

Neighbourhood Plan

Pre submission consultation responses

No.	Chapter/ Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
1	General		NWLDC	The document would benefit from paragraph numbers to assist the determination of planning applications	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
2	General		NWLDC	The National Planning Policy Framework was updated in July 2021. All references should be updated accordingly	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
3	Foreward (p4)		NWLDC	<p>The foreword states that the Swannington Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) will take priority over non strategic policies on the local Plan giving our community a real and lasting tool to influence the future of our neighbourhood.</p> <p>Whilst this is the case at the point the SNP is made it should be noted that neighbourhood plan policies can be superseded by strategic/non-strategic Local Plan Policies that are adopted subsequently (NPPF, paragraph 30)</p> <p>The governments planning practice guidance (PPG) provides further clarity on this issue stating that “ policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for example, if they conflict with policies in a local plan covering the neighbourhood area that is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan. In such cases the the more recent plan policy takes precedence” (paragraph 084 Reference ID;41-08420190509)</p>	Noted. We will amend the plan period to reflect the timescales for the emerging Local Plan.	Change to be made as indicated

				The Neighbourhood Plan is proposed to cover the period to 2031, the same as the adopted Local Plan. North West Leicestershire (NWLLP) is currently being reviewed and will cover the period up to 2039. Should the NWLLP be adopted after the SNP, it could result in policies in the SNP being out of date.		
4	A Vision for 2031 & Objectives (p10)		NWLDC	<p>What road and footpath safety infrastructure is being referred to and is this capable of being delivered through the SNP</p> <p>How will the SNP improve transport links?</p> <p>What is meant by the 'social hub scheme'?</p> <p>What is meant by promoting community areas which address age and gender needs?</p> <p>Is the community information scheme something which can be delivered through the planning system?</p> <p>In addition the links between the vision and objectives could be clearer</p>	The vision contains matters that are reflected in the policies, but also community aspirations that will be followed up by the Parish Council through Community Actions.	None
5	Planning Consent (p11)		NWLDC	<p>It would be useful for this section to reference the requirements for the SNP to meet several 'basic conditions' which are set out in planning legislation and summarised in the PPG</p> <p>(Paragraph 065 Reference ID; 41-0665-20140306)</p>	Noted. We will reference the Basic Conditions here	Change to be made as indicated
6	A Social Role (p11)			The description role has been recently updated by paragraph 8b of the NPPF (2021). For consistency it is recommended that the SNP is updated accordingly.	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated

7	Housing Provision (p12)			<p>The information on completions and commitments in the first paragraph is out of date and as such, it is suggested that it would be appropriate to delete the 3rd sentence onwards</p> <p>Given that there is no housing requirement for Swannington in the adopted Local Plan, further explanation should be provided with regards to the proposal to allocate a site for housing so that the readers of the plan are clear how this decision was reached</p> <p>One of the basic conditions of the SNP is that it should be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the NWLLP</p> <p>The adopted NWLLP (2017) does not contain a housing requirement for Swannington. However, NWLDC officers are in the process of reviewing the NWLLP, including the overall housing requirement for the District and where housing should be located. We are in the process of testing different growth scenarios which include the potential for new housing in the sustainable villages. (Which includes Swannington)</p> <p>As the review of the NWLLP is at an early stage officers are not yet in a position to provide a housing requirement for Swannington (as required by NPPF paragraph 66) In</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan can only base its policies on the latest evidence.</p> <p>It is therefore appropriate to continue with the figures as provided.</p> <p>The text will be updated to reflect this.</p>	Change to be made as indicated.
---	-------------------------	--	--	---	--	---------------------------------

			<p>such circumstances, NPPF paragraph 67 advises that neighbourhood plan bodies can request an indicative figure from the local planning authority.</p> <p>It is within the above context that planning policy officers provided a range of indicative housing figures to Swannington Parish Council (SPC) in September 2020. Three scenarios were provided which were based upon the housing land supply position at 1 April 2020 (included as Appendix 1) These ranged in requirements between 8 and 51 dwellings in the period up to 2031. Given the time that has elapsed since these scenarios were provided to SPC they have been updated based on the position at 1 April 2021 (Appendix 2) which results in a requirement between 9 and 43 dwellings</p> <p>It is noted that SPC has opted for the lowest of the housing growth options. Whilst this option is based in evidence it would be helpful to provide some justification on why it has been chosen over the other options provided by NWLDC. In order to meet this need it is proposed to allocate a site at St Georges Hill. Further comments on this allocation are made in respect of policy H1 below As advised earlier this year NWLDC policy officers are, as part of the NWLLP Review, testing various</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				housing growth and distribution scenarios, which could result in a higher housing requirement for Swannington. NPPF paragraph 29 is clear that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies. As such officers will keep SPC updated on this issue and advise on any implications for the Neighbourhood Plan		
8	Policy H1 (p13)	H1	NWLDC	<p>Officers welcome SPC's proposal to allocate a site for housing as it represents positive planning which is based in evidence. Expressing the dwelling requirement as a minimum is also supported</p> <p>To ensure the Neighbourhood Plan is clearly written and unambiguous the following revisions should be made</p> <p>Consider allocating the site for a minimum of 9 dwellings (based upon the updated evidence at Appendix 2)</p> <p>Remove the reference to a maximum dwelling figure-this is too restrictive given that the proposed mix (ie bedroom sizes) is unknown at this stage</p> <p>Amalgamate the policy requirements for the site into a single list and remove the heading 'planning conditions' (to avoid confusion with</p>	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated

				<p>the planning conditions attached to any future planning permission)</p> <p>Confirm affordable housing will be sought in accordance with NWLLP Policy H4 rather than express an affordable housing requirement in this policy. If a scheme of 11 or more new homes comes forward at this site affordable housing will be required. If the total is 10 dwellings or less there will be no requirement to provide affordable housing</p> <p>Acknowledge that some existing planting will need to be removed to access to the site</p> <p>In addition what are the 'heritage aspects' referred to in the policy and what 'high quality design and elevational treatment should be provided ? The developer of the site needs to be clear what is expected from the scheme so it would be useful to provide additional guidance</p> <p>Given the proximity of the site to Windmill View the local highways authority should be consulted whether a safe and suitable access is achievable</p>		
9	Policy H2 Settlement Boundary P15	H2	NWLDC	With regards to the second paragraph of Policy H2 it should be noted that there will be some changes of use of buildings that constitute permitted development and would not require planning permission	It is not considered necessary to refer to circumstances in which a planning approval is not required.	None

10	Figure 3 Updated Settlement Boundary (p16)		NWLDC	<p>The inclusion of the proposed allocation site within the settlement boundary is considered acceptable given that there is evidence for more housing in Swannington over the plan period</p> <p>Elsewhere the settlement boundary should accord with the Limits to Development in the adopted NWLLP and it would be helpful to confirm that this is the case</p>	<p>The new settlement boundary incorporates recent planning approvals and the NP allocation as clearly stated in the narrative.</p>	None
11	Policy H3 Housing Mix (p17)	H3	NWLDC	<p><i>SNP Policy H3 seeks to support development which incorporates three or fewer bedrooms and/or single storey accommodation whilst only supporting dwellings of four or more bedrooms where they are subservient in number to any one, two or three bedroom accommodation in any development</i></p> <p><i>The policy is not considered to be in general conformity with NWLLP Policy H6. Firstly, Policy H6 applies to developments of 10 or more dwellings rather than 'any development' Secondly Policy H6 seeks a mix which is informed by a range of evidence including the HEDNA. Whilst the HEDNA indicates a need of 1020% 4 bed dwellings the supporting text at NWLLP paragraph 7.47 recognises 'there may be a need for local variations'. It should be noted that the examiner for the Donington Le Heath Neighbourhood Plan recommends that a similar policy on housing was</i></p>	<p>The policy is based on local evidence and is considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>It is considered to be unhelpful to cherry pick Examiner comments from other NPs.</p> <p>Whilst the Examiner for Hugglescote and Donington le Heath considered a similar policy too restrictive, more recently the Examiner for Blackfordby in the District approved a similar policy, including the need to limit 4-bed houses and to apply the policy to all development.</p>	None

				<i>too prescriptive. It is recommended that the second sentence of Polic H3 is deleted</i>		
11)	Design Quality (p17)		NWLDC	Should be grade II (not grade 11)	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
12	Policy H4 Design Quality (p20/21)	H4	NWLDC	<p>The SNP should reference the NWL Good Design SPD (2017)</p> <p>i)The aspiration for car charging points is supported. However, in line with NPPF paragraph 112a it is recommended that this is amended to read ‘new development should be designed to enable charging of plug in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations</p> <p>k) it is suggested that it would be appropriate to add the following text to the end of the clause-“ in locations convenient and accessible for collection and emptying”</p> <p>m) the proposed development at St Georges Hill could provide 10 or more dwellings. Would 3 storey dwellings be appropriate at that site?</p> <p>q)Light itself, and minor domestic light fittings, are not subject to planning controls</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to repeat national policy.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>The policy criterion m) allows for this</p> <p>It would apply where planning permission is required.</p>	<p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
13	Policy H5 Affordable Housing Provision (p22)	H5	NWLDC	The provision of affordable housing is a strategic policy matter. The quantum/tenure of affordable housing provision therefor needs to be in	This is an incorrect interpretation of the policy requirement which says ‘the provision of affordable housing for people with a	None.

				<p>accordance with the requirements of NWLLP Policy H4</p> <p>It is proposed that this 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 Councils housing team. The criteria requires 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>	<p>local connection where appropriate' will be supported. It is not a blanket insistence. The comment that allowing the policy would mean that 'people in housing need who come from places with no/limited new development would never have their needs met' is simply incorrect.</p> <p>It is a shame that NWLDC take this stance when other local planning authority areas embrace the support for people in housing need to be accommodated locally.</p>	
14	Windfall Sites (p22)		NWLDC	Windfall sites are defined in the 2021 NPPF as "sites not specifically identified in the development plan" (Annex 2: Glossary)	Noted	None

15	Policy H6 Windfall Sites (p22)	H6	NWLDC	<p>For clarity, it is recommended that this policy should apply to development in the settlement boundary rather than 'infill and redevelopment sites' Any development outside the settlement boundary is covered by Policy S3 of the NWLLP</p> <p>Any overlap with Policy H4; Design (for example part e) should be removed</p>	Agreed. Development outside the settlement boundary is also covered by Policy H2 in this Neighbourhood Plan.	Change to be made as indicated.
16	Figure 5 (p26)		NWLDC	A key/marked up plan would aid the reader as it is unclear precisely what this figure shows	A key will be added to the map	Change to be made as indicated.
17	Local green space (p27)		NWLDC	<p>For context it would be useful to highlight the three 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)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) In reasonably close proximity to the community it serves (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) tranquility or richness of wildlife. (c) Local in character and is not an extensive tract of land <p>The PPG provides further guidance in terms of criteria a) and c)-The LGS should normally be within easy walking distance of the community served if public access is a key factor. In addition it should</p>	This is provided in the Appendix.	None

