

Burton Overy Neighbourhood Plan

Pre-submission consultation responses

No.	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
1	Page 53 ENV 3 Area of separation	Gt Glen PC	The provision of a buffer is welcomed. A well constructed and considered plan to meet the needs of all those living within the plan area.	Thank you for these comments.	None
2	Page 8 Final paragraph into Page 9	J. Swain	'The plan will be kept under review and may change over time in response to new and changing needs and requirements.' The right of Parishioners to be consulted on any change to the finalised Plan should be written into the Plan. I look forward to hearing that these comments have been considered and the appropriate alterations are being made before the Plan is finally submitted.	Thank you for taking the trouble to read and comment on the draft Neighbourhood Plan. No formal review can be undertaken by the Parish Council and implemented without formal statutory processes being applied, including pre-submission and post-submission 6-week consultation and a further referendum.	None
	Page 11 Third paragraph		The brickwork of The Springs was built in 1930s.	Thank you for pointing this out. We have amended the NP accordingly.	Text revised to say 'The rest is red brick of varying ages, including interesting brick detailing on such as the Springs in Carlton Lane built in the late 1930's.
	Page 12 Third paragraph		If you exclude The Old Club House behind White Cottage off Bell Lane,	Thank you. Text amended to reflect a total of 135	Amendment made as indicated.

			I think there are 135 dwellings in the Parish.	houses.	
	Page 13 under table headed Number of bedrooms		The figures appear to relate to 189 dwellings.	This is because the Census data from 2011 identifies two properties with no bedrooms.	None.
	Page 22 Second paragraph		The "group of buildings" are not known as Scotland. At the crossroads, the lane to the East was called School Lane turning into Elms Lane at Rose Cottage. There was concern when the Clerk to The Parish Council had the name School Lane removed and road sign altered to Elms Lane. Eventually the lane to the West of the crossroads became known as Rectory End. The whole area of the Village to the North of the crossroads is known as Scotland.	Thank you for this clarification. We have removed the reference to 'known as Scotland '.	Reference to 'Scotland' removed.
	Page 26		Why has the Policy item e. been removed? "It respects the shape and form of Burton Overy in order to maintain it's distinctive character, and to enhance it where possible" should remain.	This is because development needs to be within the defined limits to development therefore it will, by definition, respect the shape and form of the village, in conjunction with policy DBE1 a).	None.
	Page 50		Figure 11 is not the clearest but it appears that on Main Street, Thatched Cottage has lost its Listed Building protection.	Thank you. The map is from the Historic England map of listed buildings. It is proposed that it remains as officially listed.	None.

3	8 page document – UKLC	Leicestershire CC	The response from LCC included general comments and was not related to the Burton Overy NP.	Thank you for these general comments about neighbourhood planning.	None.
4		Environment Agency	Whilst your Plan area does include land within Flood Zones 2 and 3 associated with Main River and ordinary watercourses, land within the actual 'Limits of Development' contains no such constraints and as such the Environment Agency would have no concerns on the Plan as submitted with regards to those issues falling within our remit.	Noted.	None.
5	8 separate response forms submitted - UKLC	Mr & Mrs Muir They would like to be kept informed about progress of the NP	I have not been able to simplify the points enough to summarise in this form.	See response from landmark below	
6	POLICY DBE1: DESIGN, section h	P Hadfield	The only means of ensuring that newly-built houses do not continue to unnecessarily damage the climate is to specify an enforceable standard. Two worthwhile, enforceable and widely used standards are available currently are the Passivhouse standard and the Nearly Zero Energy Buildings standard (being developed). An enforceable standard such as these should be included here.	Thank you for this comment. Neighbourhood Plans cannot be this prescriptive and the need to build to this standard is beyond the government requirements and would impact on viability.	None.

