

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | HBBC | 1.24 | <p>Whilst the NDP will only be relevant to Sheepy Parish, the NDP once adopted will actually form part of the Statutory Development Plan for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough. Therefore reference to Statutory Development Plan for Sheepy Parish should be changed to that of Hinckley and Bosworth.</p> <p>By referring to 'most' planning applications being determined by HBBC, it is assumed the NDP is highlighting that some – such as minerals and waste applications – are determined by the County Council. In addition, the reference to the NDP forming the basis of decisions suggests the NDP becomes the basis for decision making when in fact it is one element of a broad range of inputs. In view of this and for clarity, it is recommended that some context is added to this sentence such as the following (additions in bold): <i>'...will continue to be responsible for determining most planning applications (minerals and waste planning applications are determined by the County Council, for example), but in Sheepy Parish the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the basis for those decisions along with the Local Plan and any other relevant policy instruments or guidance forming part of the Statutory Development Plan for the borough'.</i></p> | Paragraph 1.24 does recognise in the first sentence that the Neighbourhood Plan if adopted will form part of the Statutory Development Plan for Sheepy Parish. However the suggested wording to provide greater clarity is agreed. | Amend Paragraph 1.24 to read: <i>When the plan is adopted it will form part of the Statutory Development Plan for Sheepy Parish. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council will continue to be responsible for determining most planning applications (minerals and waste planning applications are determined by the County Council). Therefore in Sheepy Parish the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the basis of those decisions along with the adopted Local Plan (consisting of the Core Strategy (2009) and the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD) and any other relevant policy instruments or guidance forming part of the Statutory Development Plan for the Borough .</i> | CW |
| 2 | HBBC | 1.7 | Wellsborough, Upton, Pinwall and The Cross Hands are not mentioned within the Core Strategy however neither is that they are not expected to accommodate development. The final sentence of this paragraph implies the Core Strategy explicitly states this which is incorrect. | Noted. Clarification to be provided within the Neighbourhood Plan. | Amend final sentence of 1.7 to read: <i>There are limited services within Sheepy Parva, Wellsborough, Upton, Pinwall or The Cross Hands, and the Core Strategy does not identify specific development requirements for these small settlements and grouping of properties.</i> | CW |
| 3 | Environment Agency | 2.17 | We are supportive of the key issues, in particular protecting the countryside, minimising flood risk and protecting green areas in settlements. | Noted. | No change | None |
| 4 | HBBC | 2.2 | The borough-wide 2017 Landscape Character Assessment has now been completed and is available to view on the council website. To ensure the NDP remains up to date, this updated document should now be referred to and referenced where relevant within the NDP. The 2006 Landscape Character Assessment is no longer extant and therefore should not be referred to. | Noted. | Amend Paragraph 2.2 to read: <i>The 2017 Landscape Character Assessment provides an understanding of the landscape, its evolution and future pressures. Amend first paragraph of 2.3 to read: Sheepy Parish lies within the Sence Lowlands Character Area - the largest character area in the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough. Superseded by actions 22/02/18-02, 22/02/18-03 & 22/02/18-04</i> | DR (22/02/18-02,03) JW (22/02/18-04) |
| 5 | Environment Agency | 2.25 | Within this paragraph it states that "The largest tributary of the Sence is the Saint". The watercourse to which you refer is a "main river" of this Agency and appears on the Environment Agency Main River Map as the " Sence Brook". The Saint may be a local name but the correct name of the watercourse is the Sence Brook. | Agreed that the text should be amended to include the correct name of the watercourse | Provide link to wwebsite | CW |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 6 | HBBC | 2.35 | On this, the NPPF says 'inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere' [my emphasis]. As you have referred to the NPPF directly in this paragraph, the full context of what is said within the NPPF should be set out clearly. Current wording at paragraph 2.35 implies any area at any risk at all should be avoided when actually it is areas of highest risk that should be avoided. | Agreed | Amend paragraph 25 to read: <i>In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</i> | CW |
| 7 | Environment Agency | 2.7 | Can't see why it is necessary to include the words "that we enjoy" as this can be subjective. Surely it should be a statement without sentiment. | This paragraph provides the context to the countryside within the Parish and the countryside is enjoyed by local people. | No change | None |
| 8 | NFU | 2.7 | The NFU has 4,800 farmer members out of the 6,000 farmers in the East Midlands region who are commercial farmers. About 80 per cent of land within this part of Leicestershire is farmed. The viability & success of farmers near Sheepy is crucial to the local economy & the environment. | Noted | No change | None |
| 9 | HBBC | 3.13 | Recommend this paragraph is amended to include reference to 'significance' as follows: 'there are buildings and sites in the parish that make a positive contribution providing local character and a sense of place because of their heritage value and significance '. Policy S7: Features of Local Heritage Interest requires an assessment of the proposal against its (heritage) significance so this should be mentioned in this context. | Agreed | Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.13 to read: <i>There are buildings and sites in the parish that make a positive contribution providing local character and a sense of place because of their heritage and significance.</i> | CW |
| 10 | HBBC | 3.14 | Features of Local Heritage Interest have been compiled from three sources (the HER, Sibson Conservation Area Appraisal, and suggestions from the Historical Society (and others)). It appears that these suggestions are identified on the "Local Heritage" Policies Map on page 24 with reference then made to the map in Policy S7 (as with other occasions throughout, the title of the map does not correspond with this 'policies map' reference and this should be addressed throughout the document). It is not clear what this map displays however, and there should be certainty in what the policy covers if the map is the only source of determining this. A useful addition to supplement the map would be to provide a consolidated list of addresses for each feature considered to be a Feature of Local Interest (from each source), potentially within an appendix to the NDP. Some background information is provided on the supporting evidence website but it is not easy to determine what precisely is covered by the Policy, the Policies map, the Appendix, and the supporting evidence website. | Clarification to be provided to the mapping. It would also be beneficial to provide a consolidated list of Features of Local Heritage Interest. | Amendments be made to the titling of maps throughout the Neighbourhood Plan document to provide clarity and consistency. Provide a consolidated list of Features of Local Heritage Interest to support Policy S7. | CW |
| 11 | HBBC | 3.15 | Some further specific points in relation to the map issue raised above: -Are findspots, historic buildings, and monuments (as identified on the Policy map legend) just the records from the HER or do they also include the features of interest from the Sibson Conservation Area Appraisal and the suggestions from the Historical Society (and others); and -Why is there one large triangle for a historic building and then the rest are identified as regions? | It would be beneficial to provide a consolidated list of Features of Local Heritage Interest. | All maps to have policy in the tile. | DR, 28/3, Done JW,CS,HBBC . ?, map review |
| 12 | HBBC | 3.4 | Suggest amendment to wording to include reference to archaeology as follows: 'Scheduling is shorthand for the process through which nationally important archaeological sites and monuments are given protection'. | Agreed. | Amend paragraph 3.4 to read: <i>Scheduling is shorthand for the process through which nationally important archaeological sites and monuments are given protection.</i> | CW |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|----------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|
| 13 | HBBC | 5.4 | Wellsborough, Upton, Pinwall and The Cross Hands are not mentioned within the Core Strategy however neither is that they are not expected to accommodate development. This paragraph implies the Core Strategy explicitly states this which is incorrect. | Noted. Clarification to be provided within the Neighbourhood Plan. | Amend paragraph 5.4 to read: There are limited services within Sheepy Parva, Wellsborough, Upton, Pinwall or The Cross Hands, and the Core Strategy does not identify specific development requirements for these small settlements and grouping of properties. | CW |
| 14 | HBBC | 5.5 | Need to ensure that the figures used are the most up to date available ahead of examination in accordance with the latest published Residential Land Availability report (available on the council website). | Noted. However, the H&BBC Residential Land Availability report contains errors. | The Neighbourhood Plan will make reference to latest housing land supply data available (as of 31/3/18) | CS, 5/4 |
| 15 | HBBC | 5.8 | This paragraph implies that the settlement boundaries for Sibson and Sheepy Magna have been altered within the NDP. Comparing NDP versions and those defined within the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD, there are no obvious issues however it is unclear whether or not any changes have been implemented. If there have, it would be helpful to include a paragraph either within the supporting text ahead of Policy S10: Infill Housing or within an evidence base. | There have been many minor revisions to the settlement boundaries for Sibson and Sheepy. The Neighbourhood Plan, once 'made' will effectively supercede the Site Allocations and Development Mnaagement DPD in the regard because section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that any conflict must be resolved by the decision maker. | No change | None |
| 16 | HBBC | 6.5 | Title 'Young People' draws too much attention as though it is a separate part of the document when in fact it is just a contributory statement within the wider services, facilities and infrastructure section of the document. Consider retaining the paragraph but removing the title. | Agreed | Remove the title 'Young People' and relocate paragraph 6.5 so that it is read before Policy S14. | CW |
| 17 | Mrs L Percival | 1.3 3.8 3.13 | Features of local heritage interest; Battle of Bosworth Field. We have some concerns about the disturbance of archaeological remains/finds by any future development. The majority of Pinwall and parts of Sheepy Magna, Sheepy Parva and Sibson were owned by Merevale Abbey prior to dissolution. The Abbey received compensation from Henry VII after the Battle of Bosworth (this and the fact that he was a guest of the Abbey the day before the battle is documented). It would seem logical that his retinue will presumably have camped | Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan alerts developers and landowners to the significant heritage assets in the Parish. Archaeological assessments would be required as part of the development management process. | No change | None |
| 18 | Mr N Smith | 5.8 5.10 - 5.21 | The proposal does not meet the criteria set for low cost affordable housing as set within the DPD. The developer is proposing high cost luxury dwelling beyond the agreed Parish Development Plan. Road access and safety issues are not adequately addressed. | Development of Hornsey Rise Memorial Home would also be subject to Policy S11 and should help meet the housing needs of older households and the need for smaller, low-cost homes. It is considered that Policies S11 and S13 satisfactory address access and safety issues. | No change | None |
