

**OFFICER RESPONSE TO LONG WHATTON AND DISEWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT (REGULATION 14)**

<b>Plan Section/Policy Number (Page Number in Brackets)</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
Paragraph 1.6	Last sentence needs amending as the plan period of the new Local Plan is to 2040 (not 2039).
Paragraph 1.8	The NPPF was revised in September and December 2023.
Paragraph 1.13	Last sentence needs amending as the plan period of the new Local Plan is to 2040 (not 2039).
Paragraph 2.13	Consider removing reference to the HS2 station at East Midlands Parkway.
Map 2	Consider removing the now cancelled route of HS2 from the map.
Paragraph 2.17	Last sentence needs amending as the plan period of the new Local Plan is to 2040 (not 2039).
Paragraph 2.18	<p>As part of the recent consultation on the new Local Plan the information set out in paragraph 2.18 could as set out below.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review is seeking to identify land for a minimum of 5,700 dwellings. Therefore, suggest replacing ‘provide for’ with ‘identify land for’ in the following sentence:</p> <p><i>Having regard to the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan, the Local Plan Review is looking to <u>identify land for</u> an additional minimum of 5,700 houses.</i></p>
Paragraph 2.24	<p>Last sentence needs to be reworded to remove ‘to us’. Suggest the following:</p> <p><i>...the District Council invited landowners, developers and their agents to submit information about sites within the district...</i></p>
Paragraph 2.27	Is import in the first sentence supposed to be important? Or is there a word missing before ‘import’?
Paragraph 2.31	East Midland Airport – needs an ‘s’ on Midlands.
Paragraph 2.33	Need to remove ‘and’ after 100ha.
Paragraphs 2.37 + 2.38	Consider deleting these paragraphs or adding some additional wording the reflect the government’s decision to cancel the northern leg of HS2.

LW&D1: Countryside	It may help the user of the document if the individual settlements maps showing the Limits to Development followed this policy rather than being in the housing chapter, particularly as they relate to more than just housing?
Paragraph 4.14	Last sentence 'here' needs to be 'where'.
Paragraph 4.19	Should the second sentence refer to the 'two' previous studies not 'three'.
Policy LW&D2: Long Whatton and Hathern Area of Separation	<p>Retaining the separation between settlements is a strategic matter which is covered in criterion (ii) of adopted Local Plan Policy S3 – Countryside “it does not undermine...the physical and perceived separation and undeveloped character between nearby settlements...”.</p> <p>New Local Plan Draft Policy S4 (countryside) echoes the sentiment of criterion (ii) of the adopted Local Plan. Criterion (b) of the draft policy states that “it does not undermine...the physical and perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements...”.</p> <p>Whilst we understand the concerns around potential coalescence, Areas of Separation are usually designated between two built up areas. The proposed Area of Separation does not adjoin a built-up area to the east. Furthermore, there is no evidence that we are aware of to suggest the settlement of Hathern will extend so close to Long Whatton. As such it is unclear why there is a need for an Area of Separation in this location.</p>
Policy LW&D3: Locally Important Views	<p>Appendix 1 sets out the justification for the viewpoints. Whilst paragraph 4.23 provides a short explanation of the difference between the different viewpoints it would be useful if the supporting text could provide further clarification on the difference between a representative viewpoint and a key viewpoint.</p> <p>Appendix 1 – The key for the Long Whatton Map needs amending the 'Key Viewpoint Locations' need re-labelling as 'Representative Viewpoint Locations' in line with the wording in the Policy and with the Diseworth Map in Appendix 1.</p>
LW&D4: Protecting Valued Landscapes	<p>The vulnerable landscapes identified on Maps 4 and 5 cover large areas around both settlements.</p> <p>It is unclear how the boundaries of the vulnerable landscapes have been derived from the sites that were assessed in the Long Whatton and Diseworth Landscape Study. The Landscape Study considers 4 parcels of land around Diseworth and 5 parcels around Long Whatton. The vulnerable landscapes do not seem to follow the boundaries of any of the parcels considered in the study.</p>