	POLICY ENV 3: BIODIVERSITY GENERAL Riparian corridor b		Could the beautiful over-arched section of the Gartree Road from the stream eastwards, where the hedges are ancient both sides, be added to the wildlife corridor which otherwise ends at the ford there? It wouldn't go all the way to up to the current Burton-to-Ilston Road, but just along the edge of field 5 only, until the latter edge meets the corner of field 6.	Thank you. All sites were reviewed as part of the process of establishing the range of environmental protections and this was not identified for inclusion.	None
	"Protection of valued and important views"		There are important views from the footpaths to the north of the village, which were marked on the paper Master Plan but are omitted here.	Thank you for this comment. It is felt that the most important views have been captured in the text and it is not appropriate to add further views at this stage.	None
7	General	HDC	The community should be complimented on getting the Burton Overy NDP to this stage. It is a comprehensive plan which focusses on local issues. We look forward to receiving the Plan submission in due course.	Thank you for this helpful comment.	None.
		HDC	Page 7 (next to last paragraph): Amend to reflect that the new Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 will replace the adopted Core Strategy 2006–2028 (including retained policies from the Harborough District Local Plan 2001). Housing provision (2nd paragraph):	Agreed Agreed.	Words amended as proposed. Words amended.

		<p>Proposed Submission Local Plan was consulted on in late 2017 and states there is a residual requirement of 4,660 dwellings to 2031.</p> <p>Environmental Inventory: Much of the detail in this section could be in an appendix.</p> <p>FIG.4: As sites 174 and 057 are not referred to in Policy ENV1: Local Green Spaces. I would suggest it is unnecessary to show them on the map.</p> <p>FIG. 8: The boundary to site 057 is different to the boundary shown for the same site on FIG.4.</p> <p>FIG.11: Boundary shown for Scheduled Monument is different to that shown on FIG.4.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parish Council wish to keep the background and descriptive information in the NP to provide context for the reader.</p> <p>We would prefer to keep them there for completeness. They are clearly marked as separate to the LGS.</p> <p>Figure 4 is the Open Space map and the boundary to the land in question. Figure 8 is showing something different and represents specific earthworks which overlap the boundary.</p> <p>Figure 4 is the Open Space map and the boundary to the land in question. Figure 8 is showing something different and represents specific</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	---	--	--

				earthworks which overlap the boundary.	
	S1	HDC	<p>Policy S1: The policy at present does not make sense as the brackets are in the wrong place. Also I would suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'within the Plan area' is unnecessary as it is a Plan for the Parish only; and o 'subject to design and amenity considerations' is unnecessary as covered by 'where it complies with the policies of this Neighbourhood Plan'. 	<p>Agreed. Brackets to close after '... sporting facilities'</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Amendment as indicated.</p> <p>Amendment as indicated.</p> <p>Amendment as indicated.</p>
	Housing Policy	HDC	<p>The plan explains its position re housing by including the following (highlighted section which might be considered an of date policy).</p> <p>Core Strategy policy CS1 describes the spatial strategy as being to support rural housing which contributes to affordable housing where there is a need to protect existing services. CS17 states that development in settlements such as Burton Overy which are classed as 'Countryside' should be strictly controlled and where there are identified Limits to Development (such as in Burton Overy) should involve 'very limited small-scale infill development'.</p>	<p>Noted. The NP describes the existing Core Strategy but also explains the draft policy within the Proposed Submission Local plan to set the context.</p>	<p>None.</p>

		<p>If the local need is there, and there is extra benefit in supporting local services, it might be considered unreasonable for a NP to “reinforce” Limits without further objective landscape and design work. Why, for example, is building adjacent to the village on a paddock any more harmful (or less beneficial) than infilling an open space “within” the village?</p> <p>The NP states:</p> <p>This will enable the Parish to secure the growth that is recognised as being necessary through windfall developments in locations that are favoured by the community, avoiding the uncertainty that comes with speculative development proposals that threaten the character of the village into the future.</p> <p>A proposal on a paddock “within” the village “limits” is not necessarily any less “speculative” than one on a paddock next to the village. It is also not necessary any less “threatening” to the character of the village. Planning Officers need to weigh up the landscape, visual, historic asset etc. harm of</p>	<p>Limits to Development are a recognised tool for Neighbourhood plans to help shape development in its area. The need for ‘objective landscape and design work’ has not been required elsewhere. As stated in the text, the Limits to Development are identical to the boundaries established by Harborough DC when last reviewing the policy in 2011. Any landscape and design work undertaken by the District Council at that time would still apply?</p> <p>Noted. However, once Limits to Development are confirmed with a Neighbourhood Plan it will become a part of Harborough’s Development plan.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	--	--	---------------------------