| 19 | HBBC | Appendix 1: | For information, funding for PRoW improvements can be requested through Section 106 agreements. It might be useful to have an approach to this set out within the NDP, or at least recognition of this possibility. | Noted. A Ministerial Statement (HCWS50) issued by Brandon Lewis in November 2014 introduced an exemption from affordable housing and tariff style contributions for sites of ten units or less. As very few development of this size are anticipated we do not consider it necessary to recognise this possibility. | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|----------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|
| 20 | HBBC | Appendix 3 | This is a good list (document ref 279A), but it should clearly identify the reasons for their identification as a feature of local heritage interest (as already collated by the Society in 2014) to ensure people know why they are of significance. Perhaps include this information in an appendix. In the text for Appendix 3 it states that properties have been nominated for their history, historical association and rarity, but the reasons for identification put together in 2014 include further reasons, such as aesthetic value, evidential value etc., so the text stating the reasons for inclusion in Appendix 3 should be expanded to include all reasons. | This consolidated list of features of Local Heritage Interest is around 16 pages long. It is not practical or proportionate to include it within Appendix 3, although there will be a link to the website which includes this information. | Provide list of features of Local Heritage Interest for website. | DR, KG link on site? |
| 21 | HBBC | Appendix 3 | Additional specific comments; -List of proposed additional items of local heritage interest (ref 280 and ref 282) – what is the status of these suggestions? Are they to be considered Features of Local Interest? Confirm if they are and provide specific reasons as to why they are of value and of significance. Keep this to a consistent format. | Noted | Clarification of items of local heritage interest ref 280 and ref 282 required. | DR, ? |
| 22 | HBBC | Appendix 3 | Additional specific comments; -Justification - Unlisted Buildings of Local Historic Interest of Architectural importance identified within the Sibson Conservation Area Appraisal dated January 2008 (ref 271) – it may be useful to provide an extra column to this table that states the reasons as to why the buildings are of local value and significance, e.g. historical value, aesthetic value etc. The Conservation Officer will happily do this if required. | Agreed | Update document ref 271 to provide reasons why buildings are of local value and significance. Contact HBBC Conservation Officer to assist in providing the relevant information. Add changes if necessary. | DR, ? |
| 23 | HBBC | Appendix 3 | Additional specific comments; -Properties Nominated by Other Parties (ref 279A) – Sheepy Glade: this is more appropriately identified in the Plan as a Local Green Space. I do not believe it is a heritage asset so remove it from this list. | Noted. | Clarification of items of local heritage interest ref 279A required. | DR, ? |
| 24 | HBBC | Appendix 3 | Additional specific comments; -Are there any further nominations that should be considered, e.g. historic farmsteads in Upton. | Noted - nothing known at time of Pre Submission Consultation | No Action | None |
| 25 | Coal Authority | General | The Neighbourhood Plan area does not contain any surface coal resources or any recorded risks from past coal mining activity at shallow depth. Therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan. In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality it will not be necessary for you to provide The Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation | Noted. The Coal Authority will be consulted throughout the preparation of the neighbourhood Plan. | No change | None |
| 26 | Gladman Devts | General | Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with the basic conditions. The plan does not conform to national policy and guidance | A Basic Conditions Statement has been prepared to support Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan which shows the plans conformity with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance | No change | None |
| 27 | LCC | General | LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies | Noted | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---------------|-----------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| 28 | LCC | General | in line with the Governments advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of the natural environment including climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land | There is no legal requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan to provide policies covering all provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework. The policies within the Neighbourhood Plan have been prepared to help to deliver its vision of how the community would like the Parish to develop. A number of policies cover aspects of the natural environment identified in the representation, namely Policy S1: Countryside, Policy S3: Locally Important Views, Policy S4: Renewable Energy, Policy S5: Ecology and Biodiversity and Policy S6: Water Management | No change | None |
| 29 | LCC | General | Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and increasing the county's resilience to climate change | The Neighbourhood Plan is considered to contribute these issues, with the inclusion of Policy S4 which addresses Renewable Energy and Policy S6 which addresses Water Management including the provision of SuDS. | No change | None |
| 30 | LCC | General | Neighbourhood Plans should also consider the street scene and public realm within their communities | There is no legal requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan to provide policies covering all provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework. Notwithstanding, there is the potential to secure high quality design under Policy S8 which could benefit the street scene and the public realm and the opportunity for all the community to enjoy their built environment. | No change | None |
| 31 | LCC | General | The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment 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 on enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity such as hedgerows and greenways. | There is no legal requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan to provide policies covering all provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework. Notwithstanding, Policy S5 seeks to protect, maintain and enhance local ecological features and habitats, and ecological corridors and landscape features, and to ultimately provide for a net-gain in biodiversity. Engagement and consultation with relevant agencies has been undertaken to inform the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. | No change | None |
| 32 | Sport England | General | It is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Paras 73 and 74. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects such strategies. Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. In line with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance consideration should be given to how any new housing development will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. | There is no legal requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan to provide policies covering all provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework. The policies within the Neighbourhood Plan have been prepared to help to deliver its vision of how the community would like the Parish to develop. However Policy S9 designates Sheepy Playing Fields as a Local Green Space | No Action | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---|-----------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| 33 | National Grid | General | National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets | Noted | No change | None |
| 34 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | General (S12, S13) | Springbourne Homes concludes "....that without modification, the SPNP does not meet the basic conditions required by the Localism Act. This said, with modification as recommended in this [Springbourne Homes'] submission, the plan would fulfill the basic conditions." "Springbourne Homes openly invitesthe Parish Council to teh site for a tour of the site to fully explore the extent if [sic] the previously developed land and what is best for the sites redevelopment." | Members of the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group visited the site on 17-3-18. The purpose of the site visit was for Steering group members to gain factual knowledge and make a visual assessment of the development proposal, the site and its relationship to its surroundings. There was no discussion of the merits of the proposal at this visit and no decisions were made at the site visit. | No change | SG |
| 35 | HBBC | Mapping | In the current version of the NDP, available on the website, the policies mapping is of limited quality and in some cases unclear. This becomes a notable issue when mapping is specifically required to identify extents (such as the brownfield element of Policy S13), or precise locations (such as those of policies map 'Local Heritage'). Mapping that is of a quality required to allow decision makers to unequivocally interpret the related policy(ies) and its references is a critical element of the planning system. It is recommended that output quality on mapping is improved. For better clarity, it is recommended that alongside improved output quality, the use of more detailed scales where appropriate is considered. In addition, more appropriate 'points' icons may be available to use and this too should be considered. For example, a star on a map is generally less clear to interpret than a simple dot (and label where possible). | Clarification to be provided to the mapping. | Amendments be made to the maps throughout the Neighbourhood Plan document to provide clarity and consistency | CS,JW,HBBC (Detail clarity) JW,CW,RW. |
| 36 | Market Bosworth | S1 | Recommend Policy S1: Countryside includes a specific statement that development will not be supported if it detracts from locally important views given in Section 2, identified on the map of important views and covered in Policy S3 | The Plan should be read as a whole and when considering a development proposal all the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be applied. Policy S3 requires development to safeguard the designated Locally Important Views. This policy approach does not need to be duplicated within Policy S1. | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|-------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|
| 37 | HBBC | S1 | Community uses and essential infrastructure should be defined, potentially within a glossary, to make clear what type of development would be acceptable under this policy. Similarly, context should be provided as to what sort of development is considered to be 'suitable for a rural location'. Without this added clarity, the policy is open to challenge and a wide range of interpretation. It may be appropriate to deal with this issue within a subsection of the policy. | The policy position regarding development outside the settlement boundary should be clarified. | Policy S1 be amended to read: The Countryside (land outside settlement boundaries as defined on the Policies Map) will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, beauty, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all. Development in the Countryside will be limited to: A agriculture and forestry; B the preservation of Listed Buildings; C the re-use and adaptation of buildings in accordance with with Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD Policy DM4; D flood protection; E new dwellings in accordance with Policy S10 (criteria A-E); G employment-generating development or farm diversification in accordance with Policy S17; J community services and facilities meeting a proven local need; L development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers; M recreation and tourism; N transport infrastructure; O renewable energy in accordance with Policy S4. | CW |