				not compromise blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements (paragraph 014 reference ID 37-01420140306 & paragraph 015 Reference ID 37-015-20140306)		
18	Appendix F Environmental Inventory		NWLDC	<p>The use of a quantitative scoring system to help identify sites for Designation as Local Green Space is considered overly complicated</p> <p>To be identified as Local Green Space the site must meet the three criteria at NPPF paragraph 102. The inventory at appendix F assess sites against all five examples in the demonstrably special test at NPPF 102b which means it is assessed against seven criteria in all and gives each site a quantitative score out of 25</p> <p>It is unclear why different criteria have different scores available ; for example under beauty, sites can score up to 3 points but under tranquility, sites score up to 2 points</p> <p>In addition sites that are of national/regional/county significance in historical and ecological terms are given a higher score when the test is merely to be demonstrated special to the local community</p> <p>A site could be demonstrably special to the local community solely if it offers a place of tranquillity, but this system appears to penalise sites that</p>	<p>The scoring system has been introduced to provide a rationale for the chosen sites as explained in the Appendix.</p> <p>Adopting this approach with the agreement of the local community has enabled the most special sites to come forward and has resulted in appropriate designations – as the next comment from NWLDC confirms.</p> <p>The date of the NPPF referred to in the title and table heading of App F will be updated to that of the current version</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>

				<p>do not score well across the five demonstrably special categories</p> <p>There is a risk that sites which are capable of meeting the three Local Green Space tests at NPPF paragraph 102 have not been identified as such because of the chosen scoring system</p>		
19	Policy ENV1 Local Green Space (p27)	ENV1	NWLDC	<p>Two sites have been identified as Local Green Space (Swannington Playing Field and Gorse Field) with the supporting text identifying they scored highly (17/25 or 70%)</p> <p>It is agreed these sites appear to meet the NPPF paragraph 102 tests. They are in reasonable proximity to the local community and are not extensive tracts of land. However, so it can be clearly demonstrated that the SNP is consistent with national policy it would be more helpful for the evidence to explicitly state what makes these sites demonstrably special</p>	<p>Agreed. Appendix G (Evidence Base for Local Green Spaces) will have the descriptions augmented to demonstrate why they are special.</p> <p>The heading for the table (AppG) will also be updated to give the date of the current latest NPPF.</p>	Change to be made as indicated.
20	Policy ENV2 Open Space (p 28/29)	ENV2	NWLDC	<p>This policy also seeks to protect open spaces but affords a lower level of protection than a Local Green Space; any development proposals on these sites will be resisted but they are not protected for the duration of the plan period. The policy seeks to protect these spaces from development “unless open space is replaced by equivalent or better provision in an equally suitable location or unless the open space no longer required by the community</p>	Noted	

				<p>Swannington Playing Field is identified as a LGS in ENV1. The same audit reference (302) is used for Main Street/Jeffcoates Lane Playing Field in Policy ENV2. Are these the same site? If so why is it featured in both policies?</p>	<p>This site is currently designated as 'local open space' (one of the NWLDC OSSR typologies) in the 2008 PPG17 <i>Open Spaces Audit</i>. The draft SNP designates it as Local Green Space but this designation was technically pending, depending on the two statutory consultations and Examination, at the time of drafting. Omitting it from policy ENV2 at this stage would have misled residents and consultees and could, if the LGS designation is refused at a later stage, accidentally result in its complete omission from the Made SNP. It will be retained under both policies until the LGS designation is assured. A note explaining the duplication will be added to the narrative for both policies ENV1 and 2</p>	<p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>
				<p>For the remainder of the sites identified in this policy it is not clear why these have failed to meet the Local Green Space Criteria at NPPF paragraph 102</p>	<p>The eligibility criteria (as in NPPF para 101-102 and the relevant PPG) for LGSs have been applied rigorously in SNP, and the inventory of sites of environmental significance in the Plan Area was</p>	<p>No action</p>

				<p>Walkers Wood offers recreational opportunities and is stated on the National Forest Website to incorporate a range of different wildlife habitats (woodland, meadow, wildflower species, wetland area and hedgerows) yet in the inventory is not considered to have any natural environment significance (it scores 0). Notwithstanding the fact that a site does not need to be of national/regional/county significance to be demonstrably special to the local community has an error been made?</p> <p>It is recommended that the assessment of open spaces is revisited so that they are assessed against the three NPPF 102 criteria alone</p>	<p>therefore undertaken on the assumption that only a few sites – the highest scoring, above a threshold of 17+/25 agreed by the NP Advisory Committee – should qualify. The other sites listed under policy ENV2 scored highly for ‘recreational value’ but not necessarily under other criteria, and therefore did not reach the 17/25 threshold.</p> <p>This is an inadvertent omission. As currently non-designated for habitat/species with no significant local records, Walkers Wood will be allocated a score of 2 under ‘wildlife’</p> <p>This has been the practice followed</p>	<p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>No action</p>
21	Policy ENV3. Sites of natural Environment	ENV3/4	NWLDC	The SNP goes on to identify of Natural Environment Significance, those which scored 3 or higher in the environmental inventory (ie at least of		

	significance and Policy ENV4 Protecting & Enhancing Biodiversity (p30/31)			<p>county significance) The policy seeks to protect such sites and says that “The significance of the species habitats or features present should be balanced against the local benefit of any development that would adversely affect them</p> <p>This part of the policy is inconsistent with the NPPF. The correct test to be applied is at NPPF paragraph 180 and applies to all biodiversity interest rather than just statutory sites. The paragraph 180 test has been incorporated in policy ENV4 and as such it is queried whether Policy ENV3 is necessary or whether it could be amalgamated with Policy ENV4</p>	<p>The wording of Policy ENV 3 will be brought into line with the current NPPF. Note that there is a difference between the intended application of policies ENV 3 (site-specific, to be applied to specific biodiversity sites of demonstrably high local (or higher) significance) and ENV 4 (general, to be applied when assessing the adverse effect on biodiversity of all planning proposals in the Plan Area)</p> <p>NB: All references to NPPF and UK legislation in this section need to be brought up to date at the time of Submission</p>	<p>Change to be made as indicated.</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>
22	Historic Environment (p31-34)		NWLDC	<p>The Council’s Conservation Officer comments, “It is not clear as to why” non-designated heritage assets” have been sub divided into two separate categories (“sites of historic environment significance” and “local heritage assets”) subject to two separate plan policies. The categorisation should be omitted and</p>	<p>Policy ENV 5 covers <i>sites</i> (i.e. areas of land with visible features (earthworks or structures) or proven buried archaeology) <i>of historic environment significance</i>; it covers all such sites, not just NDHAs. Policy ENV 6 covers</p>	<p>None</p>