		<p>each proposal and not base it on an outmoded concept (“Limits”) which does not have an up to date evidence base for its existence.</p> <p>p.20 states: Note the typo. The Limits were “drawn up” in the months and years preceding 2001. They were adopted in 2001.</p> <p>“...built-up part of Burton Overy. The Limits to Development that were drawn up by Harborough District Council in 2011 have been reviewed through the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and have been confirmed as remaining appropriate, as they allow for suitable growth within the red-line boundary and therefore to accommodate the limited organic growth that is required by Harborough District Council and welcomed by the community.”</p> <p>Analysis of the Census shows that between 2001 and 2011 the parish population increased by around 8% (+34 people) and the number of households by 2%. The area has a higher than average propensity of older people. There is evidence that the population is ageing and in line with national trends the local</p>	<p>We could not find a typo</p> <p>The date on the Limits to development map in the Harborough Proposals maps for small settlements says 2011.</p>	<p>Reference made to the Limits to development being adopted in 2001.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>population is likely to live longer and require “old persons friendly” housing provision as average life expectancy continues to rise.</p> <p>Such housing may be required, but it is a poor location for such housing as all trips (to shops, doctors, post office etc.) require private vehicle use and cannot be walked to / buses used. This is not ideal for an ageing demographic.</p> <p>Policy H1 has confusing wording.</p> <p>It states that dwellings of 3 beds (or less) will be supported. But then it states that a proposal for 2 dwellings should include at least one 3 bed dwelling (or fewer). Policy H1 is therefore saying that as long as the proposal includes a 3 bed dwelling, the other dwelling could be a 6 bed. That does not support ageing demographic needs, nor the general rhetoric of the overall NP with regard to new housing.</p> <p>Policy H3. The NP authors and NP electorate may support small scale new housing proposals but is there evidence for it needing to be “within the Limits”. Have the Limits been reviewed and updated</p>	<p>Noted. It is considered important that a range of housing is available to meet a variety of needs. Older people wishing to downsize into smaller, more appropriate accommodation may wish to remain close to friends and family and this policy will support that happening.</p> <p>No and it is suggested that it is not essential for a landscape professional to be involved in such a review. Many Neighbourhood Plans</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	---	---	--------------------------

			<p>by a landscape professional?</p> <p>Our additional comments are that policy S1 is one that is supported locally as enabling development to take place in the most sustainable locations for the community and provide a locally applied policy that meets the community need.</p> <p>Although the LtD will not be included in the Local Plan it is still a Core Strategy policy (although increasingly difficult to enforce) and one that the NDP has to be in general conformity with. When the Local Plan is adopted it is not considered that inclusion of a LtD policy will inevitably mean the Neighbourhood Plan is out of General Conformity with the strategic District Policies.</p> <p>There is a requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to rely on proportionate evidence. It may be worthwhile considering whether the evidence is sufficiently robust</p>	<p>locally have passed examination or have been Made (e.g. Hungarton, Great Bowden, Kibworth) with Limits to Development but without the evidence supplied by a landscape professional.</p> <p>Noted. This appears to contradict the comments above.</p> <p>The comments here – that the NP needs to be in general conformity with the existing Limits to Development policy; that it will not be inevitably out of general conformity with the new strategic policies and that there is no requirement to employ a landscape professional are all noted.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--------------------------

		<p>for the LtD policy but there is not a requirement to employ a landscape professional if the community is able to build up the evidence base themselves</p> <p>Policy H1: Housing mix – Given the acknowledged need for smaller dwellings, is the final clause of the policy (any two-unit development should include at least one home of 3 bedrooms or fewer) likely to meet this need? Most developments will be single dwelling plots and therefore potentially deliver large dwellings.</p> <p>Policy H3: Windfall sites – the introduction to this policy states that sites ‘should be of no greater size than three new homes’. However, the policy states that ‘proposals for up to two dwellings within infill and redevelopment sites will be supported’. There is an inconsistency which needs to be amended.</p> <p>Policy ENV1: Local Green Spaces – replace ‘development is ruled out’ with ‘development will not be permitted’.</p>	<p>Noted. Suggest amending the policy to say, ‘In any development proposal, dwellings of 4+ bedrooms should be in the minority’</p> <p>This is now addressed with the re-wording of policy H1.</p> <p>The phrasing ‘development is ruled out’ has passed examination in other Neighbourhood Plans, including Hungarton, Great Glen and North Kilworth. When the phrase</p>	<p>Amend as proposed.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>I would suggest that the 6 proposed LGS sites are in a single list rather than split into 'THIS PLAN' and 'HDC PROPOSALS, 2015' and all six sites are shown as one category (Local Green Space) on FIG. 4. This will ensure that the 6 sites will be considered as proposed designations in the Neighbourhood Plan (which is likely to proceed more quickly than the Local Plan and become part of the development plan earlier). It is suggested that Figure 4 should just show LGS sites and other 'statutorily protected ' sites are removed. This will help clarity for readers of the Plan as the policy</p>	<p>'development will not be permitted' has been used it has been removed by the Examiner. The comment made was ' ... includes the phrase "will be permitted." This runs the risk of pre-determining the planning application process without taking relevant matters into account. It may prevent a balanced consideration and result in support for unsustainable forms of development'.</p> <p>Thank you for this comment however it is considered necessary to separate out the sources of the designation as although each are valid they have been designated through separate processes.</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-------------