| 38 | HBBC | S1 | When defining what uses may be acceptable in more detail, the policy must be compliant with Paragraph 55 of the NPPF which promotes sustainable development in rural areas. The range of uses covered by Paragraph 55 is wider than currently contained in Policy S1: Countryside (i.e., it includes housing). This is also the case for Policy DM4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD which contains a number of additional acceptable uses including renewable energy uses. This NDP policy should not be more narrow than these existing policies if it is to be acceptable. | The policy position regarding development outside the settlement boundary should be clarified. | Policy S1 be amended to read: The Countryside (land outside settlement boundaries as defined on the Policies Map) will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, beauty, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all. Development in the Countryside will be limited to: A agriculture and forestry; B the preservation of Listed Buildings; C the re-use and adaptation of buildings in accordance with with Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD Policy DM4; D flood protection; E new dwellings in accordance with Policy S10 (criteria A-E); G employment-generating development or farm diversification in accordance with Policy S17; J community services and facilities meeting a proven local need; L development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers; M recreation and tourism; N transport infrastructure; O renewable energy in accordance with Policy S4. | CW |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|
| 39 | Gladman Devts | S1 | Gladman do not consider that this policy aligns with the requirements of national policy given that it seeks to protect countryside for its own sake. A blanket restriction to development in the countryside would not accord with the Framework or PPG which makes clear that "all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence | The policy position regarding development outside the settlement boundary should be clarified. | "Policy S1 be amended to read: The Countryside (land outside settlement boundaries as defined on the Policies Map) will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, beauty, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all. Development in the Countryside will be limited to: A agriculture and forestry; B the preservation of Listed Buildings; C the re-use and adaptation of buildings in accordance with with Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD Policy DM4; D flood protection; E new dwellings in accordance with Policy S10 (criteria A-E); G employment-generating development or farm diversification in accordance with Policy S17; J community services and facilities meeting a proven local need; L development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers; M recreation and tourism; N transport infrastructure; O renewable energy in accordance with Policy S4. " | CW |
| 40 | LCC | S1 | Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. | This information is provided by Natural England and it is not necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to show this data. | No change | None |
| 41 | Mrs E Gardner | S1 | Concerned about how this policy can be applied and therefore how effective it will be. | The policy position regarding development outside the settlement boundary should be clarified. | Policy S1 be amended to read: The Countryside (land outside settlement boundaries as defined on the Policies Map) will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, beauty, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all. Development in the Countryside will be limited to: A agriculture and forestry; B the preservation of Listed Buildings; C the re-use and adaptation of buildings in accordance with with Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD Policy DM4; D flood protection; E new dwellings in accordance with Policy S10 (criteria A-E); G employment-generating development or farm diversification in accordance with Policy S17; J community services and facilities meeting a proven local need; L development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers; M recreation and tourism; N transport infrastructure; O renewable energy in accordance with Policy S4. " | CW |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|----------------------|
| 42 | Mrs J Garland Mythe Farm | S1 | Change the last sentence to read 'or' '(not and) suitable for a rural location'. The policy is too restrictive for any home or business owner who is not located within the settlement boundaries. | The suggested change would undermine the purpose of the policy, that seeks to protect the character of the countryside. Notwithstanding the policy position relating to development outside of the settlement boundaries is to be clarified. | Policy S1 be amended to read: The Countryside (land outside settlement boundaries as defined on the Policies Map) will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, beauty, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all. Development in the Countryside will be limited to: A agriculture and forestry; B the preservation of Listed Buildings; C the re-use and adaptation of buildings in accordance with with Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD Policy DM4; D flood protection; E new dwellings in accordance with Policy S10 (criteria A-E); G employment-generating development or farm diversification in accordance with Policy S17; J community services and facilities meeting a proven local need; L development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers; M recreation and tourism; N transport infrastructure; O renewable energy in accordance with Policy S4. " | CW |
| 43 | HBBC | S10 | Policy refers to 'Policies Map'. Assume this is referring to the maps on the previous pages (pages 30 and 31) however this is not clear. Wording should be changed to clarify for example by re-titling both elements 'policies map – Sibson settlement boundary' (etc.). Any changes should be consistent with other maps and references to them throughout the document. | Clarification to be provided. | Amendments be made to the titling of maps throughout the Neighbourhood Plan document to provide clarity and consistency | CW,JW,RW |
| 44 | HBBC | S10 | Delete ' Permission for ' at the beginning of the policy. For clarity, would be useful to make clear that infill housing will be supported, but provided it accords with other elements of the NDP and local and national policies such as in relation to design. Recommend adding some wording to this policy at the end of the first sentence which achieves this recognition of the much wider policy framework to which infill housing will need to adhere. | Permission for' is not necessary for the policy wording. However not of the view that this policy needs the suggested additional wording is necessary and would result in duplication. The Neighbourhood Plan is considered to be in conformity with relevant national planning policy and relevant policies Local Plan, which forms part of the statutory development plan for the Parish. In addition paragraph 1.24 of the Neighbourhood Plan makes it clear that when considering a development proposal, all the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be applied. | Amend the first sentence of Policy 10 to read: Housing development within the Sheepy Magna and Sibson Settlement Boundaries, as defined on the Policies Map, will be supported. | CW, ? |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---------------|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| 45 | Gladman Devts | S10 | Gladman consider that policy S10 should instead be modified to ensure a consistent approach to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is seen as the golden thread through both plan making and decision taking. | A Basic Conditions Statement will accompany the Sheepy Neighbourhood Plan and identify the ways in which the Neighbourhood Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development and its three dimensions: economic, social and environmental | No change | None |
| 46 | LCC | S10 | Reference to Policy S15 could be made within S10 to ensure that any infill development does not contribute to the stated existing traffic issues | Do not believe that the reference is necessary. When considering a development proposal all relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be applied. | No change | None |
| 47 | LCC | S10 | Neighbourhood planning groups should check with DEFRA if their neighbourhood planning area includes brownfield sites | Noted | No change | None |
| 48 | Mrs E Gardner | S10 | The use of "limited" is ambiguous depending upon the developer, the neighbor, the applicant and the planning officer. Should the first sentence include the word 'appropriate' or similar as the sentence suggests all infill (regardless of size) will be supported. There is no reference in the policy wording to brownfield sites and conversions although this features strongly in the supporting paragraph. | Policy S10 clearly identifies the type of housing development that will be permitted outside the defined Sheepy Magna and Sibson Settlement Boundaries. The Core Strategy supports housing within the settlement boundaries of Sheepy Magna and Sibson and this Neighbourhood Plan Policy is in conformity with this approach. The use of the wording 'appropriate' is not necessary as any proposal would be subject to the other relevant policies of the Local Plan which address matters such as design, amenity, traffic, and incorporation of SuDS. | No change | None |
| 49 | NFU | S10 |Conversion of vernacular buildings on farms into new business or residential use, This enables parts of older buildings to be preserved whilst helping the economy & the farm business. | Neighbourhood Plan policy supports sustainable rural growth and allows the re-use and/or adaptation of rural buildings subject to certain criteria. | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---------------|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| 50 | HBBC | S11 | This policy positively identifies that development shall provide for a 'mix of housing types' in the opening sentence, however goes on to mention only housing needs for older people and the need for smaller, low-cost homes. This policy should be written in a way which highlights all possible types of needs which may be identified by the evidence, not restricted to mentioning two types. Unsure if there is a need to refer to 'smaller' when highlighting the need for low-cost homes. Low-cost homes do not necessarily need to be smaller. | The first part of the policy applies to all housing development. Policy S11 has been prepared in line with national policy which seeks a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community, and this will be based on the most up to date evidence base available at the time. It is therefore not considered appropriate or necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to highlight all possible types of housing that may be needed. The NPPF however also identifies the need for policy to reflect local demand and having taken into account the characteristics of the parish and local need and key supply gaps, it is considered appropriate that specific mention is made of the housing needs of older households and the need for smaller, low-cost homes. Development of over 10 houses will need to demonstrate how these needs have been met as part of their proposal. | No change | None |
| 51 | HBBC | S11 | Whilst a housing needs assessment (often known as a housing needs survey at local level) is not a compulsory requirement in the development of an NDP, and it is for the plan makers to assess whether or not housing is a significant enough priority for the plan area to warrant one, the undertaking of one prior to examination to represent the 'up to date evidence of housing need' referenced in Policy S11 should be considered in the context of presenting an objective and thorough evidence base. | There is no evidence of significant demand for affordable housing. | No change | None |
| 52 | LCC | S11 | 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. | It is suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan address these points. Supporting text recognises that the parish has more households over 65 when compared to the borough. It also makes specific reference to the lack of market housing units to cater for the older households. Policy S11 requires that for developments of 10 or more dwellings, applicants will need to | No change | None |