			<p>non-designated heritage assets should be subject to one plan policy</p> <p>A neighbourhood plan should identify clear criteria for the identification of heritage assets. The (SNP) contains no criteria for identifying “local heritage assets”</p> <p>The (SNP) contains criteria for identifying “sites of historic environment significance but the criteria are broad and opaque.</p> <p>The ‘environmental inventory’ contains 18 sites that score at least 3/5 for the ‘history criterion’ Does fig 9 indicate all eighteen sites</p>	<p>buildings and structures of historic significance that are not Listed, thus NDHAs by definition. Although the policy wordings are similar, their application when planning proposals are determined will be different, so separate policies have been included for clarity.</p> <p>The specific criteria listed have been endorsed for Neighbourhood Plans by the Leics CC Archaeologist and have passed examination in other NPs. All but two of the assets shown on figure 9 are existing Leics HER designations. The additional two have been identified locally and the criteria for their inclusion are in Appendix F.</p> <p>Figure 9 shows the 18 numbered parcels of land that consist of, or are part of, the historically significant sites of relevance to planning matters recorded in the Leicestershire Historic Environment Record. There are c.9 actual HER records but some extend over several parcels</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------

				<p>The term 'designated heritage asset' would be preferable to the term 'statutorily protected heritage asset'</p> <p>Page 32 refers to designated heritage assets and says that development should take into account "their settings as defined (on a case by case basis) by Historic England". Historic England has defined the term "setting" But it is not responsible for defining the setting of designated heritage assets "on a case by case basis"</p>	<p>Designated heritage assets are not by necessarily statutorily protected: the distinction needs to be made.</p> <p>While the NPPF (and Historic England) defines the <i>term</i> ('the area within which an asset is experienced'), the practical definition of what this means in the case of an individual asset potentially affected by a development proposal, or close enough to a site allocation in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan to result in the need for the SEA screening process to be invoked, is determined (defined) by Historic England on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
23	Statutorily Protected Heritage Assets		NWLDC	I appreciate there is no policy for these assets as listed buildings are afforded protection by other areas of the planning system. However, if they are to be included in the NP, I suggest that they are listed and mapped in the document itself to avoid the need to cross reference	They are listed in Appendix H	None
24	Policy ENV6 Local Heritage Assets (p33/34)	ENV6	NWLDC	The draft NP refers to "local heritage assets" or "non designated local heritage assets" and this terminology should be corrected to - "non-designated heritage assets". This	Agreed, although 'local heritage assets' is the term used by Historic England in the <i>Guidelines</i> followed by other Neighbourhood Plans	Change to be made as indicated.

			<p>approach has been supported at other recent Neighbourhood Plan examinations in the District</p> <p>Policy ENV6 should reflect the test at NPPF paragraph 203 with regards to non- designated heritage assets, “in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”</p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer has commented that</p> <p>“The District Council has identified three local heritage assets; The former National School, The former Primitive Methodist Chapel and the former vicarage house on Loughborough Road. Policy ENV6 refers to the school and the chapel but it does not refer to the vicarage house. In May 2021 the examiner(for the Hugglescote Neighbourhood Plan) asked a question about local heritage assets that had been excluded from the relevant NP Policy and “the justification to exclude them”</p> <p>I would support the recognition of The Station Inn and the former Bulls Head Inn. I would not support the recognition of The Robin Hood PH which is a standard late nineteenth century public house. I wonder</p>	<p>identifying candidates for this sub-class of NDHA</p> <p>The Policy reflects this already.</p> <p>For completeness and easy reference, the SNP records the 11 ‘non-listed buildings’ (=non-designated heritage assets, see 24) already in the Leics. Historic Environment Record (HER). This list was considered to be adequate, and representative of the Plan Area’s built heritage, by the NP committee, so no further NDHA buildings have been proposed in the Plan. The committee also considered it inappropriate to remove any existing HER entries. If acceptable to the occupiers/owners*, the three additional NDHAs identified by NWLDC can</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>NWLDC?</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---------------------------------------

				<p>whether the former Fountain PH was considered for recognition</p> <p>I would support the recognition of Manor Farm. I am surprised that the draft NP does not recognise 32 Main Street which is dated 1706 and is adjacent to a listed building. I am surprised that it does not recognise 45 and 47 Main Street which were built in the early nineteenth century and which were used as a post office in the early twentieth century</p> <p>I would not support the recognition of 12 to 16 Hough Hill, "Station Row"(15to41 Station Hill) "Station Terrace (64 to 70 Station Hill) "St Georges Terrace" (2 to 18 St Georges Hill). These are terraced houses erected after 1846 on sites outside the historic settlement envelope. There are similar terraced houses inside the historic settlement envelope (4 to 16 Spring Lane, 19 to 23 Main Street, 61 to 69 Main Street, were these houses considered for recognition?</p>	<p>be added to the Plan by NWLDC (and to the Leics HER?) <i>after submission</i>. [*Inclusion of NDHA buildings in the draft Neighbourhood Plan provides an opportunity for occupiers/owners to comment or object during the statutory consultations – this does not happen with HER or Local Authority NDHA candidates]</p>	
25	Policy ENV7 Important Views (p35/36)	ENV7	NWLDC	<p>The Views listed in this policy (and shown in the photographs at Appendix 1) are of general countryside rather than of specific landmarks or structures. The views are therefore so widespread that this effectively amounts to a strategic policy which is inappropriate for a neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>The Policy requires development proposals to respect the views.</p> <p>Once again the District Council has referenced a NP examination which supports its comments but ignored others where important views of open</p>	Change to be made as indicated.