		<p>does not, and does not need to, mention other sites.</p> <p>Policy ENV2 – sites of environmental significance.</p> <p>It appears that all plots of land have environmental (historic or natural) significance adjacent to the built area of Burton Overy. The concern with this approach is that an Examiner may consider the policy is over restrictive in terms of development. It is appreciated that the Policy states:</p> <p><i>Development proposals that affect them will be expected to protect or enhance the identified features.</i></p> <p>However, it may be worthwhile clarifying what are the most important features to retain as this will assist decision makers in determining planning applications.</p> <p>The environmental inventory, while a great repository of information for Burton Overy, is not as useful as it could be for decision makers in its current format. It would be helpful if the site numbers were in order to assist planning officers or others in retrieving the information.</p>	<p>Noted. The comment is correct inasmuch as it is clearly not a blanket protection. The important features appear in the environmental inventory and this will be made more explicit.</p>	<p>Policy to link to the environmental inventory.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Policy ENV3: Biodiversity general – Whilst the policy designates 3 wildlife corridors it is not clear whether the first part of the policy is meant to apply to them.</p> <p>ENV6 Important Views. - The location of the important views appears to form a blanket protection from new development. The policy states</p> <p><i>Development that impacts in any adverse way on the eight locally important and valued views (map, fig. 10 above, schedule in supporting information) will be resisted, except in exceptional circumstances.</i></p> <p>This may be considered overly restrictive by an Examiner. The phrase ‘any adverse way’ may be open to interpretation, as some development may be acceptable to some people but unacceptable to others. It is also a very restrictive phrase. This does not give certainty when making decisions and could lead to disputes when making decisions.</p> <p>There is a risk that when sites for protection are overlaid they</p>	<p>Will amend the policy to say ‘... in addition the Plan designates 3 wildlife corridors ...’</p> <p>Noted. Suggest amending the policy to ‘Development proposals should respect the open views and vistas as shown in Figure 10 above. Proposals which would have an unacceptably detrimental impact on these views and vistas will not be supported.’</p> <p>It is hoped that the Examiner will see that the policies do not impose a blanket restriction on development but rather helps to shape it by respecting the highlighted features. This does not prevent development but makes sure that it is in keeping and takes account of any locally important features.</p>	<p>Amendment as proposed to be made.</p> <p>Amendment to be made as proposed.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

		<p>cumulatively provide blanket protection for all land surrounding the village and effectively prevent sustainable development of any kind. This has been picked up by previous Examiners.</p> <p>ENV7 Non-Designated Heritage Assets – it is useful to identify these assets, but the policy text does not seem to add any useful local context over and above the Local Plan or NPPF.</p> <p>Areas of Separation. It is considered by the LPA that the proposed Areas of Separation are not necessary and not justified given the distances involved.</p>	<p>The locally important features of the individual assets are described in the supporting information.</p> <p>The issue of the threat of potential coalescence is given weight by the considerable development activity on the border with Great Glen which impacts on the sense of separation between the settlements in view of the prominence of the parish border because of its height overlooking Burton Overy. The land adjoining the Kibworth Parish is in the ownership of a single landowner who has expressed the intention of development in the future.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To review.</p>
--	--	--	---	-------------------------------