| 53 | Mrs E Gardner | S11 | The mix of housing types - when does this policy apply - after a specific number of houses? | This applies to all housing development | No change | None |
| 54 | HBBC | S12 | Unsure as to why windfall housing developments (of 11 dwellings or more) are referred to as those requiring to meet affordable housing provision (of 40%). This implies that sites which are not windfall, such as the Hornsey Rise Memorial Home allocation, are not required to do so (and, indeed, affordable housing is not mentioned within the policy which is considered further on in this response). Unsure as to why the threshold for developments attracting a minimum affordable housing requirement of 40% is 11 units when national guidance identifies it as 10 units. This represents an inconsistency with national guidance and ultimately reduces the minimum requirement placed on developers which is unlikely to be considered a sustainable approach. | A Ministerial Statement (HCWS50) issued by Brandon Lewis in November 2014 introduced an exemption from affordable housing and tariff style contributions for sites of ten units or less. | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|
| 55 | Mrs E Gardner | S12 | This reads to me as two policies; - one relating to affordable housing on windfall sites and another relating to affordable housing on rural exception sites. Unsure whether it is meant to read like this. Aren't 'rural exception sites' always for affordable housing? Policy reads as though affordable housing may be permitted on rural exception sites. | This policy identifies the potential ways that affordable housing can be provided in the Parish. Rural Exception Sites are essentially small sites used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normally be used for housing. Rural Exception Sites for affordable housing may be allowed within the Parish but must meet an identified need for affordable housing that will not otherwise be met, and satisfactory address Policies S3 and S8 of the Neighbourhood Plan. | No change | None |
| 56 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S12 | Paragraph 2.7 and 2.8 of the response: "the [S12] policy is not consistent with the wording of CS15 of the adopted Hinckley & Bosworth Core Strategy (Key Policy AH&) - Its doesn't make provision for the acceptance of commuted sums in lieu-of on-site provision." "The absence of correct referencing of the Policies of the Affordable Housing SPD therefore means the Basic Conditions are not met." Recommendation from representor: "Policy S12 of the SPNP should be amended to correctly correlate with the requirements of Policy CS15 and AH7. Specific reference to the acceptance of commuted sums in-lieu of on-site provision should be inserted." | An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. Notwithstanding, new residents of the proposed development are likely to rely on the private car to access services and facilities, therefore the site may not be a suitable location for the provision of affordable housing. Commuted sums in lieu of on-site provision is therefore acceptable. To ensure conformity with the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy Policy S12 requires revision. | The first paragraph of Policy S12 be amended to: <i>'On windfall housing developments of 11 dwellings or more, the minimum Affordable housing provision is 40%. These figures may be negotiated on a site by site basis taking into account: identified local need, existing provision, characteristics of the site and viability. Commuted sums in lieu of on-site affordable housing may also be accepted.'</i> | CW,SG,? |
| 57 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S12 1.5 | Paragraph 2.1 and 2.4 of the responseSPNP does not identify the presence or reference the adopted Affordable Housing SPD (2011). The absence of appropriate referencing to the Affordable Housing SPD therefore means the Basic Conditions are not met. Attention is drawn to Para 2.1 and Para 2.3 of the SPD and their confirmation that the SPD forms part of the HBBC Core Strategy and its policies. Springbourne Homes recommends that the SPNP should refer to the adopted Affordable Housing SPD (2011). | An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. Notwithstanding, new residents of the proposed development are likely to rely on the private car to access services and facilities, therefore the site may not be a suitable location for the provision of affordable housing. Commuted sums in lieu of on-site provision is therefore acceptable. To ensure conformity with the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy Policy S12 requires revision. | The first paragraph of Policy S12 be amended to: <i>'On windfall housing developments of 11 dwellings or more, the minimum Affordable housing provision is 40%. This requirement may be negotiated on a site by site basis taking into account: identified local need, existing provision, characteristics of the site and viability. Commuted sums in lieu of on-site affordable housing may also be accepted.'</i> | CW,SG |
| 58 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S12, S13 | Paragraph 1.4 of Introduction: "We [Springbourne Homes] have concerns as set out below [in their representations] that the SPNP does not appropriately deliver the objectives of the NPPF". | Noted | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|-------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|
| 59 | HBBC | S13 | 'around 20 dwellings' is a broad requirement that is likely to be open to a wide interpretation and challenge. Consider how this can be focussed down to be less open. | An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. the term 'around 20 dwellings' has been used as it allows some flexibility. The policy approach is considered to be clear. | No change | None |
| 60 | HBBC | S13 | Point A of the policy is quite prescriptive and its restrictive nature could impact on viability. There is little flexibility afforded by this element of the policy and if, at the time of future development, it is found to be an unviable approach, the policy may be compromised. In addition, housing mix should be informed by outcomes from housing needs evidence (such as a survey) and in the future four bedroom dwellings may be in high demand. This element of the policy could be caveated to include a reference similar to the following: '...unless evidence (viability or housing needs related) indicates otherwise...' | An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. It is important that the redevelopment of the Hornsey Rise Memorial site contributes to meeting local housing needs by providing an appropriate mix of housing, however this requirement may be applied flexibly where it is demonstrated that it is likely to make the development undeliverable. | Criterion A of Policy S13 be amended to read: <i>'No more than three dwellings shall have four bedrooms or more. This requirement may be applied flexibly where it is demonstrated that it is likely to make the development undeliverable;/viable '</i> | CW, SG |
| 61 | HBBC | S13 | Point B of the policy should clarify what the intended use of the chapel will be, not just that it will be restored. If this is intended for residential use, it's important the policy sets this out. | Agree | The first sentence of criterion B of Policy S13 be amended to read: <i>'The former chapel building should be retained and converted to residential use'</i> | CW |
| 62 | HBBC | S13 | Unsure how Point D of the policy can be quantified without corroborated evidence of previous traffic levels to compare to. This needs to be expanded upon, and/or evidence should be available to support this requirement. | Agree | Delete criterion D | CW |
| 63 | HBBC | S13 | Consider if it would be worthwhile to include a reference to improved public transport services, linking this aspiration (which is included in the following section – services, facilities and infrastructure) directly with this site. Given the isolated location of the site, outside of any settlement, improved public transport provision should be sought as part of its development. | We do not consider this to be a realistic requirement. | No change | None |
| 64 | HBBC | S13 | Clarify 'the Policies Map' means the map on page 36 – i.e. include a title as with recommendations for other maps within the document for clarity | Clarification to be provided to the mapping. | Amendments be made to the titling of maps throughout the Neighbourhood Plan document to provide clarity and consistency | CW |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| 65 | Mr G Baynes | S13 | <p>The total development should not exceed 10 dwellings which would double the size of the village.</p> <p>Concerns sewage, water, electric, access, storm water. The neighbourhood plan does not cover these points.</p> | <p>It is considered that the site could satisfactory accommodate approximately 20 dwellings, on the brownfield element of the site, and meet the criteria outlined in the policy, and taking into account the poor access to key services and facilities. The National Planning Policy Framework encourages the effective use of brownfield land. It is considered that a development of around 10 dwellings would not meet this core planning policy principle. Issues relating to sewage infrastructure, and electric and water supply are not planning matters to be addressed within a Neighbourhood Plan and it is for statutory providers of these services to address should a development be permitted. Development of the site must not be more intensive in terms of traffic generation than the previous use and must have a safe and suitable acces (Policy S8). Development would also need to incorporate Sustaianbe Drainage Systems with attenuation, storage and treatment capacities incorporated.</p> | No change | None |
| 66 | Mr & Mrs Wykes | S13 | <p>The size and scale of the proposal made...both the developer and the neighbourhood plan ...is too big and not appropriate for the location.</p> <p>Seven to ten dwellings is enough to provide a good return to the developer but not so large that it would overwhelm the existing community - nor the ethos of that community which is predominantly agricultural.</p> | <p>It is considered that the site could satisfactory accommodate approximately 20 dwellings, on the brownfield element of the site, and meet the criteria outlined in the policy, and taking into account the poor access to key services and facilities. The National Planning Policy Framework encourages the effective use of brownfield land. It is considered that a development of around 10 dwellings would not meet this core planning policy principle.</p> | No change | None |
| 67 | Mr S Hawksworth | S13 | <p>There is widespread support among the residents of Wellsborough for the Hornsea Rise site to be developed. It is considered that that the 20 homes proposed in the NDP would be over-development of an inappropriate site that has poor access to key services and facilities (5.21). The building of this number of properties would greatly impact the very small existing community and reduce their access to the existing infrastructure. To that end it would be useful if S13 explicitly highlighted the need to improve the water supply and drainage (1.29). Access to and from the site is of major concern for the residents and the number of movements created by 20 homes (with no public transport) would vastly exceed that of the site's previous use - particularly in its last 5 years of operation. it would be helpful if the requirement for 'safe and suitable access' in S8(E) were restated in S13. There was consultation carried out by the Parish Council with the residents most affected by the problems created by the derelict site (see Parish Council minutes) and there was general support for permitted development off the existing footprint. It is the number of homes currently proposed within the NDP that is a problem rather than their location. Indeed a smaller number of properties spread-out over a wider area on the site would provide greater protection against too many homes homes being developed in the future. All of the above concerns of the residents of Wellsborough would be either addressed or to a large extent mitigated if the development were permitted with 7 - 10 homes built off the existing footprint. This would be a measured development of a rural site, reduce the impact on environment and infrastructure and remove the need for the restriction in S13 (A) to meet the requirements of S11:Housing Mix, which may impact on the commercial viability of the site.</p> | <p>It is considered that the site could satisfactory accommodate approximately 20 dwellings, on the brownfield element of the site, and meet the criteria outlined in the policy, and taking into account the poor access to key services and facilities. The National Planning Policy Framework encourages the effective use of brownfield land. It is considered that a development of around 10 dwellings would not meet this core planning policy principle. Development of the site must not be more intensive in terms of traffic generation than the previous use and must have a safe and suitable acces (Policy S8). Reference to a safe and suitable access does not need to be restated in Policy S13 as when considering a development proposal as all the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be applied. Water supply and drainage are matters for the statutory providers of these services.</p> | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---|-----------------------|--|--|---|----------------------|
