design policies in the Local Plan and the Good Design SPD.</p> <p>There should either be ‘and’ or ‘or’ between each bullet point to clarify if one or all need to be satisfied.</p>

POLICY E4: Re-use of agricultural and commercial buildings (page 55)	<p>There should either be 'and' or 'or' between each bullet point to clarify if one or all need to be satisfied.</p> <p>It is not clear as to what is meant by a 'rural building'; is it a building in a rural location (ie outside of the Limits to Development) or is it a building in use for a rural purpose? Clarification would be helpful.</p>
Section G Developer Contributions	
Developer Contributions (page 56)	<p>The third paragraph uses a reference to “(PPG 46)” the Planning Practice Guidance is organised like a glossary with an alphabetised list so it is not clear how this reference works.</p> <p>The District Council is not currently considering the introduction of CIL. However, it may do so at some future point in time. It is suggested that this section be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The list under CF1 has two points which should be reconsidered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference to gateway features for the village seems to be a better fit under the highways requirements rather than a community facility due to the tie in to speed reduction. Notwithstanding this, any request needs to relate to the impact that the new development will have on the existing facilities, it is difficult to see how a development would be unacceptable in planning terms if the gateways are not provided. • The reference to “<i>securing the community centre which is currently owned by the Anglican Church</i>”, will be difficult to achieve as it involves land in a third party ownership, an unknown cost (at this time) and the likelihood that the scale of new development beyond that already committed will be limited and so would not generate a significant financial contribution.
Appendix 5: Survey and Research (end of Page 3)	This includes an extract from the NPPF which details the Local Green Space criteria and is taken from the 2012 NPPF, this should be updated to show para. 100 from the 2019 NPPF.

Comments of Conservation Officer

The parish of Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath contains eight listed buildings including the grade II* listed Manor House at Donington and the grade II* listed parish church at Hugglescote. Pevsner (1984) describes the latter as “easily the best C19 church [in Leicestershire] outside Leicester”. The parish contains two conservation areas and five identified local heritage assets. These include the former National School (1862) and the former Grammar School (1909) as well as three buildings in the Hugglescote conservation area. In 2017 we adopted a rapid appraisal to support the designation of the Hugglescote conservation area.

I am pleased that heritage is important to the Parish Council. For instance the foreword refers to “the importance of retaining our heritage”; the ‘background’ says that protection of “buildings and structures of historic and architectural interest” is one of seven planning issues that “matter most to the community”; the ‘vision’ refers to the need to “balance the distinct heritage of the parish” (although it does not say what it should be balanced against).

The subchapter “natural and historic environment” accounts for one-third of the draft plan. Hence it is a pity that the draft plan makes no reference to conservation areas and contains no policy relating to development affecting conservation areas. It is a pity that it contains no policy relating to development affecting the settings of listed buildings. It is a pity that it contains no reference to the District Council’s list of local heritage assets and no reference to the shrunken medieval village of Snibston.

‘Planning issues [that] matter most to the community’

Page nine contains a bullet list of seven “planning issues [that] matter most to the community”, including the protection of “buildings and structures of historic and architectural interest”. Page fourteen contains a bullet list of eight “policy issues identified by the community as being of special importance”; this list does not refer to heritage assets. It is not clear how the bullet lists relate to each other.

‘Brief history’

Page ten contains a ‘brief history’ of the parish. It contains no reference to the shrunken medieval village of Snibston.

- Paragraph one says that “the first written record ... is to be found in the Domesday Book, with reference to Donington manor”. It would be useful to note that Hugglescote does not appear in the Domesday Book and that the first chapel-of-ease at Hugglescote was erected in the late fourteenth century (Moore, 2005).
- Paragraphs three and four appear to quote at length from a Victorian trade directory but the source is not credited. Paragraph four contains population figures for the ‘township’ and ‘ecclesiastical parish’ that do not agree with the figures on page 11. If these figures are ‘historic’ then this should be made clear.
- Paragraphs four and seven refer to the Church of St John the Baptist. The paragraphs repeat and contradict each other. Paragraph four says that the church was built in 1879 in the Franco-Norman style but paragraph seven says that it was built in 1878 in the English Geometrical Decorated style.
- Page 26 describes Hugglescote as a “nineteenth-century expansion of Coalville based on a medieval village” but page ten makes no reference to this expansion.

Paragraph four says that “the manor belonged to Lord Donington and is now part of Leicestershire Museums”. This paragraph appears to confuse the manor (lower case) with the Manor House (upper case). The Hastings family were lords of the manor (Charles Hastings was created Lord Donington in 1880) but the *soi disant* Manor House was owned by the Osgathorpe Charity (now part of Thomas Charley’s Charities). It may be interesting to explore the connection between the Manor House, the Osgathorpe Charity and the former Grammar School, which succeeded the Free Grammar School at Osgathorpe.

Paragraph six says that Hugglescote and Donington “were part of the parish of Ibstock until 1878, when they were formed into a separate civil parish”. It says that “in 1936 the parish was absorbed by the urban district of Coalville”. This paragraph appears to confuse the civil parish and the ecclesiastical parish. Our rapid appraisal says that Hugglescote “was anciently a township in Ibstock parish” but it was administered by Coalville urban district council from 1894. Kelly (1891) describes Hugglescote as a township in Ibstock parish; Kelly (1899) describes it as a township in Coalville urban district.