			<p>Policy E5 – free standing buildings are permitted development in some circumstances. Therefore part (b) of the policy would not apply to free standing buildings or extension in certain circumstances.</p>	<p>This is noted. The policy would only apply where planning permission was required.</p>	<p>None</p>
8	S1	Landmark	<p>The draft NP states that the purpose of Limits to Development is to ensure that sufficient land is available for new housing and economic activity. This is not disputed, however, the retention of the Limits to Development that were devised in the late 1990s as part of the preparation of the Harborough District Local Plan would not provide the necessary opportunities to meet the housing and other needs of the village. Retaining the previous defined Limits and trusting that sufficient sites for ‘infill development’ will be come forward is not a workable strategy for a numbers of reasons: the vast majority of obvious infill opportunities have already been taken;</p> <p>other policies and designations of the draft NP seek to restrict development on the remaining sites by designating them as Local Green Space or community-defined Green Space; the approach is inconsistent with</p>	<p>We disagree. There is a significant amount of open land within the Limits to Development to meet local requirements over the lifetime of the Neighbourhood plan and to contribute to the housing requirements of the District.</p> <p>This is not the case. As stated above, ample in-fill opportunities remain within the Limits to development, and development outside of the Limits to development is not ruled out if NP, Local plan and NPPF policies are followed.</p> <p>Again, this is not the case. A thorough process has been followed to identify the most important local open spaces and this has resulted in the desire to protect 3 LGS sites. The</p>	<p>None.</p>

		<p>the planning balance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the adopted Core Strategy, which is part of the Development Plan for the area.</p> <p>Policy CS2 of the adopted Core Strategy states that that Limits to Development around settlements will be used to shape their development and, inter alia, that housing development will not be permitted outside of Limits unless there is less than a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and the proposal is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement concerned. The Council acknowledges that it cannot presently demonstrate the requisite five-year supply. The Council's latest Annual Monitoring</p>	<p>justification for this is available in the supporting information. We would suggest that the process that has been followed is as robust as in any Neighbourhood Plan and offers comparative information which the majority do not. The other proposed designations do not prevent development but merely help to shape it in line with community wishes, taking any identified locally important features into account.</p> <p>Noted. Acceptance of this policy is welcomed.</p> <p>The position in relation to the District Council's ability to meet a 5-year land supply is likely to change over the life-time of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>work indicates that current position is that approximately 4.86 years supply is available. Accordingly, the first part of the second bullet point of criterion a) of policy CS2 is engaged and the principle of developing sites outside of limits is accepted.</p> <p>Policy CS2 is a strategic policy. The approach taken by the draft NP is therefore is not in general conformity with the strategic policies for the local area.</p> <p>The concern that allowing development outside of Limits would give rise to the merging of settlements is unjustified given the relationship of the village with nearby settlements. The scale of new development envisaged in the village (given its services and facilities) would not give rise to a serious risk of coalescence. The contention that there is sufficient developable and deliverable land within the Limits to Development to meet the housing growth required by the village to help meet overall needs</p>	<p>We disagree. It is widely acknowledged, and has been tested through examination, that the designation of limits to development is a matter of detail which is not incompatible with their removal in a Local plan.</p> <p>There is no target for housing development in the Neighbourhood Plan and none is required through the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are not required to identify housing targets. This does not undermine its ability to deliver appropriate levels of housing within the Parish over the Plan period.</p> <p>The issue of the threat of</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

			is not supported by a target for new dwellings in any policy in the draft NP.	potential coalescence is given weight by the considerable development activity on the border with Great Glen which impacts on the sense of separation between the settlements in view of the prominence of the parish border because of its height overlooking Burton Overy.	
	Housing provision	Landmark	<p>Policy CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy does not seek to treat villages that are not designated as Selected Rural Villages but that have limits, such as Burton Overy, as countryside. The policy states that development in such settlements will be strictly controlled and this is defined within criterion b) as allowing 'very limited small-scale infill development'. As the development plan must be read as a whole and policy CS2 advises that housing development will not be permitted outside limits unless there is a deficit in terms of five-year land supply, the requirements that development be infill cannot be relied upon as a basis for the approach taken in the draft NP.</p>	<p>The approach taken in the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the approach taken within the NPPF and the Proposed Submission Local plan. The existing Core Strategy is considered out of date.</p> <p>Development outside the limits to development is not ruled out but will be controlled in line with local and national policies.</p> <p>The issue of the District Council's ability to meet its 5-year land supply will change over the lifetime of the Neighbourhood Plan and does not form the basis of policy development as a result.</p>	None