| 68 | Mrs E Gardner | S13 | The policy doesn't refer to any redevelopment of this site meeting housing needs - it just writes that 20 mixed size dwellings is the allocation - housing needs is referred to in the supporting paragraph. Does a site specific policy need more detail or is the strength of the other policies expected to support the determination of an application on the site (i.e. in relation to design, views, car parking etc.) | When considering a development proposal all the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be applied. Criterion A requires that no more than three dwellings shall have four bedrooms or more. | No change | CW,SG,? |
| 69 | Mrs J Garland Mythe Farm | S13 | Access on to Wellsborough Road from Hornsey Rise Memorial Home should be closed off and access via Tinsel Lane be sought. Vehicle access onto Wellsborough Road is not safe, does not meet with current highways standards through insufficient visibility distance on exiting the property or make it a condition that the fence line onto the road is brought back several metres to improve visibility safety. | Given the previous use of the site, the existing access is sufficient in terms of width, radii, and visibility subject to revisions. | No change | None |
| 70 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 | Springbourne Homes fully support the allocation cap (20 dwellings) as promoted by Policy S13. | Noted | No change | None |
| 71 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 | Springbourne Homes respectfully suggests that the application in Policy S13 could be amended further to reflect the current [planning] application should the Parish accept the approach to re-development. | An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. | An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. | None |
| 72 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 | Para 3.1. Springbourne Homes welcomes the inclusion of the Hornsey Rise site in the SPNP. | Noted | No change | None |
| 73 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 | Paragraph 3.3 of the response: "The wording of Policy S13 does not fully achieve this objective [Para 17 of NPPF, 8th principle] in that it fails to understand the extent of the previously developed land at the Hornsey Rise site. The policy approach identifies the land occupied by buildings as previously developed is incorrect. Paragraph 3.4 of the response "...certain buildings have been omitted from the defined extents of previously developed land. The pavilion, former greenhouses and sheds located to the south west." | An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. Following its site visit, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering group accepts that Policy S13 is unduly restrictive in relation to the identification of the developable area. | The first sentence of Policy S13 be amended to: 'Land at Hornsey Rise Memorial Home, Bosworth Road, Wellsborough is allocated for the development of around 20 dwellings. The extent of the developable area is shown on the Policies Map'. The Policies Map be revised by replacing the area shown as Brownfield with a 'developable area' that matches that defined by 17/01050/OUT Parameter Plan drawing 05G. Paragraphs 5.19-5.21 to be updated accordingly. | CW,SG |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---|-----------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|
| 74 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 | <p>Paragraph 3.6 of the responsethere is significantly more than 0.5ha of previously developed land at the site when taking into account roads, parking areas, access ways, footpaths and land that has been engineered as part of the former use. Springbourne Homes promote that there is approximately 1.2 ha of previously developed land here for development.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7 of the responseThe larger development site area whilst a matter of fact, will allow for a more appropriate, landscaped led and dispersed development, that better reflects the character of the Wellsborough and the rural context.</p> | <p>An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. Following its site visit, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering group accepts that Policy S13 is unduly restrictive in relation to the identification of the developable area.</p> | <p>The first sentence of Policy S13 be amended to: '<i>Land at Hornsey Rise Memorial Home, Bosworth Road, Wellsborough is allocated for the development of up to 20 dwellings. The extent of the developable area is shown on the Policies Map</i>'. The Policies Map be revised by replacing the area shown as Brownfield with a 'developable area' that matches that defined by 17/01050/OUT Parameter Plan drawing 05G. Paragraphs 5.19-5.21 to be updated accordingly.</p> | CW |
| 75 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 | <p>Paragraph 3.8 of the response ...The Planning Act confirms that development is the carrying out an engineering operation. Within the context areas of hardstanding, tarmac and concrete paths are very obviously previously developed.....</p> | <p>An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. Following its site visit, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering group accepts that Policy S13 is unduly restrictive in relation to the identification of the developable area.</p> | <p>The first sentence of Policy S13 be amended to: '<i>Land at Hornsey Rise Memorial Home, Bosworth Road, Wellsborough is allocated for the development of up to 20 dwellings. The extent of the developable area is shown on the Policies Map</i>'. The Policies Map be revised by replacing the area shown as Brownfield with a 'developable area' that matches that defined by 17/01050/OUT Parameter Plan drawing 05G. Paragraphs 5.19-5.21 to be updated accordingly.</p> | CW,SG |
| 76 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 | <p>Paragraph 3.9 of the response Springborune Homes assessment of the building form, and the facts provide an in-depth and reasonable and an evidenced position that there is a greater extent of previously developed land that defined in Policy S13.</p> <p>Additional areas identified</p> <p>Paragraph 3.10 of the response The land immediately to the south of the main buildings comprised the former recreation terraces (part lawn) as primary recreation spaces for the home. Their purpose was to provide readily accessible and level recreational areas. They were located within close proximity of buildings and thus formed and important part of the use of the site. These areas are therefore clearly within the curtilage and closely associated with the former use.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.16 of the responsePolicy S13 fails to properly acknowledge the facts and does not therefore contribute to the achievement of sustainable development as required by the Basic Conditions. Sprinbourne Homes' recommendation is to "Amend Policy S13 to correctly show the extent of the previously developed land at the site as per the plan attached at Appendix C".</p> | <p>An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. Following its site visit, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering group accepts that Policy S13 is unduly restrictive in relation to the identification of the developable area.</p> | <p>The first sentence of Policy S13 be amended to: '<i>Land at Hornsey Rise Memorial Home, Bosworth Road, Wellsborough is allocated for the development of up to 20 dwellings. The extent of the developable area is shown on the Policies Map</i>'. The Policies Map be revised by replacing the area shown as Brownfield with a 'developable area' that matches that defined by 17/01050/OUT Parameter Plan drawing 05G. Paragraphs 5.19-5.21 to be updated accordingly.</p> | CW,SG |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|
| 77 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 Requirement A | <p>Paragraph 3.23 The housing mix restriction set out at requirement A is inconsistent with the requirements of Policy S11 Housing Mix. The pre-amble to Policy S13 makes no reference to why a very prescribed housing mix is proposed and thus is not evidenced. It therefore follows that there is no justification for this approach and the Basic Conditions are not satisfied.</p> <p>Sprinbourne Homes' Recommendation [NP Policy 13] Requirement A is deleted in the basis that housing mix is fully and correctly controlled by Policy S11.</p> | <p>An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. It is important that the redevelopment of the Hornsey Rise Memorial site contributes to meeting local housing needs by providing an appropriate mix of housing, however this requirement may be applied flexibly where it is demonstrated that it is likely to make the development undeliverable.</p> | <p>Criterion A of Policy S13 be amended to read: <i>'No more than three dwellings shall have four bedrooms or more. This requirement may be applied flexibly where it is demonstrated that it is likely to make the development undeliverable;'</i></p> | CW,SG |
| 78 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 Requirement B | <p>Paragraph 3.23 Whilst it is clear the Requirement B seeks to retain the former chapel building, the policy, as drafted, is ambiguous in so far as how this is to be achieved. Accordingly, the Basic Conditions are not satisfied.</p> <p>Sprinbourne Homes' Recommendation The policy should therefore be re-worded to remove ambiguity.</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>The first sentence of criterion B of Policy S13 be amended to read: <i>'The former chapel building should be retained and converted to residential use'</i></p> | CW,SG |
| 79 | Pegasus Group (on behalf of Springbourne Homes) | S13 Requirement E | <p>Paragraph 3.30 of the response The current Springbourne Homes proposal seeks to make pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the site via the original tree line avenue to the sites north-eastern boundary. This proposal would connect with the existing pavement to the south side of Bosworth Road and negates the need for further tree removal adjacent to Bosworth Road. Springbourne Homes promote their proposal for connectivity is with greater merit in Arboricultural and highway safety terms and would be happy for Requirement E to be amended to reflect use of tree lined avenue.</p> <p>Sprinbourne Homes' Recommendation That requirement E be amended to promote the provision of pedestrian and cycle access to the site.</p> | <p>An outline planning application (17/01050/OUT) was submitted on 12 Oct 2017 by Springbourne Homes Ltd for the demolition of the care home building and the erection of up to 25 dwellings including conversion of former chapel to dwelling and associated access, drainage and landscaping works (in part). A subsequent amendment reduced the scale of development to 20 dwellings. It is anticipated that the application will be determined before the Sheepy Parish Neighbourhood Plan is submitted and therefore the Plan may need to be amended accordingly. A footpath/cycle path from the site to the south side of Bosworth Road to the point where there is a footpath on the north side of Bosworth Road is important, but it is accepted that this can be achieved in other ways.</p> | <p>Criterion E of Policy S13 be amended to read: <i>'The construction of a footpath/cycle path from the site to the south side of Bosworth Road to the point where there is a footpath on the north side of Bosworth Road; and'</i></p> | CW,SG |