				<p>The examiner for the Hugglescote Neighbourhood Plan recommended modifying a similar policy to read “development proposals which would significantly harm the rural setting of the village and will not be supported” and it is advised that Policy ENV7 is amended accordingly</p>	<p>countryside have passed examination (see Blackfordby).</p> <p>We will add a clause allowing mitigation.</p>	
26	Footpaths, bridleways and byways (p36)		NWLDC	<p>Policy ENV8 seeks to protect the existing public right of way network. NWLDC’s Health and Wellbeing Team have advised that it is currently consulting on a new Walking and Cycling Strategy (2022-2032). The document identifies a potential cycling route (p22) which travels through Swannington, utilizing the disused rail line north-west of Coalville to connect to the Cloud Trail</p> <p>It is noted that there is nothing in the SNP as drafted that would prevent this cycleway being delivered. However the SNP could make reference and provide support to this potential new route</p>	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
27	Policy ENV9 Flood Risk Resilience and Climate Change (p38/39)	ENV9	NWLDC	<p>It is suggested that consideration as to whether this policy is needed given that flood risk is adequately dealt with in national and local planning policy</p> <p>Figure 14-should make it clear to the reader what the different blue areas represent</p> <p>The inclusion of a balancing test in the first paragraph of Policy ENV9 is inconsistent with the NPPF</p>	<p>We believe that the policy adds local weight to an important issue.</p> <p>The map will be updated (latest Environment Agency mapping) and a key will be added.</p> <p>Noted. The policy wording will be changed to require</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p>

				<p>The requirements in the third part of the policy are in places inconsistent with the NPPF paragraphs 167,168 and169 of the NPPF as well as being too onerous for minor development</p> <p>To avoid conflict and potential confusion to applicants I would suggest deleting this policy from the SNP</p>	<p>development to meet the sequential test.</p> <p>We will amend the policy to relate to major development only.</p>	Change to be made as indicated
28	Policy ENV10 Renewable energy generation infrastructure (p40/41	ENV10	NWLDC	<p>The figure reference is currently missing from the policy</p> <p>Currently the policy reads that if a proposal is not locally initiated then it would not be acceptable. It is suggested that the policy is reworded to read” Proposals for single small-scale(turbines less than 30m) particularly those that are local resident, business, amenity or community-initiated</p>	<p>The figure is illustrative only</p> <p>This is the intention of the wording, so addition of the qualifying ‘particularly’ would allow developers other than those listed to bring proposals forward. The policy is considered to be a positive manifestation of the veto provided by the Ministerial Statement on turbines and local communities</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
29	Policy CF2: New or Improved Community Facilities	CF2	NWLDC	Should this refer to the relevant design criteria in Policy H4	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
30	Policy E1 Support for Existing Employment	E1	NWLDC	The vacancy period of 12 months in Policy E1 is inconsistent with NWLLP Policy Ec3 which requires a vacancy of at least 6 months. The SNP should	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.

	Opportunities (p44/45)			be amended to ensure consistency with the NWLLP-a similar change was requested by the examiner of the Hugglescote Neighbourhood Plan		
31	Policy E2 Support for new employment opportunities	E2	NWLDC	Part a) is inconsistent with NWLLP Policy S3 which confirms that employment land is an appropriate use in the countryside, subject to the provisions of NWLLP Policy Ec2	Policy E2 allows for development outside the settlement boundary if suitable for a countryside location.	None
32	Policy E6 Broadband	E6	NWLLDC	It is not clear as to whether this would apply to residential developments as well. In addition, whilst 30Mbps may be appropriate at the current time, as technology develops it may no longer be appropriate. Furthermore, it would conflict with policy IF1 of the adopted local plan which does not specify any speeds. Therefore it is suggested that the requirement for at least 30Mbps could be removed and replaced with "All new developments should have access to the highest broadband speed that is technologically available" This is to ensure that there is no conflict with NWLLP Policy IF1 but would also help to futureproof the policy	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated.
33	Policy T4 Electric Car Charging	T4	NWLDC	There is no Policy T3 in this document In relation to the first part of the policy, please see the comments made above in relation to Policy H4 With regards to the second part of the policy there is the potential to conflict with the General Permitted	Agreed Noted Noted	Change to be made as indicated. None None

				Development Order. Schedule 2, Part 2, Class D & Class E confirms the installation of electrical charging outlets in lawful off street parking areas constitute permitted development (subject to certain requirements)		
34	General	General	M Joyce [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Against development on green Land	Noted.	None
35	Sec 1 p13		Vic & Barbara Whitehouse [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<p>Settlement Boundaries become meaningless if they keep being moved</p> <p>Providing up to 12 properties will give the impression of crowding, hence lack of space in their local/ immediate environment. Therefor the development would not fit in with the aesthetics of the local neighbourhood. Properties on St Georges Hill have access leading on to the main Road</p> <p>Properties need to be no more that eight as a maximum otherwise sense of crowding and change of the villag's visual appearance and character becomes altered</p> <p>Why does the village need more properties, especially now that the Spring Lane develop[ment has gone through planning ?</p> <p>Existing green assets -to be retained- there are hedges and well-</p>	<p>It is necessary to move the settlement boundaries to accommodate appropriate growth.</p> <p>Noted. The District Council has set a housing requirement for the Parish of up to 43 dwellings, so Swannington has to accept this level of development.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