			<p>The draft Local Plan for Harborough is at a relatively early stage of preparation as consultation only ended in November 2017. Accordingly, it is not part of the development plan and it should be afforded little weight in terms of its relevance to the draft NP. In terms of policy advice that may be relevant to the draft NP, policy SS1 repeats the current Core Strategy advice that development in villages such as Burton Overy should be strictly controlled. Paragraph 3.1.14 advises that in such villages, development should be treated as countryside, however, this has not been tested at examination and it fails to take account of the advice provided in paragraph 55 of the Framework. Policy GD4 – New housing in the Countryside does recognise this advice, including criterion c that would allow a dwelling of innovative and/or exceptional design quality</p>	<p>The Proposed Local Plan is not afforded weight, although the evidence gathered as part of its preparation is. If the Neighbourhood Plan progresses to Examination in advance of the Proposed Local Plan then it will indeed be measured by its general conformity with the adopted Core Strategy. We have ensured, however, that we have taken the emerging Local plan into account in the preparation of the Neighbourhood plan so that amendments are minimal once the Proposed Submission Local Plan is Adopted.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does indeed state the Core Strategy reference to ‘strict control’ but policy S2 talks about development being ‘carefully controlled’ in accord with local and national policy.</p>	
	S2	Landmark	<p>Policy S2: Development Proposals outside the Defined Limits as drafted fails to recognise the</p>	<p>This is incorrect. The policy does indeed have regard for national policy</p>	None

			advice provided in paragraph 55 of the Framework that new homes in the countryside can be supported in special circumstances, including where the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the dwelling would help raise standards of design in rural areas, significantly enhance its immediate setting, and is sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.	by stating that development will be carefully controlled in line with local and national strategic planning policies.	
	H3	Landmark	Policy H3 relates to windfall sites and advises that such developments should be limited to two dwellings. It is clear from policy S1 that windfall sites are being relied upon entirely to provide for the unmet needs of the NP area. Paragraph 48 of the Framework is clear that windfall sites can make a contribution to housing supply if there is 'compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply'. No evidence is provided detailing the contribution that such windfall sites have made in the past and it is clear that as such sites cannot reliably be identified in the advance. My view is that relying on windfall sites within the limits is an unreliable strategy and seeking to restrict any sites that may come	Noted. The limit of two dwellings will be removed from the text.	Amendment to be made as proposed.

			<p>forward to a maximum of two dwellings (irrespective of their size or characteristics) further reduces the effectiveness of the approach in meeting housing needs.</p> <p>An alternative approach which did not seek to rely on rigidly defined limits but rather referred to ensuring that development was in scale and character with the form of the village would be more effective in addressing housing needs in keeping with national policy.</p>	<p>This approach has been considered and rejected in favour of the retention of limits to development as Neighbourhood plans are able to do.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	DBE1	Landmark	<p>No concerns are raised regarding the content of policy DBE1 on Design, however, the second supporting paragraph refers to the location of development not adversely influencing any Local Green Space (LGS) or community-defined Green Space areas. As indicated in my concerns regarding policy S1, a large number of these Green Space designations are proposed to the point where almost all areas of unbuilt land within the limits of the village or adjacent to it are proposed to be protected. This approach is incompatible with a policy which would allow development within limits and with paragraph 76 of the Framework which seeks to ensure</p>	<p>This is a general statement that is not reflected in the policy. It is the policy that is to be part of the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Other than the Local Green Spaces, which afford a high degree of protection from inappropriate development, the other designations require development proposals to take the identified features into account. This is not incompatible with paragraph 76 (which refers to Local Green Spaces) rather than the</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None</p>