	Maps 4 and 5 – some of the numbering for the viewpoints is obscured by the yellow dots.
Policy LW&D5: Countryside Access	No comments.
Policy LW&D6: Ecology and Biodiversity	<p>Having checked our records of LWS against Map 7 of the Neighbourhood Plan we can advise of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is difficult to see the extent of and label for site 90368 on Map 7.</li> <li>• Site 90368 appears to be on Map 7 and also on the Policies Map but it is not listed in Appendix 2: Local Wildlife Sites.</li> <li>• It is difficult to see the extent of and label for 90367 on Map 7.</li> <li>• Should the label for site 72850 be above the label for 73764 as site 72850 is north of site 73764.</li> <li>• Sites or labels not visible for sites 72662, 72635, 73488, 72760.</li> <li>• There is a cluster of four circles to the west of the M1, given these are so close together it is difficult to see which site the labels relate to on Map 7.</li> <li>• There are a number of site labels that overlap the Neighbourhood Area boundary and are difficult to read.</li> </ul> <p>For accuracy, the Council recommends that the NP Group checks these discrepancies with the LCC Ecology team.</p> <p>It would be useful to clarify if historic Local Wildlife Sites are still designated sites. If they are no longer designated this would suggest that they are not included.</p>
Paragraph 4.44	<p>Our data suggests there are 7 confirmed TPOs in Diseworth, 31 confirmed TPOs in Long Whatton and 1 TPO to the south of East Midlands Airport.</p> <p>A spreadsheet detailing the TPOs referred to above has been submitted alongside these comments.</p>
Policy LW&D7: Trees and Hedgerows	Unsure how Development Management colleagues would determine whether trees or hedgerows were of ‘good’ arboricultural and amenity value?
Policy LW&D8: Local Green Spaces	<p>For context, it would be useful to highlight the tests which need to be met for a piece of land to be able to be designated as Local Green Space (paragraph 102 of the NPPF) and that this is cross referenced to Appendix 3:</p> <p><i>a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</i></p>

	<p><i>b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</i></p> <p><i>c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</i></p> <p>Suggest that evidence/justification is provided to supports the various statements at Appendix 3 and how each sites meets the relevant criteria.</p> <p>Specific comments relate to sites 9, 17, 18 and 19 in Diseworth.</p> <p>Site 9 (Hallfield, Diseworth) is significant in size. Whilst there is a public footpath that runs diagonally across the area the site is larger than local in character and so we would suggest that this is an extensive tract of land contrary to the requirements set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>Sites 17 (Clement’s Gate Crofts, Diseworth) and 18 (Clement’s Gate Orchard, Diseworth) these sites individually and more so collectively represent large areas of land contrary to the criteria set out in the NPPF. In addition, neither site appears to be publicly accessible.</p> <p>Site 19 (Millenium Meadow, Diseworth) we note that this was provided by and is maintained by the Parish Council and is therefore already public open space. However, given its distance from Diseworth itself, it is questionable as to whether it meets the criteria for designation set out the NPPF paragraph 102, sub paragraph a).</p>
LW&D9: Non-designated Heritage Assets	Comments from the council’s Senior Conservation Officer (James White) were sent to Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council by email dated 22/02/2024.
LW&D10: Design	Please see covering email.
Paragraph 7.5	The end of the first sentence refers to ‘all three communities’ query whether this should refer to two communities i.e. Long Whatton and Diseworth.
LW&D11: Water Management	<p>Para 175 (NPPF, December 2023) requires that major developments (defined as residential development of 10 or more homes, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more, whilst non-residential development is defined as additional floorspace of 1,000m2 or more, or a site of 1 hectare or more) should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The NP requirement for development to incorporate SuDs where the construction area is of 100sqm is much more stringent than the NPPF requirement, unless there is any local evidence to demonstrate that such a requirement is justified.</p> <p>Draft Local Plan (Policy Ap8) requires ‘all major development proposals will include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off unless it can be clearly demonstrated that: (a) SuDS are not technically, operationally or financially deliverable or viable and that surface water drainage</p>