| 80 | HBBC | S14 | <p>Unsure of what the Services and Facilities map is showing. Recommend complementing the icons on the map with figures and including these in the section prior. There is also no reference to the map within Policy S14 yet it is assumed that those facilities listed are those things indicated on the map.</p> | <p>Agreed . The Neighbourhood Plan would benefit from the suggested clarification.</p> | <p>Provide clearer referencing between Policy S14 and the Services and Facilities map. Policy S14 to make reference to the map.</p> | CW, |
| 81 | Mrs E Gardner | S14 | <p>What if the facilities are unviable? If the parish would like improved facilities, could the policy be more positive in supporting appropriate community facilities and services?</p> | <p>In accordance with the National Planning Policy, this policy guards against the unnecessary loss of valued services and facilities. The loss of the stated community services and facilities will only be permitted if all the policy criteria is satisfied.</p> | <p>No change</p> | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|
| 82 | HBBC | S15 | <p>The blanket requirement for two off-street car parking spaces to be provided for every new dwelling appears to be overly-onerous and inflexible and could lead to design implications. In addition, such a blanket requirement is likely to face viability based challenges in application, particularly where the development of smaller scale dwellings are concerned and the cost associated with providing land for two spaces is factored in.</p> <p>Recommend that the policy is made scale-based to be most effective. Small dwellings, with one bedroom for example, would not necessarily require two parking spaces and the implications in design terms could be significant over-proliferation of hard-surfacing across the parish which is not required. The County Council's 6Cs Design Guidance provides a more flexible approach, where different scales of development attract different levels of parking provision and this should be referred to within the NDP or used to further develop this policy. It should be borne in mind that Leicestershire County Council are consulted on applications for development and will apply the 6Cs guidance in determining a view.</p> | <p>The provision of services and facilities in Sheepy Parish is limited and the only bus service is a two-hourly, Monday to Saturday service only, with a stop in Sheepy Magna and Pinwall and nowhere else in the wider Sheepy Parish. Consequently, there is a reliance on the private car for many journeys as demonstrated by high levels of car ownership (95% of Sheepy Parish households have access to a car/van compared with 85% in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough source: 2011 Census). Furthermore, on-street parking was identified as an important issue for local people.</p> | No change | None |
| 83 | HBBC | S15 | <p>The policy is entitled '... and new development' however only covers new dwellings. Consider whether there is a gap in policy here in relation to provision for new employment or retail uses, for example.</p> | Noted. | Amend Policy S15 to read: <i>Car Parking and New Housing Development</i> | CW |
| 84 | Mrs E Gardner | S15 | <p>The potential for compliance with this policy to result in horrendous design (swathes of hardstanding) is of concern. Parking must always be carefully designed and integral to a scheme.</p> | <p>On-street parking has been identified as a problem within the Parish and this policy has been prepared to prevent exacerbating the problem further. Policy S8 would also be relevant for new housing development and development must be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.</p> | Check evidence supports policy | MT, 29/3, evidence reviewed & ok (JW,DR) |
| 85 | Mrs J Garland Mythe Farm | S15 | <p>Amend this so that three off-road parking spaces are provided for properties of three bedrooms or more. With housing density requirements as they are more off road parking is a must particularly that many people live at home longer while saving for a house deposit.</p> | <p>On-street parking has been identified as a problem within the Parish and this policy has been prepared to prevent exacerbating the problem further. Policy S8 would also be relevant for new housing development and development must be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.</p> | Check evidence supports policy | MT, 29/3, evidence reviewed & ok (JW,DR) |
| 86 | LCC | S16 | <p>it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy. A policy inclusion near the Communications Infrastructure policy would be logical to link it to services and infrastructure in general to mitigate the impacts of any new development in Sheepy</p> | <p>Noted. A Ministerial Statement (HCWS50) issued by Brandon Lewis in November 2014 introduced an exemption from affordable housing and tariff style contributions for sites of ten units or less. As very few development of this size are anticipated we do not consider it necessary to recognise this possibility.</p> | No change | None |
| 87 | LCC | S16 | <p>Developers are only responsible for putting in place broadband infrastructure for developments of 30+ properties. Consideration for developers to make provision in all new houses regardless of the size of development should be considered</p> | <p>Policy 16 requires all new residential and employment development to incorporate open access ducting to enable all homes and premises to be served by fibre optic broadband technology.</p> | No change | None |
| 88 | HBBC | S17 | <p>The first element of this policy is very broad, encompassing all types of businesses and enterprise. Recommend providing some further clarity as to what use classes are included under this broad description. '...employed in the linked workspace should be imposed' – replace 'will'. '...enterprise through the conversion of existing buildings and appropriately - designed new buildings...' – replace 'well'.</p> | <p>Policy S17 reflects NPPF paragraph 28. Minor amendment to Live/Work element of policy agreed.</p> | Amend last sentence of Policy S17 to read: 'In addition conditions preventing sub-division and restricting residential occupation to those employed in the linked workspace should be imposed.' | CW |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---------------|-----------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| 89 | LCC | S17 | recommend including economic development aspirations with your Plan, outlining what the community currently values and whether they are open to new development of small businesses etc | The Neighbourhood Plan seeks a prosperous local economy. Policy S17 supports new sustainable economic development through conversion or new development, along with tourism development and live/work units. | No change | None |
| 90 | Mrs E Gardner | S17 | Is this two policies? One about sustainable growth of business and the other about tourism? 'All tourism development '----' is encouraged' - this is a worryingly broad sentence surely it needs to be of an appropriate scale, in an appropriate location and appropriately designed? So much can fit under the 'tourism' umbrella, this policy could be quiet permissive. Regarding the first sentence of the policy, although good design is referred to, the appropriateness of a business/enterprise also relates to the type of business/enterprise and its relationship with others. Once again good design is not just about the building - its about development as a whole. | This policy should be read as one and tourism is a form of economic development. Any growth or expansion of tourism development would need to be sustainable. Any development would also need to meet the design requirements of Policy S8. | No change | None |
| 91 | NFU | S17 |New farm buildings needed by the business.. This could be for regulatory reasons (e.g New slurry stores) or because new or more crops & livestock are being farmed (again stores, barns, livestock, housing etc) | Noted | No change | None |
| 92 | NFU | S17 |Farm & rural diversification. Some farmers will be in a good position to diversify into equine businesses, on farm leisure & tourism and into other sectors that will help boost the local economy & support the farm business | Noted | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|
| 93 | HBBC | S2 | <p>Recommend that the policy be expanded to include reference to enhancing the existing Public Rights of Way, not only protecting them. General re-wording recommended as follows: 'Development should protect and enhance the existing Public Rights of Way within Sheepy and wherever possible create new links to the network including footpaths and cycleways'.</p> <p>Policy should refer to the relevant map (on page 11).</p> | <p>Agreed. Paragraph 75 of the NPPF looks for planning policies to protect and enhance public rights of way and access.</p> | <p>Policy S2 be amended to read: <i>Development should protect and enhance the existing Public Rights of Way within Sheepy Parish (as shown on the Policies Map) and wherever possible create new links to the network including footpaths and cycleways.</i></p> | CW |
| 94 | HBBC | S2 | <p>Reference should be made to this map within the Policy S2: Public Rights of Way Network section</p> | <p>Agreed.</p> | <p>Policy S2 be amended to read: <i>Development should protect and enhance the existing Public Rights of Way within Sheepy Parish (as shown on the Policies Map) and wherever possible create new links to the network including footpaths and cycleways.</i></p> | CW |
| 95 | Market Bosworth | S3 | <p>Recommend the inclusion of the panoramic view from the layby / footpath on the B585 at the top of Wellsborough Hill described as an 180 degree arc starting from Market Bosworth in the east and sweeping across North West Leicestershire (see 3 photographs below). This view encompasses the view from the Sheepy/Market Bosworth parish boundaries identified in the Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan</p> | <p>There are many views over the countryside within the Parish. Our Plan seeks to protect the most important views and vistas. A more liberal approach to the protection of views would have the effect of de-valuing the policy. Nonetheless, this view will be given further consideration.</p> | <p>The panoramic view from the layby / footpath on the B585 at the top of Wellsborough Hill described as an 180 degree arc starting from Market Bosworth in the east and sweeping across North West Leicestershire should be considered in relation to Policy S3.</p> | JG photos from MB |
| 96 | Market Bosworth | S3 | <p>Recommend the inclusion of the panoramic view looking towards Market Bosworth from the A444 south of Sibson (GR 354997) that is referenced in the Market Bosworth Neighbourhood Plan</p> | <p>There are many views over the countryside within the Parish. Our Plan seeks to protect the most important views and vistas. A more liberal approach to the protection of views would have the effect of de-valuing the policy. Nonetheless, this view will be given further consideration.</p> | <p>The panoramic view looking towards Market Bosworth from the A444 south of Sibson should be considered in relation to Policy S3.</p> | JG photos from MB |
| 97 | HBBC | S3 | <p>Reference is made to a 'policies map'. It is assumed that this is referring to the map on the previous page (page 12) entitled 'Important Viewpoints', however this is not clear. Wording should be changed to clarify for example by re-titling both elements 'policies map – important view points'. Any changes should be consistent with other maps and references to them throughout the document.</p> | <p>Clarification to be provided</p> | <p>Amendments be made to the titling of maps throughout the Neighbourhood Plan document to provide clarity and consistency</p> | CW |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|
| 98 | HBBC | S3 | On the appropriate map, it is recommended that directional arrows are incorporated to represent the direction of the view to correspond with the descriptions within the policy. This, as well as including numbering against every view identified (linking with the appropriate policy description) will help ensure the policy and its geographical application is clear and undisputed. | Clarification to be provided. It is noted that a some of the identified views have not be numbered. | Views' map be amended and all views identified to be numbered, corresponding with the views detailed in Policy S3. Directional arrows to be added. | CW,JW |