			<p>that sustainable development can still be delivered. Paragraph 77 of the Framework further advises that LGS designations should only be used where the green area is 'demonstrably special to a local community and holds particular significance'.</p> <p>Strong evidence would be required to demonstrate that all of the proposed LGS and community defined green spaces met this requirement.</p>	<p>other environmental designations. Also – paragraph 77 of the NPPF refers to Local Green Spaces. The comment seems to be applying to all of the other proposed designations within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Once again, this comment applies to Local Green Spaces only not the wider range of environmental designations sought.</p>	None
	Landscape and geological setting	Landmark	<p>The assessment of the village in its setting is supported, however, in the special character of Burton Overy section, describing the landscape of the village as exceptional is questioned because if this were the case, it would carry a designation. In order to respect the character of the village and its landscape setting, all applications on the edge of the village should be supported by a bespoke Landscape Assessment that demonstrates that no significant adverse impact would result from the proposals.</p> <p>Describing the village as 'vitaly unique' is also questioned (at least, in the context of small High</p>	<p>Noted. This affirmation is welcome.</p> <p>The text will be amended to say 'considered by local people' to be of great importance...'</p> <p>We believe that Burton Overy is indeed 'vitaly unique' and are happy</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amendment to be made as proposed.</p> <p>None.</p>

			<p>Leicestershire villages) although plainly there is nowhere that is exactly the same. It is accepted that the working farms are certainly part of the character of the village, however, plenty of development has happened in the last couple of hundred years to change the 'fundamentally agricultural nature' of the settlement.</p> <p>Finally, in respect of the community spirit in the village, whilst this clearly exists by virtue of the preparation of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, there would need to be evidence to suggest that it is 'outstanding' as claimed in the text of the Plan.</p>	<p>with the retention of this description. The content of this section itself demonstrates this point well.</p>	
	Existing environmental designations	Landmark	<p>In common with the landscape assessment, the environmental assessment is generally supported.</p> <p>All applications that may have implications for protected species should be supported by an up-to-date ecological assessment.</p>	<p>Support for this policy is welcomed.</p> <p>Will amend Policy Env 3 to say 'Where a development proposal will affect a protected species, an up to date ecological assessment should be undertaken prior to development, and mitigation measures will be required as a development condition'.</p>	Amendment to be made as proposed.

	Env 2	Landmark	<p>The protection of a large number of areas of land as Sites of Environmental (Natural and Historical) Significance in policy ENV2 because they have been identified by local subject specialists within the NP Group as being of ecological or historic significance is opposed. The guidance provided in the Framework regarding Local Green Spaces is clear in that such designations require clear justification.</p> <p>The work undertaken in respect of the five sites proposed for designation under policy ENV1 (Local Green Spaces) may justify the protection of these sites.</p> <p>The introduction of a 'second tier' of additional sites that do not score as highly as these five sites is not supported. As indicated in the introduction to these representations, my clients own land at Carlton Lane (site 157 – Spring Corner). This site has been assessed by a qualified ecologist as containing poor semi-improved grassland which is not a optimum habitat for protected species. A need for a further survey in respect of great crested newts was</p>	<p>The respondent appears to be confusing the criteria for designation of Local Green Spaces with that of the other designations. They are not the same and do not offer the same degree of protection against inappropriate development.</p> <p>Qualified affirmation of the suitability of the sites selected as Local Green Spaces, using the NPPF criteria, is welcomed.</p> <p>The 'second tier' designations do not carry the same weight as Local Green Space designations. They require development to have regard for important features identified.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	-------	----------	---	---	-------------------------------------

			<p>identified, however, badgers were not observed on the site and the retention of trees and hedges would ensure that the site remained as a habitat for bats and birds. The historic significance of the site is assessed in an archaeological study carried out by CgMS and this concludes that the site was previously used as pasture and possibly as an orchard. The site is of local interest but not to the extent that it warrants protection under a policy such as policy ENV2.</p>		
	Community Action Env2	Landmark	<p>Community Actions are not planning policies, however, CA ENV2 seeks to encourage the parish Council to work with Harborough District Council, landowners and other partners to secure the protection of the sites listed in CA ENV2. These sites include site 157 – Spring Corner. CA ENV2 proposes that the site at Spring Corner be designated as a ‘natural and semi-natural greenspace’). Whilst my clients are committed to preserving the essential character of the land and retaining the character of the public footpath, the designation of this site as ‘natural and semi-natural greenspace’ is incompatible with my client’s intentions to</p>	<p>As the respondent has stated, this relates to a community action which is not a planning policy, and which will not be subject to examination.</p> <p>The concerns are noted. However, it reflects an aspiration for the Parish Council and other parties and the respondent will have opportunities to express a view as and when the work progresses.</p>	None

			construct a dwelling of exceptional quality on the site. Accordingly, it cannot be supported.		
--	--	--	---	--	--