	<p>issues from the development can be mitigated in an alternative way; or (b) The SuDS scheme will itself adversely affect the environment or safety and that surface water drainage issues from the development can be mitigated in an alternative way’.</p> <p>The supporting text in the Draft Local Plan acknowledges the government’s intention to make SuDS mandatory for most new development in England and once SuDS become a legislative requirement there may be no need for a Local Plan policy.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan needs to be consistent with the requirements of the NPPF. As currently drafted the Neighbourhood Plan Policy goes beyond national and local policy requirements.</p> <p>However, as the requirements for SuDS is dealt with at a national and local level we would query whether the policy is required at all.</p> <p>Should the first sentence of the third section refer to developments being ‘designed’ rather than ‘built’ to manage surface water sustainably?</p>
<p>Policy LW&amp;D12: Retention of Community Services and Facilities</p>	<p>No comments.</p>
<p>LW&amp;D13: New Long Whatton Community Centre</p>	<p>Adopted Local Plan Policy IF2 (Community and Cultural Facilities) seeks to resist the loss of key services and facilities unless an appropriate alternative is provided, or there is demonstrable evidence that the facility is no longer required and/or viable and that suitable alternative community uses have been considered.</p> <p>Draft Local Plan Policy IF2 (Community Facilities) supports proposals for new, extended or improved community facilities. The policy requires that for such facilities that are located in areas identified as the countryside, it must be demonstrated that the proposal will address a proven local need for the facility. The loss of a facility needs to accord with the criteria set out in the Draft Policy. Part (3) of the Draft Policy requires major residential/residential-led development to make provision for new community facilities where no facilities exist, or facilities are insufficient for the demand likely to be generated from the new development.</p> <p>The issues with the current community centre are noted and these would support the provision of a new community centre.</p>
<p>Policy LW&amp;D14: Internet</p>	<p>No comments.</p>
<p>Policy LW&amp;D15: Infrastructure</p>	<p>No comments.</p>

Paragraphs 9.5, 9.6 and 9.7 and Map 17	Query whether it is worth deleting this paragraph now that the government has announced that it will no longer proceed with the eastern leg of HS2 which would have passed through the district.
Policy LW&D16 Donington Park Services	No comments.
Paragraph 9.16	Remove word 'of' in first part of the first sentence.
Policy LW&D17: Nuisance Parking	No comments.
Policy LW&D18: Noise Impact	<p>Adopted Local Plan Policy D2 (Amenity) requires proposals for development to be designed to minimise their impact on the amenity and quiet enjoyment of both existing and future residents within the development and close to it. Development proposals will be supported where they do not generate a level of activity, noise, vibration, pollution or unpleasant odour emission, which cannot be mitigated to an appropriate standard and so, would have an adverse impact on amenity and living conditions.</p> <p>These requirements are also set out in Draft Local Plan Policy AP2 – Amenity. As such we query whether this policy is necessary.</p>
Policy LW&D19: Construction Method Statements	Query what the definition of minor development means – is it the same as the NPPF? It may just need some clarification in the text.
Paragraphs 11.2 and 11.3	The redevelopment of previously developed land for housing should be within or well related to the settlement boundary. This should be reflected in the text for clarity.
Paragraph 11.4	Second sentence needs amending as the plan period of the new Local Plan is to 2040 (not 2039).
Paragraph 11.5	<p>Last sentence needs amending as the 686 dwelling per annum requirement over the equates to 13,720 over the plan period 2020-2040 (not 2021 to 2039).</p> <p>Also the plan period of the new Local Plan is 2020 to 2040 (not 2021 to 2039).</p>
Paragraph 11.7  Paragraphs 11.7 to 11.9 New Settlement	<p>Last sentence needs amending as the plan period of the new Local Plan is to 2040 (not 2039).</p> <p>The reference to the potential for the new Local Plan to include a proposal for a new settlement is noted, as is the response to the questionnaire survey undertaken.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the reference at paragraph 11.7 to 30 years should be 20 years?</p>
Paragraph 11.11	Query whether the plan period for the NP should be 2020-2040 to align with the new LP or whether the NPs plan period is as stated (2021-2039).