Policy G3 ‘Design’

Policy G3 is two pages long and contains twenty sub-policies. The headline policy says that development should “reflect the character and context of existing development”. Good

design is about more than being “sympathetic to local character”. Chapter 12 of the NPPF and Local Plan policy D1 recognise other aspects of good design; some of these aspects are reflected in policy G3’s sub-policies. The headline policy should be amended to reflect these other aspects. The NPPF says that “Neighbourhood Plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development” (paragraph 126). It is a pity that the draft plan does not do this.

Policy G3 contains eight sub-policies that relate to “character and context” (sub-policies (b) and (c) and sub-policies (h) to (m)). Considering the length of policy G3 I would recommend that the Parish Council split policy G3 into two separate policies, the first referring to “character and context” and the second referring to other aspects of good design. The headline policy says that development should “reflect the character and context of existing development” but supports “contemporary and innovative materials and design” in some circumstances. The headline policy is contradicted by sub-policy G3(b), which says that “all development will enhance and reinforce the local character” but makes no allowance for “contemporary and innovative” design.

- Sub-policies G3(a), G3(f), G3(g) and G3(q) refer to “green technology” and “sustainable design”. I am pleased that these sub-policies have been included – they reflect Local Plan policy D1(5) – but the sub-policies are repetitive and sub-policy G3(f) does not appear to constitute a policy.
- Sub-policies G3(h) and G3(i) refer to the “diversity” of new development. Sub-policy G3(i) says that “within each development the housing should not be the same in appearance”. Parts of the parish (e.g. the “nineteenth-century expansion of Coalville”) exhibit a great degree of uniformity and in these contexts uniform development would be “sympathetic”.
- Sub-policies G3(p) and G3(r) refer to parking and electric vehicle charging. These sub-policies appear more relevant to chapter D “Transport and access”.

Finally I am disappointed that policy G3 makes no reference to the creation of safe places. For instance please refer to NPPF paragraph 127(f) and Local Plan policy D1.

Donington Fields

Page 27 contains two paragraphs of text entitled “historic environment”. The text does not appear to refer to the historic environment but instead refers to “the agricultural land known locally as ‘Donington Fields’”. The text says that “this is an important environmental and recreational area” but the draft plan does not refer to it as a heritage asset. The fields are not identified on figure 7.1 “sites of historic environment significance” or in policy ENV4 “local heritage assets”. Figure 11.3 indicates that one of the fields contains well preserved ridge-and-furrow.

Destroyed features

Page 28 refers to the “site of the Manor House bank-and-ditch” and describes this as a “feature of high historical and archaeological significance”. Policy ENV4 refers to the site of a cruck framed house and describes it as a “local heritage asset ... important for [its] contribution to the village”. These features have been destroyed.

Local heritage assets

Page 39 says that the NPPG “confirms the ability of Neighbourhood Plans to identify non-designated heritage assets”. The NPPG says that “there are a number of processes through which non-designated heritage assets may be identified, including the local and Neighbourhood Plan-making processes”. It also says that “it can be helpful if LPAs keep a list of local heritage assets, incorporating any such assets that are identified by Neighbourhood Planning bodies”. Historic England (2016) *Local heritage listing* says that

“work in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan may indicate buildings and sites that merit inclusion on the local list” but recommends that “final ratification” of a local list should be “sought at the appropriate level within the LPA”.

In conclusion a Neighbourhood Plan should not contain a list of local heritage assets, but the plan-making process (“the work in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan”) may identify non-designated heritage assets and the LPA may subsequently include these assets on a local list.

Page 39 says that the County Council “has identified five buildings and structures ... that are considered to be of local significance”. The draft plan does not say when or how this work was carried out or which buildings and structures were identified. I suspect this is a reference to the District Council’s adopted list of local heritage assets. Page 39 says that “recent research for the Parish Council has identified a further seventeen buildings and structures of similar local heritage significance”. Again the draft plan does not say when or how this work was carried out and I suspect that the “research” is based substantially upon our draft list of local heritage assets, which was prepared in 2017. The Parish Council should credit the District Council for the work that it has carried out.

Figure 7.1 indicates “sites of historical [sic] environment significance”. It indicates no more than twenty sites so it should be feasible to list the sites in the text (see policy ENV3). Figure 7.1 depicts earthwork remains at Hugglescote Grange and Snibston in a manner that differs substantially to our draft list of local heritage assets (see attached). At Snibston the Historic Environment Record notes that “most earthwork remains have been ploughed out”.

Ridge and furrow

Page 42 says that Historic England “recognises the national historic importance of ridge-and-furrow and supports its protection as a non-designated heritage asset”. No source is offered to support this assertion. Figure 11.3 indicates “surviving ridge and furrow” coloured buff and orange. There is no key to explain the significance of the two colours.

Other comments

- On page 14 the ‘vision’ refers to the area’s “proud industrial heritage” but none of the sites identified in figure 7.1 or in policy ENV4 are industrial heritage sites.
- The map on page 18 indicates the boundary of the South Eastern [sic] Coalville development scheme. It would be useful to indicate the parish/plan boundary on this map.
- Page 38 refers to listed buildings and says that development should “take into account their settings as defined (on a case-by-case basis) by Historic England”. This makes no sense. Historic England has defined the term ‘setting’ but it is not responsible for defining the settings of listed buildings “on a case-by-case basis”.
- Page 46 refers to six “important views”. For monitoring purposes it would be useful to include a photograph to indicate each view.