| 99 | HBBC | S3 | Recommend that additional wording is included within the policy which explains how development will safeguard and enhance the views, for example through good design (building on the opening sentence of the policy) and potentially refer to Policy S8: Design. | Do not believe that the additional wording is necessary as the policy refers to the need for development to be appropriately designed and located. Nor is a need to refer to Policy S8: Design. When considering a development proposal all relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be applied. | No change | None |
| 100 | Gladman Devts | S3 | For a view to be considered important, it must exhibit some demonstrably physical attributes which elevates its importance above simply being an area of under development countryside. An area's pleasant sense of openness and the presence of views across an area to open countryside cannot on their own amount to a valued landscape | The views and vistas have been identified as important in defining the character of the area and in providing recreational benefits for walking, cycling and enjoying the outdoors. Additional supporting information on each of the identified views is detailed in Appendix 2. | No change | None |
| 101 | Market Bosworth | S4 | Recommend Policy S4: Renewable Energy includes a specific statement that development of renewable energy does not detract from locally important views given in Section 2, identified on the map of important views and covered in Policy S3 | The Plan should be read as a whole and when considering a development proposal all the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be applied. Policy S3 requires development to safeguard the designated Locally Important Views. This policy approach does not need to be duplicated in Policy S4. | No change | None |
| 102 | HBBC | S4 | Concerned that Point A of the policy will effectively mean there would be almost no development of solar farms within the parish given that there will be very limited brownfield land available given the rural makeup of the parish. Given the nature of solar farms, they invariably rely on a rural location and so there should be a balance struck between energy needs and the quality of greenfield sites – for example their agricultural grading. Keeping in mind that installations are temporary, the policy seems quite limiting in this area and will provide very few opportunities for such development. The element of the policy dealing with wind turbines should be aligned with the provisions of the Ministerial Statement HCWS42 (18 June 2015). At present, it is overly dismissive without reasoning and this undermines this element of the policy and raises a question as to how far Policy S4 has been positively prepared. It should be borne in mind that a starting point for the NPPF and indeed the Local Plan for the borough is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Ministerial Statement introduces a requirement for local community support to be in place before a development of this nature can be supported by the Local Planning Authority. It is recommended that Policy S4 recognises this and sets out the conditions upon which a wind turbine development could be acceptable (as per the Ministerial Statement). Technically, 'impacts' as referred to within point B of the policy can also be positive. Therefore suggest amendment to wording as follows: <i>'their location is selected sensitively and well-planned so that the proposals do not adversely impact on any features of Local Heritage Interest'</i> . | Planning Practice Guidance provides guidance on solar farm development and recognises that large scale solar farms can have a negative impact on the rural environment, particularly undulating landscapes. Point A supports solar farm development on non-agricultural land as well as brownfield land, in conformity with the relevant Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The PPG also identifies other factors to be taken into account, such as, the conservation of heritage assets in an appropriate manner, visual impact of this type of development, and the need for installations to be removed when they are no longer in use and the land is restored to its previous use. Policy S4 has been prepared taking these factors into account. With respect to the development of wind turbines although the NPPF recognises that the community has a responsibility to increase the use of supply of green energy, it provides the view that the need for renewable energy does not automatically override environmental protections and the planning concerns of local communities. Local Planning Authorities can only grant planning permission for wind farm development if it is sited in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. However guidance does not state that a Neighbourhood Plan must identify suitable areas. Consultation responses received during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan illustrated that the majority of the responses received objected to the development of wind turbines and wind farms. In light of the views of the local community no areas are proposed as being suitable for wind energy development. Agree to the suggested wording with respect to the 'impacts' | Amend Point b to read: <i>Their location is selected sensitively and well-planned so that the proposals do not adversely impact on any feature of Local Heritage Interest.</i> | CW |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|
| 103 | Mrs E Gardner | S4 | Is this a renewal energy policy or just a policy about ground mounted solar panels? How will "limited circumstances" be determined? It will be difficult to assess a planning application with this wording. Limited according to who? Limited according to size of any solar farm or the number of solar farms? How will a planning application be assessed - what would make a solar farm acceptable? | This policy would be used to deal with planning applications for ground-mounted solar photovoltaic farms and provides a list of criteria that would need to be addressed for such a proposal to be supported. | No change | None |
| 104 | NFU | S4 |On farm renewable energy farms can be the ideal places for wind turbines, PV, solar, anaerobic digestion, biomass & biofuel plants providing that they do not cause nuisance to others. The UK must meet a target of 15% renewable energy by 2020, Currently we are not meeting this target but on farm renewables can help us meet it. | Noted. This policy has been prepared in conformity with the relevant Planning Practice Guidance. | No change | None |
| 105 | Environment Agency | S5 | We support this Policy for Ecology and Biodiversity. | Noted. | No change | None |
| 106 | Natural England | S5 | Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan other than to welcome Policy S5: Ecology and Biodiversity and its commitment to ensure that development does not harm the network of local ecological features and habitats, including Sheepy Fields Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which is protected by the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (As Amended). We further welcome the commitment within Policy S5 for any new development to maintain and enhance existing ecological corridors and landscape features (such as watercourses, hedgerows and tree-lines) for biodiversity, thus demonstrating overall net-gain. Also referred to copying with guidance in Annex 1 of letter | Noted. | No change | None |
| 107 | HBBC | S5 | Policy refers to 'Policies Map'. Assume this is referring to the 'Ecology' map on the following page (page 17) however this is not clear. Wording should be changed to clarify for example by re-titling both elements 'policies map – ecology'. Any changes should be consistent with other maps and references to them throughout the document. | Clarification to be provided. | Amendments be made to the titling of maps throughout the Neighbourhood Plan document to provide clarity and consistency | CW |
| 108 | HBBC | S5 | Recommend altering the final paragraph to the following: <i>'New development which impacts on existing ecological corridors and landscape features (such as watercourses, hedgerows and tree-lines) will be expected to maintain and enhance them for reasons of biodiversity thus demonstrating overall net-gain.'</i> | Agreed | Final sentence of Policy S5 be amended to read: <i>New development which impacts on existing ecological corridors and landscape features (such as watercourse, hedgerow and tree-lines) will be expected to maintain and enhance them for reasons of biodiversity thus demonstrating overall net-gain.</i> | CW |
| 109 | LCC | S5 | Consideration should also be given to blue green corridors and how they could be used to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, including benefits to surrounding areas | Supporting text to this policy recognises the green and blue corridors within the parish and their benefits. Policy S6 seeks to maintain and enhance existing ecological corridors and landscape features, including green infrastructure and blue infrastructure corridors. | No change | None |
| 110 | Environment Agency | S6 | Whilst the responsibility for surface water drainage and SuDS rests with the Lead Local Flood Authority (Leics County Council) we are pleased to see that the policy takes full account of flood risk from fluvial sources (watercourses). | Noted. | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|---------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|
| 111 | LCC | S6 | When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning(Rivers and Sea)). 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. | Noted. In accordance with National Planning Policy, new development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. In addition policy S6 has been prepared taking into account the history of flooding within the Parish with development proposals taking into account the risk of flooding from rivers, groundwater and overland flow. There is also a specific requirements for the inclusion of SuDS within development. | No change | None |
| 112 | LCC | S6 | 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. | Noted | No change | None |
| 113 | Mrs E Gardner | S6 | Should the policy wording include that new development should do something about flood risk. My concern is that by acknowledging flood risk in a planning application a developer has taken account of flood risk therefore satisfying the policy. | In accordance with National Planning Policy inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding will be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, it will be necessary to ensure it is made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Guidance on the application of the sequential and exception test is set out in the NPPF. The technical guidance on flood risk sets out how this policy should be implemented | Amend paragraph 25 to read: In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. | CW |
| 114 | HBBC | S7 | The corresponding map contains a lot of information and 'points of interest'. With this in mind, in its current form it is not clear enough. Recommend including a supplementary list of addresses to correspond with the map etc., as suggested in the comments above. The policy wording may need amending accordingly to take this into account. | It would be beneficial to provide a consolidated list of Features of Local Heritage Interest. | Provide a consolidated list of Features of Local Heritage Interest to support Policy S7. | DR |
| 115 | HBBC | S7 | Recommend that the policy requires that the need for and public benefit of a proposal are considered in tandem with one another through the Development Management process. Can achieve this through the following or similar wording: "will balance the need for, and the public benefit of.." | Agreed | Amend Policy S7 to read: <i>The determination of planning applications which would affect features of local heritage interest (as shown on the Policies Map) will balance the need for, and the public benefit of, the proposed development against the significance of the asset and the extent to which it will be harmed.</i> | CW |
| 116 | Mrs E Gardner | S7 | Is this policy referring to planning applications on local heritage features, next to or near them or in sight lines of? | This policy applies to development which would affect features of local heritage interest, either directly, for example, impact on the physicality of the feature or indirectly, where a development may affect the setting of the local heritage asset | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 117 | National Grid | S8 | An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas apparatus. National Grid has identified the following high-pressure gas pipeline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary. FM 14 - Alrewas to Churchover. From the consultation information provided, the above gas pipeline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites. Gas distribution - low/ medium pressure. Whilst there is no implications for National Grid gas distribution's intermediate / high pressure apparatus there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) gas distribution pipes present within proposed development sites.(If further information is required in relation to the gas distribution network please contact - plantprotection@nationalgrid.com) | Noted. This matter shall be investigated further | Contact plantprotection@nationalgrid.com to determine whether Hornsey Rise site is affected by Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) gas distribution pipes . No reply from Cadent! | RW |
| 118 | Highways England | S8 | The total proposed housing allocation for the Parish over the Plan period is 71 dwellings, including 24 dwellings planned for Land at Trout Ponds Farm and 20 dwellings planned at the Hornsey Rise Memorial Home site (Policy S13). We do not consider that this low number of dwellings coming forward will have any impact on the operation of the SRN. As such, Highways England has no further comments to provide. | Noted. | No response received | None |
| 119 | HBBC | S8 | There needs to be more information on the character of the area provided here to ensure it will guide development proposals from their inception and ensure that Policy S8: Design can be used effectively within the Development Management process. This could be a general statement of traditional design characteristics such as scale, form, materials, distinctive local features (e.g. eyebrow dormers) etc., for the area as a whole or for each settlement. This does not necessarily have to be too prescriptive but the identification of predominant characteristics would likely be useful, perhaps use the brief synopsis of each settlement in the parish area from para. 1.4 as a starting point. Information on this could be used from sources such as the Landscape Character Assessment (2017) and Sibson Conservation Area Appraisal, etc. | Consideration has been given to the inclusion of more comprehensive design guidance in the Neighbourhood Plan. For the time being, this is not considered appropriate for the following reasons: a the limited scale of development planned for the neighbourhood area; b the diversity of design within the neighbourhood area; c for Sibson, the Conservation Area appraisal already provides useful design guidance; d the delay caused to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. | The inclusion of more comprehensive design advice be considered at the time of the neighbourhood Plan review. | No immediate action SG to recommend that the Parish Council consider the inclusion of more comprehensive design advice at the time of the neighbourhood Plan review. |
| 120 | HBBC | S8 | The condition that only development that reflects buildings in the parish that are distinctive <i>and</i> traditional will be acceptable in design terms is slightly conflicting and overly constraining. A distinctive development could be very modern and of a contemporary nature and in these circumstances it is unlikely it would also be traditional. Consideration of the word or should be given rather than and, but this would mean that support is to be given to distinctive developments which may of course not be of a traditional nature so this will depend on the aspirations of the plan. A word of caution relating to this is that a design policy that espouses following only traditional characteristics will probably not be considered NPPF compliant (with paragraph 55 for example) so there should be circumstances where development of distinctive nature could be supported. Consider whether the term distinctive is sufficient for the policy or whether a circumstantial approach is more appropriate (similar to para 55 of the NPPF), such as ' only development that reflects the buildings in Sheepy Parish that have a traditional character will be supported '...' unless the development is of exceptional quality or innovative design '. This kind of approach is more positive however the terms 'traditional' and 'distinctive' will need to be explained and supported through design character statements to provide the context required to make an assessment against these them. | Agreed | Amend Policy first sentence of Policy S8 to read: 'Only development that reflects the buildings in Sheepy Parish that have a traditional character will be supported unless the development is of exceptional quality or innovative design'. Design requirements to be revisited by the Parish Council at a later date | CW SG to recommend to Parish Council consider at NP review. |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|--|
| 121 | HBBC | S8 | Point D of Policy S8: Design is generally not considered to be a design issue but a general transport/ infrastructure related one. | Noted | No change | None |
| 122 | Gladman Devts | S8 | Gladman consider that criteria D which states 'not significantly increase the volume of traffic through the Parish's settlements' is ambiguous and does not provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal in accordance with paragraph 154 of the Framework. This element of the policy should therefore be deleted. | The TRICS system allows its users to establish potential levels of trip generation for a wide range of development and location scenarios (there are 110 separate land use categories in the database), and is widely used as part of the planning application process by both developer consultants and local authorities. | No change | None |
| 123 | Mrs E Gardner | S8 | Seems that the policy seeks development to be in keeping with the character of the parish. This appears to not support appropriate modern development and potentially stifles design. Modern extensions on traditional and even listed buildings often look better than trying to mimic the existing design. There are also buildings in the parish that have a distinctive character but this doesn't mean a good design - a design policy should see to improve not just maintain design standards. The policy focuses on the building itself but good design is about the spaces between buildings, layout, car parking boundary treatments etc. | Consideration has been given to the inclusion of more comprehensive design guidance in the Neighbourhood Plan. For the time being, this is not considered appropriate for the following reasons: a the limited scale of development planned for the neighbourhood area; b the diversity of design within the neighbourhood area; c for Sibson, the Conservation Area appraisal already provides useful design guidance; d the delay caused to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. | Amend Policy first sentence of Policy S8 to read: 'Only development that reflects the buildings in Sheepy Parish that have a traditional character will be supported unless the development is of exceptional quality or innovative design'. Design requirements to be revisited by the Parish Council at a later date | CW SG to recommend to Parish Council consider at NP review. |
| 124 | Mrs J Garland Mythe Farm | S8 | Need to delete 'significantly' as this is open to interpretation. | The suggestion would result in no development being permitted that would increase the volume of traffic. Such a blanket ban approach would not be NPPF compliant. The policy however does allow this issue to be considered and assessed as part of any planning proposal, and on its merits. | No change | None |
| 125 | NFU | S8 | The NFU will be looking to see that the neighbourhood plan has policies which positively encourage the above (please see points above) & do not deter them because of, for example, restrictive landscape designations and sustainable transport policies which imply that all development needs to be by a bus stop, There can also be issues about new buildings being sited too close to noisy or smelly farms buildings which can cause nuisance to new householders & lead to abatement notices being served on longstanding businesses. We would urge the local planning authority to be especially careful before granting permission to residential development near to bad neighbour uses. | Noted. | No change | None |

| No. | Representor | Policy/Paragraph etc? | Representation | Response | Proposed revision to Sheepy NP | Actioner/Date /Notes |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|---|
| 126 | K Barrs & P Khian | S9 | The piece of land in front of 15-19 Meadow Close is of tremendous amenity value to the village. It is currently protected by the chestnut tree. The tree will not last forever. The Neighborhood Plan should specifically protect this piece of land from development. This request has been made by various parishioners at various stages of the consultation but has at best been overlooked or possibly just been ignored. Please ensure that provision is made in the Neighbourhood Plan to protect this resource or explain why it is not to be included. | The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides the opportunity for Neighbourhood Plans to identify special protection green areas of particular importance to them. It does however also identify that a Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space and goes onto to detail the specific circumstances a Local Green Space designation can be used. | Complete a Local Green Space proforma for the area of land in front of 15-19 Meadow Close to determine whether it meets designation criteria. Draw map | CS JW (drafted -awaiting validation) |
| 127 | Gladman Devts | S9 | <u>The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:- Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</u> (emphasis added).It is considered that there is insufficient evidence to support the proposed designations against the requirements listed above | The identified Local Green Spaces are supported by evidence. The designated Local Green Spaces are shown on the Policies Map and are all considered to be in reasonable close proximity to the communities they serve. Do not believe any of these to be large extensive tracts of land. Appendix 4 shows the assessment of the Local Green Spaces against the other criteria detailed within the NPPF. | No change | None |
| 128 | HBBC | SEA/HRA | Some plans require a Strategic Environmental Assessment and/or a Habitat Regulations Assessment (SEA/ HRA respectively), and although it is unlikely these would be needed for the Sheepy NDP, it would be appropriate to undertake a screening assessment to determine this prior to the plan being submitted for examination. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council have already provided some additional advice to the plan making group on this matter, in an email dated 17 November 2017. | Agreed | SEA/HRA screening to be undertaken. | CS,JW,CW, HBBC, RCC |
| 129 | HBBC | Supporting Evidence | The BAP species records search for Policies 1, 5 and 7 includes maps of protected species including bats and great crested newts. Ensure that the locations of these species can be made public due to their protected nature (contact Leicestershire County Council Ecology Department to check). | Noted. | Consult Leicestershire County Council Ecology Department on use of BAP mapping on neighbourhood plan website. | MT, 5/4 = LCC confirmed they can be made public |
| 130 | HBBC | Supporting Evidence | The Landscape Character Assessment referred to is no longer valid. It has been replaced by the 2017 version, available on the council website at the following location: https://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/downloads/download/308/landscape_character_assessment . Any reference to this in the supporting evidence library and NDP document should be updated. | Noted. | Text in the Neighbourhood Plan to refer to the 2017 Landscape Character Assessment and the weblink be updated on the appropriate page(s) of the Parish Plan website. | CW |
| 131 | Environment Agency | Vision | We are supportive of the Vision. | Noted. | No change | None |