				established trees surrounding this site including an old ash tree, approx. 150 years old		
36		H1	Vic & Barbara Whitehouse	All eight (maximum number) properties to be affordable and/or privately owned bungalows to accommodate older people as referred to in the plan	Noted. The requirement for affordable housing is set by the District Council as a proportion of the overall site for developments above 10 dwellings. The NP cannot require a greater level of affordable housing than this.	None
37		H2		Policy sounds good within the (newly designated so disagree with this) settlement unless the settlement boundary is changed again, therefore, as mentioned above (comments to pg 13) becomes meaningless if the boundaries keep being moved		
38		Policy6	Vic & Barbara Whitehouse	Windfall Sites are the way forward for the village and not developments Lack of publicity. This pre submission plan has not received the publicity it rightly deserves. The plan can be found on the Parish Council Website but only if villagers know about it and have the facility to look at it. The other form of communication is by word of mouth. Originally it was believed that the consultation process would incur a meeting at the village hall at the end of the process and not left to parishioners to guess the outcome	Noted We feel that the process has been adhered to. The long delays due to Covid have not helped the impetus. The initial survey to all 500 plus dwellings resulted in a 16% response. The website displayed the plan and stakeholders were notified.	None
39		General	Vic & Barbara Whitehouse	Please keep us updated on progress with the development of the Neighbourhood Plan	Thank you	None

40		General	Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 02 February 2022</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p>	Noted	None
41			Leicestershire County Council	<p>Highways Specific Comments Page 13 – Housing Provision - Should a planning application come forward,</p>	Noted	None

				<p>there would be a requirement for an access to be provided to Leicestershire Highways Design Guide standards, however given the scale of development there would not be a requirement for a footway/footpath.</p> <p>Transport - It is noted that there is no reference to public transport provision within the plan. The village does however benefit from having good bus links to nearby Coalville and Swadlincote. The service operates seven days a week on an hourly frequency.</p>		
41			Leicestershire County Council	<p>General Comments</p> <p>The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth. Like very many local authorities, the County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded from</p>	Noted	None

				<p>third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding.</p> <p>To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems.</p> <p>Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provided as a commuted sum.</p> <p>In regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped ie they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third-party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third-party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures</p>		
42			Leicestershire County Council	<p>Flood Risk Management The County Council are fully aware of flooding that has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding,</p>	Noted	None

				<p>review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a statutory consultee on major planning applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure that the onsite drainage systems are designed in accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage solution.</p> <p>The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation. • Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development. • Require development to resolve existing flood risk. <p>When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)). 		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map). • Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding. • How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff. • Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk. <p>All development will be required to restrict the discharge and retain surface water on site in line with current government policies. This should be undertaken through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites when considering the housing density to ensure that the potential site will not limit the ability for good SuDS design to be carried out. Consideration should also be given to blue green corridors and how they could be used to</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, including benefits to surrounding areas.</p> <p>Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.</p> <p>LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies.</p> <p>For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning Practice Guidance webpage.</p> <p>Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals.</p> <p>Risk of flooding from surface water map: https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk</p> <p>Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</p>		
43			Leicestershire County Council	<p>Planning Minerals & Waste Planning</p> <p>The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development. Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood. You should also be aware of Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Areas, contained within the</p>	Noted	None

				<p>adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan (Leicestershire.gov.uk). These safeguarding areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect minerals resources or waste operations. The County Council can provide guidance on this if your neighbourhood plan is allocating development in these areas or if any proposed neighbourhood plan policies may impact on minerals and waste provision.</p>		
44			Leics CC	<p>Property Education Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two-mile (primary) and three-mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places. It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school. However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure</p>	Noted	None

				that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.		
45			Leics CC	Strategic Property Services No comment at this time.	Noted	None
46			Leics CC	Adult Social Care It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and that development seeks to include bungalows etc of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.	Noted	None
47			Leics CC	Environment General Comments With regard to the environment and in line with Government advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of archaeology and the historic and natural environment including heritage assets, archaeological sites, listed and	Noted	None

				unlisted historic buildings, historic landscapes, climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land.		
48			Leics CC	<p>Archaeology and the Historic Environment</p> <p>The planning process provides one of the most effective tools to manage the impact of land use change upon the historic environment. This is achieved both through the shaping of development plans (Local and Neighbourhood Plans) and the delivery of development management advice on individual planning applications. In that context, the inclusion of heritage in your Neighbourhood Plan, and the provision of relevant and effective policies, will significantly strengthen the management of these issues, and will be an effective way of the community identifying its own concerns and priorities.</p> <p>Ideally, Neighbourhood Plans should seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver this strategic objective, based on robust local evidence and priorities. We recommend that each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential</p>	Noted	None

				<p>development or management decisions on the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. The historic environment is defined as comprising all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving evidence of past human activity, whether upstanding, buried or submerged, as well landscapes and their historic components.</p> <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (LRHER) can provide a summary of archaeological and historic environment information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include gazetteers and maps describing the locally identified non-designated heritage assets, typically archaeological sites (both earthworks and buried archaeological remains), unlisted historic buildings and historic landscapes (parks and gardens). We will also provide information on medieval ridge and furrow earthworks to help you evaluate the surviving earthworks in your area. Information on Designated assets (Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>and Gardens, Battlefields) is available from the National Heritage List for England (NHLE). https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/</p> <p>Consideration of the historic environment, and its constituent designated and non-designated heritage assets, is a material consideration in the planning process. While the data held by the LRHER is constantly maintained and updated, it is unlikely that the record represents an exhaustive list of all assets with the plan area. We suggest that information provided by the LRHER should be taken into account when preparing the Neighbourhood Plan and contribute to any list of locally identified heritage assets. Based upon a structured assessment process, this will be the basis of any non-designated heritage assets identified within the plan and given force through the preparation of appropriate heritage policy. Contact: her@leics.gov.uk, or phone 0116 305 8323 For help with including heritage in your Neighbourhood Plan please see the following guidance: CBA Toolkit No. 10, Neighbourhood Planning (2017)</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				https://www.archaeologyuk.org/asset/6FE3A721-B328-4B75-9DEBBD0028A4AEED/ National Trust Guide to Heritage in Neighbourhood Plans (2019) https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/documents/neighbourhood-planning-and-heritageguidance.pdf		
49			Leics CC	Climate Change The County Council through its Environment Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire's resilience to the existing and predicted changes in climate. Furthermore, LCC has declared a climate emergency along with most other UK councils. The County Council has committed to becoming carbon neutral as a council by 2030 and to working with others to keep global temperature rise to less than 1.5 degrees Celsius, which will mean in effect needing to achieve carbon neutrality for Leicestershire by 2050 or before. Planning is one of the key levers for enabling these commitments to be met and to meeting the legally binding target set by the government for the UK to be carbon neutral by 2050. Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek	Noted	None

				to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and to increasing the county's resilience to climate change.		
50			Leics CC	<p>Landscape</p> <p>The County Council would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account Natural England's Landscape character areas; Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy; the Local District/Borough Council landscape character assessments and the Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study for Leicester and Leicestershire (2017) which examines the sensitivity of the landscape, exploring the extent to which different areas can accommodate development without impacting on their key landscape qualities. We would recommend that Neighbourhood Plans should also consider the street scene and public realm within their communities, further advice can be found in the latest 'Streets for All East Midlands' Advisory Document (2006) published by English Heritage.</p> <p>LCC would encourage the development of local listings as per the National Planning Policy</p>	Noted	None

				<p>Framework (NPPF) and LCC have some data on the social, cultural, archaeological and historic value of local features and buildings (https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-andcommunity/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record)</p>		
51			Leics CC	<p>Biodiversity The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, providing net gain for biodiversity, and reducing pollution. Neighbourhood Plans should therefore seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver a strategic approach to protecting and improving the natural environment based on local evidence and priorities. Each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential development or management of open spaces on enhancing</p>	Noted	None

				<p>biodiversity and habitat connectivity, such as hedgerows and greenways. Also, habitat permeability for habitats and species which addresses encouragement of movement from one location to another such as the design of street lighting, roads, noise, obstructions in water, exposure of species to predation and arrangement of land-uses.</p> <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of protected and priority Biodiversity Action Plan species.</p> <p>These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent Habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				Contact: planningecology@leics.gov.uk, or phone 0116 305 4108		
52			Leics CC	<p>Green Infrastructure Green infrastructure (GI) A network of multi-functional green and blue spaces and other natural features, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental, economic, health and wellbeing benefits for nature, climate, local and wider communities and prosperity (NPPF definition). As a network, GI includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/churchyards allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls.</p> <p>The NPPF places the duty on local authorities to plan positively for a strategic network of GI which can deliver a range of planning policies including: building a strong, competitive economy; creating a sense of place and promote good design; promoting healthier communities by providing greater opportunities for recreation and mental and physical health benefits; meeting the challenges of climate change and flood risk; increasing biodiversity and</p>	Noted	None

				<p>conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Looking at the existing provision of GI networks within a community can influence the plan for creating & enhancing new networks and this assessment can then be used to inform CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedules, enabling communities to potentially benefit from this source of funding.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and in doing so they should ensure that their Neighbourhood Plan is reflective of the relevant Local Authority Green Infrastructure strategy.</p> <p>Through the Neighbourhood Plan and discussions with the Local Authority Planning teams and potential Developers communities are well placed to influence the delivery of local scale GI networks.</p>		
53			Leics CC	<p>Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land</p> <p>The NPPF encourages the effective use of brownfield land for development, provided that it is not of high environmental/ecological value. Neighbourhood planning groups should check</p>	Noted	None

				<p>with Defra if their neighbourhood planning area includes brownfield sites. Where information is lacking as to the ecological value of these sites then the Neighbourhood Plan could include policies that ensure such survey work should be carried out to assess the ecological value of a brownfield site before development decisions are taken.</p> <p>Soils are an essential finite resource on which important ecosystem services such as food production, are dependent on. They should be enhanced in value and protected from adverse effects of unacceptable levels of pollution. Within the governments "Safeguarding our Soils" strategy, Defra have produced a code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites which could be helpful to neighbourhood planning groups in preparing environmental policies.</p> <p>High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification.		
54			Leics CC	Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) Information for Neighbourhood Planning groups regarding Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) can be found on the Neighbourhood Planning website (www.neighbourhoodplanning.org) and should be referred to. As taken from the website, a Neighbourhood Plan must meet certain basic conditions in order to be 'made'. It must not breach and be otherwise compatible with EU obligations. One of these obligations is Directive 2001/42/EC 'on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment' (Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations, 2004, available online). This is often referred to as the SEA Directive. Not every Neighbourhood Plan needs a SEA, however, it is compulsory to provide when submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority either:	Noted	None

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of reasons as to why SEA was not required • An environmental report (a key output of the SEA process). <p>As the UK has now left the EU, Neighbourhood Planning groups should remain mindful of any future changes which may occur to the above guidance.</p>		
55			Leics CC	<p>Impact of Development on Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC)</p> <p>Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and Leicestershire County Council. The County's Waste Management team considers proposed developments on a case by case basis and when it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the local HWRC infrastructure then appropriate projects to increase the capacity to off-set the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire's Planning Obligations Policy (2019) and the relevant Legislation Regulations.</p>	Noted	None
56			Leics CC	<p>Communities</p> <p>Consideration of community facilities is a positive facet of Neighbourhood Plans that reflects</p>	Noted	None

				<p>the importance of these facilities within communities and can proactively protect and develop facilities to meet the needs of people in local communities. Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carry out and report on a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. 2. Set out policies that seek to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect and retain these existing facilities, • support the independent development of new facilities, and, • identify and protect Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations. 3. Identify and support potential community projects that could be progressed. <p>You are encouraged to consider and respond to all aspects of community resources as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. Further information, guidance and examples of policies and supporting information is available at www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/useful-information.</p>		
57			Leics CC	<p>Economic Development We would recommend including economic development aspirations with your Plan, outlining</p>	Noted	None

				what the community currently values and whether they are open to new development of small businesses etc.		
58			Leics CC	<p>Fibre Broadband</p> <p>High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a fast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life.</p> <p>All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to ultrafast broadband (of at least 100Mbps) and allow mechanisms for securing a full fibre broadband provision for each premise and business from at least one network operator, provided on an open access basis. Such provider must deploy a Fibre to the Premise (FTTP) access network structure in which optical fibre runs from a local exchange to each premise.</p> <p>Developers should take active steps to incorporate adequate broadband provision at the preplanning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure fibre broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete. Where practical, developers</p>	Noted	None

				<p>should consider engaging several telecoms providers to encourage competition and consumer choice.</p> <p>The Council supports a 'dig once' approach for the deployment of communications infrastructure and a build which is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Council encourages telecommunications build which does not significantly impact on the appearance of any building or space on which equipment is located and which minimises street clutter.</p>		
59			Leics CC	<p>Equalities</p> <p>While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council's Equality Strategy 2020-2024 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work. A copy of the strategy can be view at: https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2020/7/10/Equality-strategy-2020-2024.pdf</p> <p>The Neighbourhood plan should comply with the main requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty. This requires public bodies to have due regard of the need to:</p>	Noted	None

				<p>Eliminate discrimination Advance equality of opportunity Foster good relations between different people</p>		
60			Leics CC	<p>Accessible Documents In today's working environment more and more information is being produced digitally. When producing information which is aimed at or to be viewed by the public, it is important to make that information as accessible as possible. At least 1 in 5 people in the UK have a long-term illness, impairment or disability. Many more have a temporary disability. Accessibility means more than putting things online. It means making your content and design clear and simple enough so that most people can use it without needing to adapt it, while supporting those who do need to adapt things. For example, someone with impaired vision might use a screen reader (software that lets a user navigate a website and 'read out' the content), braille display or screen magnifier. Or someone with motor difficulties might use a special mouse, speech recognition software or on-screen keyboard emulator. Public sector organisations have a legal requirement to make sure that all information which</p>	Noted	None

				<p>appears on their websites is accessible. As Neighbourhood Plans have to be published on Local Planning Authority websites, they too have to comply with government regulations for accessibility. Guidance for creating accessible Word and PDF documents can be found on the Leicestershire Communities website under the heading</p>		
61			Coal Authority	<p>Thank you for your notification received on the 3rd February 2022 in respect of the above consultation.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. As a statutory consultee, The Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.</p> <p>Our records indicate that within the Neighbourhood Plan area there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including; mine entries, shallow coal workings and reported surface hazards. These features pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety.</p> <p>The Coal Authority's records also indicate that surface coal resource is</p>	Noted	None

				<p>present on the site, although this should not be taken to imply that mineral extraction would be economically viable, technically feasible or environmentally acceptable. As you will be aware those authorities with responsibility for minerals planning and safeguarding will have identified where they consider minerals of national importance are present in your area and related policy considerations. As part of the planning process consideration should be given to such advice in respect of the indicated surface coal resource.</p> <p>It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan includes at Figure 2 and housing site allocation. I have reviewed this against our data and can confirm that it does not appear that coal mining legacy features are present on this site at surface or shallow depth. Should any additional sites be proposed for future allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan we would expect these to be assessed against our downloadable GIS data, which we provide to North West Leicestershire District Council.</p>		
62			National Highways	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission version of the Swannington Parish Neighbourhood Plan dated June 2021, which covers the period up to 2031.</p>	Noted	None

				<p>It is noted that the document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out several key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications. National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth.</p> <p>In relation to the Swannington Neighbourhood Plan, our principal interest is in safeguarding the M1 and A42 which route approximately 6.5km to the east and 3km to the west respectively from the centre of the plan area.</p> <p>We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish of Swannington is required to be in conformity with the North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC) strategic policies and this is acknowledged</p> <p>Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363</p> <p>within the document. However, this should be reviewed and updated as required through the ongoing review of the NWLDC Local Plan.</p> <p>Having reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan it is noted that although there is no specific housing requirement for Swannington in the Local Plan, the Neighbourhood Plan has undertaken an assessment of potential residential development sites in a positive approach to securing sustainable development and to help meet a local need, over the Plan period. However, it is noted that these development sites are small in scale and therefore will not result in any significant transport related impact, with only Policy H1 identifying 12 dwellings at St Georges Hill.</p> <p>There are no new facilities or schools planned however, Policy CF2: New or Improved Community facilities and Policy CF3: Primary School indicate that new / improved community facilities or expansion to the existing primary school would be supported.</p> <p>In terms of employment land allocations, no strategic sites have been identified, with employment opportunities within the parish, limited in scale. It is noted that many established businesses run from home-based facilities within the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>village, with this trend is likely to continue.</p> <p>Due to the limited level of growth currently being proposed across the Neighbourhood Plan area, we do not expect that there will be any impacts on the operation of the SRN.</p> <p>We have no further comments to provide and trust that the above is useful in the progression of the Swannington Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--