Paragraph 11.12	This paragraph also reference the NP’s plan period to 2039 (see comment above).
Policy LW&D20: Housing Requirement	Query whether the NPs plan period should align with the new Local Plan’s plan period?
Policy LW&D21: Windfall Housing Development (Maps 19 and 20)	<p>It is noted that the proposed Limits to Development for both Long Whatton and Diseworth do not fully accord with the Limits to Development in the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council have undertaken a review of the Limits to Development. Public consultation on this review took place from 05 February to 17 March 2024. The proposed Limits to Development for Long Whatton and Diseworth in the Neighbourhood plan do not fully accord with the proposed Limits to Development as set out in the Local Plan consultation document.</p> <p>The differences between the NP and draft LP in Long Whatton are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rear of No.2 West End (property curtilage included in LP not in NP).</li> <li>• All Saints Church and two large properties accessed of Mill Lane (excluded from LtD in NP).</li> <li>• Land to east of Harlow Bros Ltd (included in NP as expansion land).</li> </ul> <p>The differences between the NP and draft LP in Diseworth are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Garden land north of nos. 9 to 15 Clements Gate (included in draft LP excluded in NP).</li> <li>• Slight difference around new housing at Avocet Close.</li> <li>• Land north of no. 9 Hall Gate (Draft LP includes more land than the NP).</li> <li>• Triangular parcel of land north of Hall Gate (include in draft LP not in NP).</li> <li>• Land rear of the Plough Inn (parcel of land included in draft LP but not in NP).</li> </ul> <p>We would welcome a meeting to discuss this matter further.</p>
Policy LW&D22: Hathern Road, Long Whatton	<p>Given that there is no housing requirement for Long Whatton or Diseworth in the adopted Local Plan, planning policy officers have provided the Parish Council with indicative housing figures. Having tested various housing growth and distribution scenarios a final figure was determined of 13 dwellings for both Long Whatton and Diseworth for the plan period.</p> <p>Officers welcome the Parish Council’s proposal to allocate a site for housing as it represents positive planning which is based on evidence. However, the proposed site in Long Whatton is for approximately 90 dwellings which greatly exceeds the 13-dwelling requirement.</p>

	<p>It is noted that the Housing Allocation was further informed by a 'Call for Sites' and Site Appraisal process. The proposed allocation site appears to be a logical extension to Long Whatton.</p> <p>Although query whether it would be possible for the housing and the community centre to be provided on the same site.</p> <p>Criteria C of the Policy refers to the provision of a community centre - it is unclear if this refers to the land or the building itself. We would also query whether the size of the site is sufficient to justify a requirement to provide a community centre in terms of the CIL test. The Policy could, however, refer to the allocated housing site contributing towards a community centre.</p>
<p>Policy LW&amp;D23: Tea Kettle Hall, Diseworth</p>	<p>Given that there is no housing requirement for Long Whatton or Diseworth in the adopted Local Plan, planning policy officers have provided the Parish Council with indicative housing figures. Having tested various housing growth and distribution scenarios a final figure was determined of 13 dwellings for both Long Whatton and Diseworth for the plan period.</p> <p>Officers welcome the Parish Council's proposal to allocate a site for housing as it represents positive planning which is based on evidence. The site at Tea Kettle Hall, Diseworth is allocated for approximately 13 dwellings which would meet the housing requirement.</p> <p>The site at Tea kettle Hall lies to the south of the settlement of Diseworth and is somewhat isolated from the rest of the settlement, with a road in between. As such it is not an ideal location for housing development, but as the site is previously developed land, it is considered that this weighs in favour of the site and so no objection is raised.</p> <p>It is noted that para 11.18 refers to the site being previously developed. However, Policy LW&amp;D23 (criteria C) refers to the site being considered as greenfield for the purposes of the affordable housing requirement. The affordable housing requirement should reflect the status of the site as previously developed land. As such, and in accordance with the affordable housing requirement in the Local Plan no affordable housing would be required unless there is local evidence to suggest otherwise.</p>
<p>Policy LW&amp;D24: Housing Mix</p>	<p>Policy LW&amp;D24 identifies a housing mix that developments of 10 or more dwellings should broadly reflect, unless informed by a more up to date evidence of housing need. This is justified having regard to the housing profile of the Parish as well as a 2021 Housing Needs Assessment.</p> <p>This is in line with Local Plan Policy H6 which also applies to developments of 10 or more dwellings.</p>



Paragraph 11.34	This refers to the North West Leicestershire Core Strategy – this needs to be amended to the adopted Local Plan.
Policy LW&D25: Affordable Housing	<p>Please see detailed comments attached from the councils Strategic Housing Team.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing is a strategic policy matter. The quantum/tenure of affordable housing provision therefore needs to be in accordance with the requirements of Local Plan Policy H4.</p> <p>It is proposed that the requirement for a local connection should be deleted from this policy for the following reasons; a) it does not accord with the affordable housing eligibility criteria applied by the district council’s Housing team. The criteria require a connection to the district, not to the local area; and b) it is not in general conformity with NWLLP Policy H4 which includes no such local connection requirement.</p> <p>On a practical level, a consequence of a local connection requirement is that people in housing need who come from places with no/limited new development would never have their needs met. Local connection requirements can also constrain Registered Providers’ ability to secure funding for new affordable housing schemes.</p> <p>A similar approach has been advocated in other Neighbourhood Plans in the district and has not been supported by Examiners. Supporting such an approach would be inconsistent.</p>
Policy LW&D26: Rural Housing	The existing Local Plan and the new Local Plan are silent on the issue of subdivision of an existing residential dwelling. However, the NPPF allows for the development of isolated homes in the Countryside if the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling.
Policy LW&D27: Residential Conversion of Rural Buildings	Query is raised over the application of this policy. For example, would the residential conversion of a rural building not be supported if a building is not of architectural and historic interest. This approach would be odds with national and local policy.
Policy LW&D28: Rural Worker Accommodation	In line with the policy in the new Local Plan.
Policy LW&D29: Replacement Dwellings	<p>Are we correct in our understanding that the prevention of the loss of 2 or 3 bedroom accommodation is linked to the local housing profile.</p> <p>We appreciate the desire to resist the loss of a 2- or 3-bedroom property, but such properties could still be lost through an extension to an existing 2 or 3 bedroom property, so will the policy achieve its objective? In addition, if Criteria C is complied with, how likely is it</p>

	that the new build would have more bedrooms than was previously the case?
Paragraph 12.3	First sentence consider deleting 'lie' to ensure the sentence makes sense.
Paragraph 12.7	Consider deleting the word 'any' from the second sentence to ensure the sentence makes sense.
Policy LW&D30: Harlow	<p>Neither the supporting text nor the policy make reference to the additional land that has been included to the east of the current Harlow site to allow the business to expand.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the policy relates to Harlow expanding or whether any other local business could use the site. The policy needs to be clearer as to whether the additional land is for use by Harlow or whether another business could use the site. Is there any local need for additional employment land?</p> <p>Query whether there should in fact be 2 separate policies - one relating to the retention of existing site and its use and an additional policy that refers to the new site/additional land extension of the existing site.</p>
Policy LW&D31: Employment Development in the Countryside	In terms of criteria c of the policy would it be worth adding a reference to maps 4 and 5 that show the Vulnerable Landscapes.
Policy LW&D32: Business Conversion of Rural Buildings	No comment
Policy LW&D33: Working From Home	No comment

### Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan Design Code 2023

<b>Plan Section/Policy Number (Page Number in Brackets)</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
Page 12 Para 2.1	<p>Design code refers to the 'North West Leicestershire District Council Local Plan 2011-2031 (Adopted November 2017)'</p> <p>It should be the 'North West Leicestershire Local Plan (as amended by the Partial Review) adopted March 2021'</p>
Section 7 Page 66	First sentence refers to Breedon on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan – this needs changing to Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan.