

GREAT EASTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
Pre-Submission Consultation Responses
as at
16 Dec 16

	<u>Chapter/ Section</u>	<u>Policy Number</u>	<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Amendment</u>
1			Resident	<p>- First can I congratulate everyone for producing something that I think is pretty balanced though I am sure that will not be the case for all.</p> <p>- [] Page 45 Community Action NHE1 view No 18 in text but not on associated map</p> <p>- [] Policy DBE1 is too weak on sustainability in design. All should meet at least EPC rating C and all should be fitted with solar panels. I am still surprised when looking in the paper at new builds when their EPC rating is still only the UK average.</p> <p>- [] Policy NHE4 is a little naive. You cannot just say that if woodland is threatened it must be replaced. That might be true for the trees but actually it is the whole local ecosystem that would be destroyed and consequently not easy to replace, unless there is crucial detailed knowledge</p>	<p>Thank you for this and subsequent comments.</p> <p>No. 18 is on both the map and the text.</p> <p>We disagree. All new homes should meet or exceed the latest standards for efficiency, based on Building Regulations current at the time of build.</p> <p>It is not possible to protect woodland as an absolute which is why the policy is worded as it is. As such, it provides as strong a degree of protection as is possible.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

				<p>and surveys of that environment. This should say no woodland will be affected since we have so little of it</p> <p>- [] On views p53/54 view vii not on map</p>	View vii is on the map on p52 of the pre-submission version	None
2			Resident	<p>The presentation of the draft Neighbourhood Plan today was excellent and I congratulate your team on the hard work that you've done in getting to this point. I intend to support the plan when it comes to referendum as it seems to be the best compromise in meeting Great Easton's local development quota. I trust that developers will make commitments to the level of affordable housing set out in the plan and that there will be some way of ensuring that they abide by these. I also hope that there won't be any restrictions/no go areas for the citizens of Great Easton.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Thank you. Noted	None
3			Resident	<p>We're writing to you to take the opportunity to submit our comments during the consultation stage of Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan. Firstly we do appreciate what a mammoth task this has been for everyone involved and the commitment required by all. We strongly feel that there is a need for the village to have a NP.</p> <p>We assume that you are aware of the procedures of assessment and the awarding of a RAG score for each identified site. The site we'd like to comment on is No 8 on the NP, Station Yard. This site was awarded a high green</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. In response, we have reduced the scale of the site so that it does not fall within the flood zone and proposes development on the previously developed part of the site only. For this reason and in view of the need to provide a potential future site should housing need increase over the lifetime of the NP, we have decided to keep the site as a reserve site. To address your concerns in greater detail:</p>	<p>Have amended the reserve site to reduce the size and re-drawn the Limits to Development (LTD).</p>

			<p>score and was put into one of the top 4 sites to be developed.(Has since been put as a reserve site) The Station Yard is in close proximity to our property. We received an email from a third party enquiring as to whether we had seen the NP? And that it involved our property. Needless to say we were completely shocked as we hadn't been consulted in any way. Our field is part of our home, it runs at the back of our garden .It is approx 2 and three quarter acres. We keep 3 horses, 2 goats and chickens on it, we also have 3 stables, a tack room and a field shelter to house them. It has amazing views towards Rockingham Castle and in my opinion is an area of outstanding natural beauty (see Pic 1). In fact the draft copy of the NP Page 53 Protection of views and landscape, have listed the panoramic views south from Caldecott Road over water meadows to Rockingham Castle and hills beyond as valued and will be strongly resisted.</p> <p>On further investigation and reading the minutes of the PC meeting and the Developers presentation, again of which we were not aware had taken place.(see Pic 2) It became clear that the owner of the field next to our property, which belongs to Dr. Craven, has offered to have a road built through it to accommodate a new access for the site. He states that his field is adjacent to the Station Yard and there's just the resolution of a small strip of land. He also claims that the main reason why previous planning at this site had been refused was on the grounds of poor access. Firstly his field is not adjacent to the site, adjacent means next to or touching, his field is neither. In between his field</p>	<p>Station yard is a brownfield site that is already generating traffic and other activity. It is already hardened and is raised slightly above the surrounding land by it being part of the former railway and it is not covered by the flood risk map, now that the scope of the site has been confined to the previously developed land. The inclusion of Dr Craven's field is no longer deemed necessary and this overcomes any issues over flooding and landscape amenity value.</p> <p>Access to the site can be achieved by negotiation, using the existing access to the pumping station. This would enable closure of the existing access on the A6003 and would therefore enhance road safety by removing turning traffic from the main road and thereby reducing the number of accesses within a short distance.</p> <p>The site can easily be connected to Caldecott by a short footway extension; the proposal provides for a food retail farm shop, thereby increasing the amenities available to people in Caldecott, who no longer have a shop; it</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>and the site is our field and it is not a small strip of land. It would have to be built right the way through our property dividing our 2 acres from the rest of the land and my stables and house. It would be an intrusion into our lives. There is also another piece of land adjacent to Station Yard which has been included in that “strip of land” and that belongs to TATA Steel and it has already been established that there are 2 x 20” pressurised pipes underground delivering water to the steel works at Corby and this land cannot be built on. (See Pic 2A and 2B). Planning was refused on this site for other reasons than just poor access, mainly being that it was not sustainable. (see Pic 3)</p> <p>We then decided to look at the assessment done on this site (see Pic 4,5 pages))and we’re in complete disagreement with it for reasons as follows:</p> <p><u>Current Use</u>: Partly brownfield site comprising an old coal depot. Some of the agricultural land is ridge and furrow of poor quality.</p> <p>This fails to mention that this site is also industrial and in current use. There is a modern Industrial unit on site and it employs numerous workers (see Pic 5). The unit is a hive of activity, they work till 11 O clock at night sometimes. It seems mostly to be Eastern Europeans working there. There are 2 companies at this unit, 1 of which is registered with Companies House.(see Pic 6) however I do believe there are more as there seems to be a mechanics business</p>	<p>is close to a scheduled bus route, which includes on its route the road past Bringhurst School. The additional passengers that would be generated will contribute to the financial viability of the Rutland Flyer service, which is essential to connect Great Easton and other communities to Uppingham and Corby. It is, therefore, considered to be a sustainable development with connection to a settlement, albeit not Great Easton village, and it reuses a brownfield site, in line with policies in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. In sustainability terms, it is important to take into account the potential benefits to Caldecott.</p> <p>Details of the proposed access arrangements cannot be sought as yet, as this is a reserve site and the proposers cannot be expected to incur costs for a site that may not progress, though there are no technical impediments to securing access to the site.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>too. The evidence submitted for this site fails to acknowledge its existence. It appears to us at no time ever has any one made any enquiries or even considered the amount of employment that this unit creates. The companies boast on their websites to have made nearly 3000 hot tubs between them in 4 years . Have the Directors of these companies been consulted? This unit would have to be demolished to make way for houses. In the NP, Page 60, number 11 Employment, support for existing : Because of the restricted opportunities within the Parish, it is considered to be important that such facilities are protected against other uses.</p> <p>Ridge and furrow: poor quality. This field is in the NP twice. It is the field that belongs to Dr Craven. It is included in the NP for development (road to be built through it) Page 21,figure 2.It is also then identified as a ridge and furrow field NP page 48 Figure 7, as a site with well-preserved ridge and furrow earthworks and should be preserved.</p> <p><u>Topography:</u> Relatively flat land The site for the housing development is flat having been raised approx 3 feet above ground to protect it from the floods, but Dr Craven’s field, where the proposed road will be, runs downhill in both directions. One way towards our house and the other way towards our field.</p> <p><u>Greenfield or previously Developed land?</u> Currently farmed and recreational purposes.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Again there is no mention of the 2 vibrant businesses on this site, or the builders yard or The castle Sleeper Hotel.</p> <p><u>Landscape quality</u> : Overall Brownfield</p> <p>It is not clear if referring just to the Station Yard or the rest of the outlined site. In which case it would be overall Greenfield.</p> <p><u>Local wildlife</u>: Nesting birds</p> <p>We also differ on this, as we live very close to the site we see numerous mammals and birds. There are nesting boxes for birds on the trees and there are Barn Owls, Tawny Owls, Green Woodpeckers, Spotted Woodpeckers, snakes to mention but a few. We have a foxes den in our hay store which currently has a litter of cubs in it.</p> <p><u>Listed Building or important build assets</u>: None identified</p> <p>There is an old loco shed which is deemed as an important heritage building, deemed to be early 19th century and should be considered a Heritage asset (see Pic 7)</p> <p><u>Ancient monuments or archaeological remains</u>: None identified</p> <p>It is believed that this site is on or near an old roman settlement and a high likelihood of significant remains lie under the railway line.(see aslo Pic 7)</p> <p><u>Any known contamination issues?</u>: No major issues identified</p> <p>The site is highly likely to be contaminated.(See Pic 8)</p> <p><u>Any known flooding issues</u>: None</p> <p>Quite unbelievable. The whole site is surrounded by a Flood Zone 3 area. The entrance to the site is in flood Zone 2 .Flooding is by far the most serious concern. The River Welland bursts its banks several times a year and floods</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>the surrounding fields, which are recognised flood plains and water meadows. Approx twice a year the flooding is so severe that it completely floods our field all the way up to the railway line. The railway line and station was built approx 2-3 feet above ground level, obviously to prevent flooding and allowing the trains to still run during the floods, it also acts as a dam and prevents the water reaching the Station Cottages and Caldecott village, who already suffer from severe flooding. The Environment Agency have already stated that the level of the railway cannot be altered for this reason(See Pic 9). The only exposed bit of dry land that I have in my field when this happens is the railway line and this is where Dr Craven has offered to have a road built on it for us to provide a safe access, we suggest he also throws in a boat for the residents as they're going to need it! The water butts up against the development site boundary line by about 1 foot deep. I have enclosed photos of the floods earlier this year in March 2016 (See Pic 10,10A and 10B) There is nowhere for any more water to go, it will put all of my field under water if it were to be developed. I would lose my grazing and have to find an alternative for my horses and livestock, which would be extremely expensive. It would be completely ludicrous to build on this site. The disturbance of the railway line during construction would surely weaken its structure and cause it to disperse over a matter of time as it is a manmade platform. We also note that the NP does not acknowledge any flooding issues in this area and have omitted to insert a flood plan map for the area, it gives us a feeling of" we don't really matter</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>“when it comes to other issues, we’re only brought to the attention when they can plant 12 plus houses and a highway on us a mile from the village. I have enclosed a picture of the flood plan surrounding this site (See Pic 11)</p> <p><u>Drainage issues: None found</u></p> <p>Again probably one of the most serious problems we have. The agent could not have visited the site as if he had, he would’ve noted the pumps laying around in Tata Steels ground adjacent to Station Yard. All surface water collects here as it is the lowest point and it can’t drain away. There is a culvert in my field which cannot cope with the surface water that already drains into it from the industrial unit at Station yard. The flooding from storm water is so bad that earlier this year TaTa Steel put a new drainage pipe in from their land to the adjacent field which borders Station Yard ,they tried to relieve their own land of flooding, needless to say it flooded the other field and local farmer Phil Johnson was not very pleased as his field was now sitting under water, he gave them 7 days to remove the pipe and reinstate it. The only other option they had was to pump the water into nearby drains which filter water from the reservoir up to Corby. The pumps are still there.(See Pic 12).So where is the water from a housing estate going to go? Probably on our field again raising the flood waters so we have no grazing left whatsoever.</p> <p><u>Issues related to planning history on the site : None found</u></p> <p>Where did he look? It’s not rocket science to find out previous planning issues on this site. We’re Joe Public and we’ve managed to uncover previous history. Please refer to HDC planning ref 13/00621/OUT. You will find lots of</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>documents related to this site, and opposing comments.</p> <p>So as you can see we feel that this site has been misrepresented and it gained entry into the NP under false pretences. We don't believe it is sustainable and achievable, and it is certainly not available by means of accessing it across our property.</p> <p>We feel Dr Craven's field should never have been considered as an option, as it is green field in open countryside. The assessment mentions twice that one of the owner's land agents is pushing for the development to go forward .We believe this is Dr Craven's land agent as he uses one to rent out his field to a local farmer. It's a NP for local people and shouldn't be influenced by outsiders trying to line their pockets. We fear that if this field is included in the NP, despite whether or not a road gets built through it, that the owner will see this as a green light and try to develop it, claiming that it's in the NP and it's where villagers want to see development .Dr Craven has been involved in a development including his land in the village before, which ended up going to appeal before being approved. He appears very keen to develop his field near Station Yard.</p> <p>In the NP Policy H5-Reserve site Station Yard, Caldecott, this site is referred to as Brick Yard Lane? We can't find any reference to Station Yard being Brick Yard Lane on any maps of the area and it's not recognised on any search engines</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>It would be nice to see the Old Loco Shed at Station Yard recognised as a building of important heritage within the NP and should be preserved.</p> <p>Again we like to say how we appreciate everyone's time and effort in producing this NP, but we do feel it necessary to express our concerns over such a development that would have lifestyle changes for us.</p>		
4			Resident	<p>First of all I must commend the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan Group for all their hard work and endeavour in producing this Draft, and in particular, the 'Vision for Great Easton'. There are, however, numerous points to raise, not least the contradictions that are contained within this Draft.</p> <p>I am, in the main, an avid supporter of Neighbourhood Plans but I am concerned that certain elements in the Housing Section, in particular, will be open to abuse by developers who will attempt to ride roughshod over what is finally decided upon and brow-beat the Local Planning Authority as we have witnessed in the past.</p> <p>No-one in Great Easton doubts this is a beautiful and popular place to live and it is accepted further development will happen but this has to be achieved harmoniously, with care and consideration to existing residents.</p>	Thank you.	None

			<p>The vast majority of residents want to preserve the attractiveness and existing identity of Great Easton. Regrettably, a few within Great Easton appear hell-bent on destroying our tranquil and beautiful location purely for greed and financial gain. This minority, unfortunately, <u>do not</u> have the best interests of the village at heart and invariably their submissions on future housing developments come with strings attached.</p> <p>POLICY H1: HOUSING PROVISION.</p> <p>One has to query how Harborough District Council has arrived at a band of 17 - 32 new dwellings by 2031. Great Easton is a village that has neither stagnated nor stood still over the years with regard to housing development; indeed, the Draft confirms there has been a 20% increase in the population from 2001 to 2011. We have actually seen over 50 new homes built in the last 30 years.</p> <p>Irrespective of the 'start date' the undeniable fact is that there are already plans afoot and in the pipeline to build up to 20 new dwellings within the village which are outside the remit of this exercise but, to my mind, should be noted. Although it seems, erroneously in my view, they cannot be included in this document, potentially; Great Easton could grow by these 20 new dwellings already approved over and above the headline figure. These include: - 6 @ 09/00044/FUL</p>	<p>We are required to conform to the requirement for new housing within the HDC emerging Local Plan, which is scheduled to be Adopted in November2017.</p> <p>The latest housing estimate for Great Easton for 2017 – 2031 is 35 new houses and the Housing Chapter in the NP will be amended to reflect the latest figure.</p> <p>HDC have taken into account all permissions granted up to April 2016 in arriving at the final figure of 35</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Housing numbers amended to 35</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>2 @ 14/0111/OUT 1 @ 14/01326/FUL 1 @ 15/01288/FUL 9 @ 15/01826/FUL 1 @ 16/00598/FUL</p> <p>So, in conclusion, the 20 above + 13 (phase 2, Broadgate) + 10 (rear of 2, High Street) would potentially give Great Easton an additional 43 new dwellings!! Even discounting the 20 listed above there are still 23 new properties which fall into the 17 -32 band and as it is the intention to review the Plan every 5 years there is absolutely no need to include more at this stage.</p> <p>POLICY H3: HOUSING ALLOCATIONS.</p> <p>I am at ease with the first site shown in the document, land behind 2, High Street and the third site listed the proposed development of 13 properties on the back land of the site already approved behind 28, Broadgate, however, I cannot, for one minute, support the decision to include the Barnsdale House proposal.</p> <p>To contemplate the building of 7 new houses within the grounds of Barnsdale House is absolutely ludicrous, totally unacceptable and will fly in the face of many local residents. It seems to have been included in this document purely as an act of appeasement.</p> <p>It is also noted and is no surprise this scheme comes with “strings attached”. It has already been determined by an independent assessor that sites with a Red RAG rating</p>	<p>However we believe that the three separate locations for the main developments, which are separately located on three sides of the village, will not be detrimental to the overall character of the village and the inclusion of a high level of smaller affordable houses will improve the housing balance.</p> <p>The independent housing assessments carried out for all potential sites contributed to but were not the sole determinant in the final housing recommendations.</p> <p>The Barnsdale development scored second in the final Housing recommendations after a very rigorous consultation. Development will have to have regard for the setting including the listed buildings.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	--	-------------------------------------

			<p>“should not be developed” On that basis alone this plan should not be considered or included.</p> <p>With that in mind it is of great concern to see the Housing Group have chosen to list the Barnsdale House proposal in this document. The plan to link in a tied cottage at a different location and a fanciful and superfluous “circular village walk” after the owner has already erected an obstruction prohibiting access is absurd. These are completely separate issues in terms of planning and should be treated as such. Presumably, the threat is if the Barnsdale House scheme in its present form is unsuccessful the offer of an unnecessary circular village walk and the permissive footpath will be withdrawn. So be it.</p> <p>Apart from these manoeuvrings and mind games my reasons why this scheme should not be included in the Neighbourhood Plan document are as follows: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The recent Great Easton Sustainable Housing Development Sites Assessment carried out by Mr Doran clearly states under the RAG rating system “red scoring sites should not be developed” 2) Any development within the grounds of Barnsdale House would detract from its Grade II Listed Building status and be of detriment to the area and completely out of kilter with the setting of this prominent village property. It has already been stated that development here would “undermine 	<p>As previously stated, the independent Housing Site Assessments contributed to but were not the sole determinant in the final housing recommendations.</p> <p>Do not agree. Many listed buildings are in close proximity to new developments. Great Easton is a mixture of old and new buildings and care will be taken to enhance the heritage aspects of this and other sites</p>	<p>Policies H2, H3 and H4 are to be strengthened to demonstrate sensitivity to the heritage setting.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>the integrity and setting of this important property”.</p> <p>3) The tied house, linked to the stable yard adjacent to Bringhurst School, should not be considered in this instance but dealt with as a separate matter as it is not part of the land attached to Barnsdale House.</p> <p>4) Barnsdale House is not a “brownfield” site so priority should not be given to this site in the Housing Allocation exercise.</p> <p>5) It is also worth noting that although some “affordable housing” has been included in this proposal by the developer they would be under no obligation to provide any such housing as the criteria for inclusion will not have been met as your document states under Policy H7.</p> <p>6) If this proposal were to be adopted and eventually approved it is highly probable the number of new dwellings would increase substantially on this site in later years.</p> <p>7) There is absolutely no justification for allowing 7 properties to be built here to provide the necessary funds to rejuvenate Barnsdale House. This should not be the basis for its inclusion as the owner/developer knew about the state of the property beforehand.</p>	<p>There are not enough Brownfield sites to meet the housing need.</p> <p>The affordable housing elements would be one of the conditions on development required through the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The number of houses required is capped through the NP. Once housing need increases and the allocations need to be looked at again, further assessments will be undertaken.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	-------------------------------------

			<p>POLICY H5: RESERVE SITE – Station Yard, Caldecott.</p> <p>Despite, surprisingly, being given a Green scoring site in the RAG rating system this area has previously proved to be a completely unsuitable and unsatisfactory site for housing development. The Housing Group committee will, undoubtedly, be aware of the previous failed Planning Application (13/00621/OUT) appertaining to this site. The main reasons for refusal were on grounds of sustainability and the vehicular access, coming directly out on to the busy A6003 thoroughfare.</p> <p>It was stated by the Local Planning Authority 3 years ago the proposal “would represent unsustainable development in the countryside which would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area” and “would result in an unacceptable increase in traffic turning onto or off a Class 1 road”. Nothing as altered apart from the fact this road has seen an increase in traffic volumes since 2013.</p> <p>My understanding is a nearby landowner has offered some assistance to overcome this problem by making land available for a vehicular access on to Great Easton Road, Caldecott; but seems unfazed by the fact that there is no direct access from the proposed development site to this field!!</p> <p>It is, therefore, a totally unacceptable and unsuitable site for this type of development and should not be included on these two important grounds.</p>	<p>It has been agreed to keep this site as a reserve site for the reasons described in the answer to comment 3) above.</p>	<p>Amendments have been made as described in 3) above.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>To conclude on the subject of housing it has been stated in the Neighbourhood Plan document that it is envisaged this will be reviewed with the possibility of revision every 5 years to coincide with the District Council's Local Plan. In that case it is not essential nor is it necessary to include site two or the reserve site at this juncture.</p> <p>POLICY NHE 1 – PROTECTION OF OPEN GREEN SPACES.</p> <p>It is noted there is no mention of the area of the historic piece of Common Lane situated at the end of Oakley's Yard, Barnsdale, Great Easton. As far as I remember this was given a reference 'CL63', I think, in the list of areas of common land within Leicestershire. To my mind this area should be included in this document as a green space to be protected. This will, at the very least, confirm its existence and make its status known to potential developers.</p> <p>TRAFFIC & ROAD SAFETY.</p> <p>Whilst great significance, quite rightly, has been given to the parking problems outside Bringhurst School no mention has been made of the junction close to the Sun Inn public house. With commercial vehicles and cars parked right up to and, sometimes, actually on this junction this location is a serious accident waiting to happen particularly when entering the village from the direction of Caldecott and being on a bus route. I appreciate the fact that it is not high on the list of priorities of the Highways Authority as a simple suggestion</p>	<p>The area is mentioned in the NP. It is mapped in Figure 6 and listed and described in the Environmental Inventory. It did not score highly enough in the independent assessment to be considered suitable for LGS or OSSR designation.</p> <p>The traffic situation in the area of the Sun public house is acknowledged. Reference will be made within the NP to consideration to be given to the need to review traffic conditions in this area.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>The need to review traffic conditions in this area has been included in the list of Community Actions.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>previously made has fallen on deaf ears.</p> <p>However, this dangerous situation needs resolving with the village increasing in population and more vehicles using this popular route to and from the village. To my mind a lay-by cut into the verge running alongside the wrought iron chain linked boundary fence of Great Easton Manor for 50 metres or so would alleviate the problem.</p> <p>Finally, as this document has to be accepted and voted upon in its entirety in the forthcoming referendum, regrettably, I will be unable to support the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan in its current form.</p> <p>In the event of the Neighbourhood Plan being revised or modified before the referendum I would like to be kept informed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. We hope you will be able to reconsider your position in relation to the referendum. Although no Plan is likely to have every element supported by every resident, not having a NP will result in a lack of control over development activities in Great Easton which may result in the areas of concern – and others - materialising in any event.</p>	<p>None</p>
5		Leicestershire County Council (LCC)	<p>Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan Comments Requested – 4 September 2016</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council is supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process. Due to the current resources available, we are only able to provide general comments at this stage:-</p> <p><u>Highways</u> General Comments</p> <p>The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>	

			<p>they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth.</p> <p>Like very many local authorities, the County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding.</p> <p>To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems.</p> <p>Where potential S106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be</p>	Noted	None
--	--	--	---	-------	------

			<p>assessed against the County Council's other priorities and as such may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provided as a commuted sum.</p> <p>With regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p> <p>The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.</p> <p>Flood Risk Management All types of flooding must be considered when identifying new development sites as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) section 10, 'Meeting the challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change'. Developers should also consider The</p>		
				Noted. NHE 9 covers flood risk	None

			<p>Sequential and Exception Tests as outlined in the document Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Flood Risk.</p> <p>In line with current government policy, (Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161, December 2014), Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be prioritised for managing surface water flows. Therefore, appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites. These features should look to introduce blue green corridors to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new developments, and surrounding areas where possible.</p> <p>Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. LCC 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.</p> <p><u>Planning</u> Developer Contributions If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Developer contributions are covered on a site specific basis in Policy H3 Housing Allocations.</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	---	-------------

			<p>obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Draft North Kilworth NP and the draft Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances at Great Easton. This would in general be consistent with the relevant District Council's local plan or its policy on planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of new development and enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations, where applicable.</p> <p>www.northkilworth.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/nk-draft-low-resolution-1.pdf</p> <p>www.greatglen.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/uploads/175670305aeaf48650823074.pdf</p> <p>Mineral & Waste Planning</p> <p>The County Council is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; this means the council prepares the planning policy for minerals and waste development and also makes decisions on mineral and waste development.</p> <p>Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood.</p> <p>You should also be aware of Mineral Consultation Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals Local Plan and Mineral and Waste Safeguarding proposed in the new</p>	Noted	None
--	--	--	---	-------	------

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

			<p><u>Property</u> Strategic Property Services No comments at this time</p> <p><u>Adult Social Care</u> Suggest reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and look for developments to include bungalows etc of differing tenures. 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.</p> <p><u>Environment</u> No comments at this time</p> <p><u>Communities</u> Consideration of community facilities in the draft Plan would be welcomed. We would suggest where possible to include a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. Consideration could also be given to policies that seek to protect and retain these existing facilities more generally, support the independent development of new facilities and relate to the protection of Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations. The identification of potential community projects that could be progressed would be a positive initiative.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy H6 gives priority to single storey accommodation for elderly people.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The section on Community Facilities addresses the need for support for new community facilities in line with local need.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p><u>Economic Development</u></p> <p>No comments</p> <p><u>Superfast Broadband</u></p> <p>High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a superfast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable, but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life.</p> <p>All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to superfast broadband (of at least 30Mbps) Developers should take active steps to incorporate superfast broadband at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure superfast broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. A broadband policy is included in the NP. We will add in the specific reference to 30 Mbps as the standard to achieve.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>30 Mbps has been added into the policy along with a reference to the policy to apply to community facilities.</p>
6			Resident	<p>Following all the hard work your committee has done over such a long period of time, and most recently putting on the display of your findings in the Village hall on Sept 3rd, I write to say your current plans for Great Easton appear to be eminently sensible and appropriate to the village needs. In particular the proposal for ten units on the chicken sheds site would, for a number of reasons, be an asset to the general layout of our housing stock and a great place for families to live. I also fully understand your decision that the Station</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>The site was considered suitable as a reserve site following a detailed assessment.</p> <p>On review of the comments received through Regulation 14 we have reduced the scope of the site to the brownfield site only.</p>	<p>Amendments have been made to the reserve site as described in the response to no. 3.</p>

			<p>Cottages proposal at Caldecott should, for the time being, be regarded as a reserve site.</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam, RE: GREAT EASTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT CONSULTATION</p> <p>The purpose of my writing is two-fold, firstly to comment on the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission document and secondly, in response to comments raised in a letter at response no 2.</p> <p>I support the inclusion of my land as part of the site referred to in Policy H5: Reserve Site – Station Yard, Caldecott but I believe and suggest it would be more appropriate to include this land as a fully allocated housing site.</p> <p>I propose that including Station Yard as a fully allocated housing site is necessary in order for PolicyH1: Housing Policy to demonstrate flexibility in the delivery of new homes and ensuring that the plan is found sound. I understand that the latest housing numbers identified for Great Easton by Harborough District Council is higher than the figure of 32 dwellings identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, further housing allocations are required to meet this demand.</p> <p>I would argue that the Station Yard site should be put forward as a fully allocated site in order to meet this housing shortage.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The NP supports Station Yard as a reserve site, subject to the modifications in area and entrance as explained in the response to 3.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Part of the site is considered to be a brownfield location and therefore the redevelopment of the site is encouraged by national and local planning policy. The National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF] at paragraph 17 identifies, as one of the core planning principles, that planning should <i>'encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value'</i>. Furthermore, this principle of encouraging brownfield sites is also evident in the Harborough District Council adopted Core Strategy – Policy CS1: Spatial Strategy for Harborough-recognises that priority should be given to the reuse of previously developed land.</p>	Agreed	
			<p>Furthermore, the site can be considered to be sustainable. The NPPF endorses a presumption in favour of sustainable development <i>'At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking'</i>. I would consider that the site constitutes sustainable development as it is located in close proximity to a number of services including the Castle Inn Public House which is located on Rockingham Road opposite the proposed development site.</p>	Agreed	
			<p>Further services, such as a Garage, The Plough Inn, the St John the Evangelist Church and a Primary School are all</p>		

			<p>located within Caldecott which is accessible from the site via a footpath. Further services, including a secondary school and college, can be accessed via the RF1 bus service which runs between Corby, Uppingham and Oakham and has a stop 0.3 miles from the site. From Corby, connections can be made to the wider region, including Market Harborough and Kettering.</p> <p>Should the Parish Council take into consideration the above policy context I would suggest that the Station Road site be promoted as a fully allocated site as it accords with national and local planning principles, which encourage a presumption in favour of sustainable development and prioritising the re-use of previously developed land.</p> <p>I would also like to take this opportunity to address some of the concerns regarding the suitability of the site for development raised in response no 2.</p> <p>The letter suggests that development of the site should be resisted because of the impact that it would have on the views south from Caldecott Road towards Rockingham Castle. These views are protected by Policy NHE 6: Protection of Views of Landscape and Community Value in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. I would suggest that the location of the proposed site means that the majority of the view will be unaffected by any future development. In addition, I would argue that the view from their property can be protected through a sympathetic and well-designed scheme. This could be achieved by providing</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
--	--	--	--	--------------	--

				<p>future development masterplan.</p> <p>Furthermore, their argument that development is not suitable because the Old Loco Shed should be deemed an important heritage building is not appropriate. As identified in the sustainability appraisal and the Historic England's Listed Building record, the site contains no listed buildings which would be a constraint to the future development of the site.</p> <p>Finally, I would also disagree with their argument that development of the site is unsuitable due to issues with flooding and drainage. I have enclosed a copy of the Environment Agency's Flood Map for the site which shows that whilst the site is bounded by areas that are within Flood Zone 2 and 3, the majority of the proposed development site is not identified as an area of significant flood risk. I would argue that there is sufficient space on the site that is not within an area of significant flood risk to accommodate new residential development without proposing any dwellings on areas of flood risk.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could keep me updated on the progress of the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted	
7			Waterloo Housing Group (Seven	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft neighbourhood plan for Great Easton. If you are not already aware, Seven Locks housing is now part of Waterloo Housing Group and I am responding on behalf of the group, focusing on the housing section of the</p>	Noted	None

			Locks Housing)	<p>document.</p> <p>This is well structured and clear and it is good to see the development of appropriate new homes being promoted in the village, including sensible affordable housing proposals. We are particularly pleased to see the Broadgate site identified as a priority and we hope that planning consent for the phase 2 element of the site will be approved by Harborough District Council later this year.</p> <p>We have no serious concerns about the plan proposals but would suggest some care is taken on local connection requirements. In our experience the use of inflexible planning conditions create complications with mortgage providers, even for people with a strong local connection. Lenders typically require an option of unrestricted market sales in circumstances where repossession is required. Individual allocations agreements on each development site can provide the flexibility required by lenders over time, whilst still ensuring local connection is prioritised.</p> <p>I hope the feedback is of use, and we look forward to seeing the finalised plan.</p>	<p>Broadgate was approved by HDC on Sep 16 2016 and this will be reflected in the final version of the NP.</p> <p>A housing allocation agreement, which gives priority to those with a proven local connection, has been approved in principle with HDC and the developer, in conjunction with the Parish Council.</p> <p>The affordable units are likely to be for rent which negates the need for mortgage considerations. The Policy H7 is worded to say 'where possible' and 'shall be' which leaves the door open to remove this requirement if not feasible.</p>	Amended
8		H4	Resident	<p>I read what I could at the Village Hall and want to make two observations. I appreciate all the effort that has gone into creating the document.</p> <p>1. Flooding. We appear to suffer already from a lack of enforcement of the rules on permanent paving. I see numerous examples that seem in contravention – usually</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>Flooding. The Planning regulations state "If the surface to be covered is more than 5 sq</p>	None

			<p>due to the area size covered and the type of block paving employed. Often sited on slopes, the run-off generated downhill makes a significant contribution to unwanted surface water.</p> <p>2. Biodiversity. Much was made of verges etc., but reference to gardens appeared lacking. I enclose research findings highlighting the importance of non-native garden flora and its role in supporting pollinator populations.</p> <p>In addition to the blocks of land allocated for housing development, it was disappointing not to see any proposed curbs on those wishing to “cash in” on their back gardens in cheek by jowl sell-off schemes, thereby reducing village green space and habitats as well as village character.</p>	<p>metres, planning permission will be needed for laying traditional impermeable driveways that do not provide for the water to run to a permeable area”. There is no such requirement for back gardens.</p> <p>Bio-Diversity. An interesting observation but apart from Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), there are no current rules for back gardens.</p> <p>The NP does allow for small scale “infill” developments of private land in order to safeguard the larger open spaces within and around the village. So curbs on back land (garden) development would be in direct opposition to the housing policy as currently proposed.</p> <p>However, Policy H4 Windfall Development states that : d. Infill proposals will be supported if they retain existing important natural boundaries, such as trees, hedges and streams... and do not reduce garden space to the extent that they adversely impact on the character of the area.</p>	None.
--	--	--	--	--	-------

9			Midlands Rural Housing	<p>Thanks very much for this. At first glance the Plan looks both comprehensive and sensible. I will find some time to look at it in detail and complete a comments form before the deadline.</p> <p>Thanks for the chance to do this – it’s always nice to see how Plans have progressed which I have had some involvement with. Well done for getting to this stage!</p>	Noted	None
10			Resident	<p>With reference to the pre submission consultation document I would like to comment on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5, What we want the Neighbourhood Plan to achieve, which states that policies in the Neighbourhood Plan must support the National Planning Policy Framework’s “presumption in favour of sustainable development” <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 8, Housing where the document states that the Independent Sustainability Assessment informed the choice of options put forward. <p>I am therefore asking the following:</p> <p>1. Why are two of the proposed allocations (pg27), land adjacent to Barnsdale House and land to the rear of 28 Broadgate contradictory to the recommendations made in the Public Site Sustainability Summary May 2016?</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>The site assessments formed only a part of the overall assessment process which also took into account public</p>	None

				<p>2. Bearing in mind that the Independent Sustainability Assessment informed the choice of options put forward can you provide the rationale of the NP committee, in relation to the choice of the two above allocations. These allocations according to the supporting documents were assessed using best practice methodology, evidence from Harborough District Council, other approved Neighbourhood plans, National Planning Policy Framework, were scored as red and were deemed not sustainable.</p> <p>3. With reference to the Public Site Sustainability Summary which reports on 14 sites. The Parish Council website details 15 sites. Can you provide clarification regarding this?</p>	<p>consultation and the detailed consideration of the proposals at a meeting with the developers in June 2016.</p> <p>There were originally 15 potential development sites but one was withdrawn before assessment.</p>	None
11			Resident	<p>As requested I enclose the boundary map drawn up by the architects, which depict the rather disappointing boundary change proposal from the latest version of the NP . If you could look into this and revert with any conclusions, we would be grateful. Hopefully just an erroneous error with no malice aforethought...!</p>	<p>Agree. This was an error.</p>	LTD has been amended.
12			Resident	<p>Thank you for sending the pre-submission Neighbourhood plan for comments. It is evident that you have taken a great deal of care and attention when gathering the</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p>	

			<p>information, and I feel that have got to know my village better on reading the document.</p> <p>I have taken note regarding the comments relating to the recreation ground, and as you say all documents require a revisiting every so often. At the time when we gathered information for the recreation ground the village was asked to rank their preferences, both for and against a variety of facilities. Areas such as a skate park area were on the list but the cons outweighed the pros. I would be available to speak further on getting more facilities for the recreation area, my only reservation would be that funding any project takes dedication and that all equipment has to be replaced in time (the current area had a budget of 50K).</p> <p>I would like to congratulate you and the team who put the document together. It is evident that projects that Great Easton as a village undertake are always done with thought, care and to a high standard.</p> <p>One other point, 16 Cross Bank is Grade 2 listed, unless it has been taken off listed building status.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>16 Cross Bank is not on the British Listed Buildings web site as a listed building.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
13		National Grid	<p>Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan Consultation SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID</p> <p>National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

			<p>its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p>About National Grid National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customer. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.</p> <p>Specific Comments An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus.</p>	Noted	None
--	--	--	--	-------	------

			<p>National Grid has identified the following high pressure Gas Transmission pipeline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:  FM02 - Duddington to Churchover</p> <p>From the consultation information provided, the above gas transmission pipeline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.</p> <p><i>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure</i> 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</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. This presence will be confirmed on receipt of planning applications once received and appropriate action taken.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None.</p>
14		Historic England	<p>Thank you for your email consulting Historic England on the latest draft of the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan. Further to our initial advice on the neighbourhood plan, we note that the plan includes proposed sites for housing, and we therefore draw your attention to our advice note on this which sets out the evidence necessary to support such policies: https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/heag074-he-and-site-allocation-local-plans.pdf/</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The SEA screening exercise was always scheduled to take place by HDC during the pre-submission consultation.</p> <p>The Screening Report has been undertaken and will be included in the submission documentation accompanying this NP.</p> <p>You will note the recommendation from</p>	

				<p>Having read the plan it does not seem to have followed this – it makes no reference to SEA, we have received no SEA screening consultation, and it is not present on your website. We note that the allocations lie within the development boundary, but this does not obviate these requirements – and the “independent assessments” do not fulfil the requirement under the SEA regulations. We therefore advise you to re-visit this aspect of the plan in accordance with our advice, as at present the plan lacks the evidence base to demonstrate that the proposals are sustainable, and is therefore at risk of being found unsound at examination. If you have not already done so we recommend that you contact the local plans team at Harborough District Council who will be able to advise you further.</p>	<p>HDC is that a full SEA is not required at this time. Should policies be amended or representations are received from the statutory consultees, the outcome to the screening report may change and the NP will be amended to reflect these changes.</p> <p>Since then Historic England have responded that, in their view, an SEA is likely to be required. HDC, in conjunction with the NP Group, have concluded that a full SEA is not required and the NP will be submitted on this basis.</p>	
15		Agent for Potential Developer	<p>This document provides a written submission to the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft Consultation.</p> <p>1. Introduction On behalf of our client, we are seeking to work with the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan Group in promoting the subject site, Land to the rear of 22 Broadgate, Great Easton (Appendix 1), for residential development.</p> <p>2. Planning Context Great Easton has been identified by Harborough District</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>	

			<p>Council (HDC) in the adopted Core Strategy as a Selected Rural Village and as such is required to accommodate residential development, at a scale in keeping with the existing built form and character of the village. This is further emphasised by HDCs inability to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and therefore, there is increasing pressure to bring forward land for development. We consider that the subject site is deliverable, available and achievable.</p> <p>We have informed the Great Easton Parish Council of the site's development potential. A telephone call took place between Stephen Mair of Andrew Granger & Co. and David Gibley of Great Easton Parish Council, week commencing Monday 29th August.</p> <p>On behalf of the landowner, Andrew Granger & Co. also submitted a pre-application request to HDC and have held two meetings with the Local Planning Authority to discuss the site. The first formal pre-app meeting took place on 14 June 2016 and a written response was received from the Planning Officer on 20 June 2016. Discussions have also taken place with Leicestershire County Council Highways Department.</p> <p>3. Site and Development Potential</p> <p>The site (Appendix 1), measures approximately 0.61 ha (1.49 acres) and sits adjacent to the Planned Limits to Development for Great Easton as designated by HDC.</p> <p>The site has clear boundaries and is adjacent to two</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>approved residential development schemes for 13 and 9 dwellings to the west, by existing residential properties to the south and east, and by agricultural fields to the north. P/300/S59 – Land rear of 22 Broadgate, Great Easton 4</p> <p>In addition, the site is in a highly accessible location and is well placed with regards to local services within Great Easton, the Village Hall, St. Andrews Church, the Post Office and a Public House are all within 0.5 miles.</p> <p>We suggest that the site could accommodate 9 dwellings, which would consist of a mix of house types, including bungalows and starter homes, ranging from 710 sq. ft. to 1,600 sq. ft. (including two, three and four bedroom properties). This proposal received a positive response from HDC during pre-app discussions.</p> <p>As part of the proposed development, we would be looking to provide access to the site via a new private access road situated between 22 and 24 Broadgate.</p> <p>4. Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan On behalf of our client, we wish to make the following observations on the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft. Overall, we agree with the Vision and Objectives set out in the Plan and the Parish Council is to be commended on the extensive documentation which they have produced to arrive at the Pre-Submission Draft.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>We support the inclusion of Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development and propose that this complies with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	Noted	None
			<p>In respect of Policy SD3: Limits to Development we suggest that greater flexibility should be applied to this policy. The NPPF requires all Neighbourhood Plans to conform to its associated Local Plan, and at present the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan does not do this in respect of Limits to Development. Policy CS2 of the adopted HDC Core Strategy states: <i>'Housing development will not be permitted outside Limits to Development unless at any point there is less than a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and the proposal is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement concerned.'</i></p>	<p>We disagree with this interpretation.</p> <p>Where there is no 5 year land supply the existing Core Strategy is considered out of date and therefore the Core Strategy policy CS2 will not apply. If there is a 5 year land supply then Core Strategy policy CS2 will stand and NP Policy SD3 will be in conformity with it.</p> <p>The NP secures the housing requirement as stipulated by HDC. It also contains provision for a reserve site should housing need increase or there be a failure to deliver existing allocations.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
			<p>Therefore, Policy SD3 should be amended to reflect this. It should allow for development out with the proposed amended Limits to Development boundary when there is less than a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land. This will ensure flexibility in the Neighbourhood Plan and also enable HDC to adopt a flexible approach to the delivery of new homes when there is less than a 5 year supply, as the case is at present.</p>	<p>Recent determinations from the Secretary of State (most recently in October this year at Kineton in Warwickshire) have blocked developments that are contrary to a NP even when the local authority does not have a 5 year land supply.</p>	
			<p>In respect of Policy H1: Housing Policy we suggest that</p>	Agreed. The new information provided	Minimum

			<p>there should be greater flexibility within this policy to assist in the delivery of new homes and ensure the plan can be found sound. At present the policy proposes up to 32 dwellings, however, this should be a minimum of 35 dwellings in line with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This would allow for sufficient flexibility in the plan and enable the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver future growth as and when it is required. A report which went before the HDC Local Planning Advisory Panel on the 19th September 2016 recommended that the Lutterworth Strategic Development Area should be the preferred option for meeting Harborough District's housing and employment needs over the plan period to 2031 and P/300/S59 – Land rear of 22 Broadgate, Great Easton 5 beyond. Within this preferred option a housing target for Great Easton has been identified as 35 dwellings. Therefore, Policy H1 should reflect this.</p> <p>We object to Policy H3: Housing Allocations. To deliver a robust strategy that will enable the Neighbourhood Plan to meet its identified need we propose that Land to the rear of 22 Broadgate is included as a formal allocation. The Parish Council's own Site Sustainability Assessment ranks this site as being more sustainable than the proposed allocations, including Land adjacent to Barnsdale House, which has been included in the plan. This would appear to contradict the principle of sustainable development that underpins the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, we would advise that to ensure the plan can be found sound,</p>	<p>since the pre-submission version of the NP was published, means that the minimum housing target should be 35.</p> <p>The development proposal is strongly opposed for the following principal reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The required number of houses to be built during the period of the NP is currently 35 and this requirement is met in full by the three larger developments identified in the draft N Plan and one smaller development of 4 units to meet the recently increased housing target. 	<p>housing target has been increased to 35.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

			<p>the housing allocations are reassessed against the Parish Council's Site Sustainability Assessment.</p> <p>Furthermore, we disagree with many of the comments that have been made as part of the Site Sustainability Assessment. The assessment argued that the site would have a major visual impact, would threaten important trees, woodland and hedgerows, and would not be able to provide a safe access. A sympathetic design can be implemented to take into account important trees, hedgerows and residential amenity. In respect of access to the site, we have discussed the site with a member of the County Highways team who has confirmed that the proposed access to the site is suitable to accommodate residential development.</p> <p>Additionally, we disagree with the suggestion that the site is unsuitable for development because it is outside of the Limits to Development and would set a precedent for further development, which would not be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing village. We would argue that the inclusion of other allocations as potential residential development sites will and have set a precedent for development in this location because they are outside of the original Planned Limits to Development. In addition, the site to the rear of 28 Broadgate extends further into the countryside than land to the rear of 22 Broadgate. In promoting the site for residential development we propose to create a wide corridor for landscaping and tree planting around the site boundaries,</p>	<p>These developments have been chosen following a detailed assessment process, as outlined at para 8b in the Housing Chapter, which included village questionnaires and consultations, independent assessments of all potential sites, developer presentations to an independent panel and numerous meetings of the Housing Group and the full committee. The developer was aware of the process over the last two years and the consultation response was the first communication for a new development.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the timing of the notification, the very clear mandate from the extensive local consultation was that whilst the need for additional housing was accepted, the overwhelming consensus was for the potential developments to be smaller and spread around the village rather than concentrated in one location. This has been achieved in the present plan, with 4 developments spread on all four sides of the village. A concentration of potentially 31 houses in the Broadgate area - (9 approved immediately prior to the NP,</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p>thereby creating a strong defensible boundary to this edge of Great Easton.</p> <p>We support the Neighbourhood Plan's recognition of the need for the provision of a mix of housing types. Policy H6 states that priority will be given to dwellings of three bedrooms or fewer and to single storey accommodation suitable for older people. We consider that our client's site can help meet this objective as it aims to provide 5 three bedroom properties; 2 of which are bungalows. However, we disagree with the policy's presumption against 4 or more bed houses. The Parish Council would be advised to develop a residential development strategy that enables them to have some flexibility with regards to future development; the current policy does not allow this.</p> <p>5. Conclusion</p> <p>We believe that Land to the rear of 22 Broadgate has the potential to provide 9 dwellings and associated vehicular access.</p> <p>As Great Easton continues to grow and expand, we believe that development will be needed to provide for the various household groups that will be looking to live</p>	<p>13 during the NP and the proposed 9), would be in direct opposition to the community wishes.</p> <p>The Site Sustainability, referred to in the comments, was only a part of the overall decision making process from which the final housing recommendations were made.</p> <p>Wording in the NP to be amended to enable flexibility in relation to larger houses being included within an overall mix favouring smaller dwellings.</p>	<p>Policy wording has been amended as proposed.</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

				<p>within the area and that the P/300/S59 – Land rear of 22 Broadgate, Great Easton 6 current draft of the Neighbourhood Plan does not provide sufficient flexibility in order to meet the future residential demand.</p> <p>We believe that the current allocation of sites for residential development completely disregards the principle of sustainable development that underpins neighbourhood, local and national planning. The Parish Council’s own Site Sustainability Assessment identifies how our site is more sustainable than at least one of the current allocations, and as such we recommend that Land to the rear of 22 Broadgate is included as an allocation.</p> <p>Andrew Granger and Co. would like to remain involved throughout the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan process and therefore request to be informed of any future consultation stages and when the document is submitted to Harborough District Council and the Independent Examiner.</p>		
16			Resident	<p>We have previously discussed our intention to investigate developing part of our land which is adjacent to the field owned by the Coopers. Our intention would be to build a single dwelling of a scale and design that was aligned with other, neighbouring properties and would be for us to live in. For ease of identification please refer to the attached document (M127 SK04) which is a proposed site plan. This outlines the location and gives some indication of the size and positioning of the house, we are proposing.</p>	<p>Noted. The adjacent Coopers Field is now being recommended for a 4 house development and the LTD line has been redrawn to reflect that.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out a number of proposals for housing developments in Great Easton. It also recognises the importance of 'infill' or</p>	None

				<p>We are aware that the Coopers expressed a desire to have their field assessed as part of the GENP, for circa 3-4 dwellings and this, whilst not identified as one of the top 3 sites, nevertheless was consider a good site for infill development. In case it is a consideration, you will note, as highlighted in the Environmental section of the GENP, the area we are discussing, like the Cooper’s field, is not considered to have ridge and furrow.</p> <p>It is our understanding, that this positive view, led to the Neighbourhood Plan proposing to alter the limits to development to include the Coopers field and the properties up to 28a Caldecott Road.</p> <p>Given the supportive narrative in the Neighbourhood Plan for sympathetic infill development and the high scoring of the Coopers field we would like the GENP to alter the limit to development to the position highlighted in the Document (M127 SKO5) to include the section of our land.</p> <p>We would be delighted to provide any further supporting documentation that you may require or to discuss in person if this was considered helpful</p>	<p>'windfall' sites which have historically delivered a number of new dwellings in the village.</p> <p>The request to amend the LTD was discussed at the full meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan and Parish Council on 14 December 2016 which had been called to agree the final documents prior to submission to HDC</p> <p>The proposal to amend the LTD line was not agreed.. This decision was recorded in the minutes of the meeting, noting that this did not preclude the applicant submitting a planning application in the future, in accordance with the normal planning process.</p>	
17			Major Landowner	<p>I acknowledge safe receipt of the above plan and we have no comments to make at present. I would be grateful if you continue to keep me updated with progress.</p>	Noted	None
18			Medbourne Parish Council	<p>I am writing in response to your sending Medbourne Parish Council a copy of your draft Neighbourhood Plan as part of your Pre-Submission Consultation. This was passed</p>	<p>Noted We are in liaison with Medbourne as they develop their NP</p>	None

				<p>to me as Chair of the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee.</p> <p>We note the contents with interest, in particular, the inclusion of Bringhurst School in your plan. It is interesting to read your policy options and to see how you are planning to address issues, many of which we have in common. We have no specific comments to make but wish you well with the consultation and referendum.</p>		
19			Natural England	<p>Pre-Submission version of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Great Easton for 2017-2031</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 04/09/2016.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to</p>	Noted	None

				<p>the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land We have not checked the agricultural land classification of the proposed allocations, but we advise you ensure that any allocations on best and most versatile land are justified in line with para 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>For clarification of any points in this letter, please contact me on 02080261940.</p> <p>For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p>	<p>There is no “best” agricultural land within the NP area.</p> <p>All agricultural land in the NP is classified as 3, on a scale of 1:5, which is officially described as “moderate” to “good”.</p>	
20	P23 (b)		HDC	<p>The housing number used in the draft plan (9500) should be checked with the latest emerging figure for growth in the district. The latest figure is 11000 dwellings between 2011 and 2031 (recent Executive report on preferred option). Subsequently the amount of housing growth to be allocated to Great Easton is expected to be in excess of 32 units in the plan period.</p>	<p>Agreed. The new information provided since the publication of the Pre-Submission version of the NP will be reflected in the Submission version.</p>	<p>The District-wide housing requirement for 9,500 houses has been uplifted to 11,000 and the minimum target for Great Easton increased to 35.</p>

21		H5	HDC	<p>The LA have concerns about the reserve site. Is there evidence that Gt Easton have spoken with neighbouring LA that Caldecott lies in? The travel to school for children at Caldecott would be large. It should be considered whether this policy meets the requirements of Sustainable development as it is not well linked to Caldecott village</p>	<p>Having reviewed this, it has been agreed to reduce the scale of the reserve site to the brownfield element only.</p> <p>In terms of the link to Caldecott, the site can easily be connected to Caldecott by a short footway extension; the proposal provides for a food retail farm shop, thereby increasing the amenities available to people in Caldecott, who no longer have a shop; it is close to a scheduled bus route, which includes on its route the road past Bringhurst School. The additional passengers that would be generated will contribute to the financial viability of the Rutland Flyer service, which is essential to connect Great Easton and other communities to Uppingham and Corby. It is, therefore, considered a sustainable development with connection to a settlement, albeit not Great Easton village, and it reuses a brownfield site, in line with policies in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. In sustainability terms, it is important to take into account the potential benefits to Caldecott.</p>	
----	--	----	-----	--	---	--

22		H6	HDC	<p>The LA considers this policy could be strengthened, as in its current format it is unlikely to deliver smaller properties. Life time homes may be better substituted with a specific requirement for a percentage of homes to be built to building regs Part M2 for adaptable and accessible homes.</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/540330/BR_PDF_AD_M1_2015_with_2016_amendments_V3.pdf</p>	The policy is to be amended to reflect a desire for 50% of dwellings to meet this standard.	Text and policy have been amended as proposed.
23		H7	HDC	<p>This policy is designed to give current residents and those with a connection to the village priority for affordable housing. The current demographics of Great Easton are predominantly of white ethnicity (1.8% BME), and it would be worth considering whether this policy in its current form is subject to inherent inequalities. The Plan should also be considered for equalities in general.</p>	The NP is being prepared to reflect the local circumstances of Great Easton, so it is inevitable that policies that promote the locality reflect the current population mix. This is true of policies that support provision for older people or for young families.	None
24		NHE 5	HDC	<p>It would be good to see a requirement for a contribution to support some sites recognised as possible sites for improvement. The water course (Eyebrook) is mentioned for access and views (NHE6) and this is supported in Natural England's Character Area profile No 93 – High Leicestershire which identifies the Eyebrook as being an Environmental Opportunity. It would be worthwhile considering whether opportunities could be realised to provide not only access but additional habitat and water quality improvement by identifying suitable project along</p>	Agreed. Text to be amended to address this issue.	<p>Addition to policy added:</p> <p>“Projects for enhancing riparian habitats in and around the main watercourses of the River</p>

				the watercourse. The Welland Valley partnership may be able to help with this https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289703/Welland_Valley_Partnership_River_Improvement_Plan_15_02_13_FINAL_2_f0d67b.pdf		Welland, Eye Brook and Great Easton Brook will be encouraged.”
25		NHE 7	HDC	Contributions to improvements and extensions of specific footpaths may be a good way to strengthen this policy. If projects are identified through the plan it will help officers to secure contributions when development takes place	Agreed. Text and policy to be amended to reflect this.	Amended: “Developer contributions will be sought to improve and extend footpaths where appropriate”.
26		NHE 9	HDC	Flood zone 2 should also be avoided for development if possible and water quality should be addressed in this policy. Item c should include that run-off should be no more than the green field site.	Agreed. Wording to be amended to reflect this	Words have been inserted into the policy as proposed and also ‘Where there is a risk of flooding, a sequential test will be applied to development in line with national and local policies’.

27		E5	HDC	It cannot be assumed that all people working at a home either will or should live there. This appears to be outside the scope of planning. See https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common-projects/56/working-from-home . The point has been checked with HDC enforcement team who state that it would be unenforceable.	Agreed. Delete Policy E5 a).	E5 a) deleted.
28	Section 8 Housing Subsg		HDC	Intro text identifies areas of “Council Housing” which have been provided within the village, but there is no mention of the Social Housing which has been secured through development (for instance 5(?) units at Home Close (land rear of Clarksdale)). Consideration should be given to whether this impacts upon the remainder of the figures in this section.	This narrative does not impact on the policies, so it is not intended to reword the text in this section..	None
29	Section 9 Design & Built Heritage		HDC	The plan defines the Conservation Areas and lists all listed buildings and SM’s within the plan area and the intro text to Policy DBE2 states that by listing and naming all of the Listed Buildings in the plan area, the plan highlights the local importance of these buildings, but they are already designated and therefore have national importance. Are there any properties which fall outside of CA, are not listed but which the group feel are worthy of protection? If so, this could be the opportunity for the group to establish a “Local List” through the neighbourhood plan giving the property the status of a “non-designated heritage asset” and therefore ensuring that consideration has to be given to the impact of any development upon	Agreed – this section needs a slight rewrite to achieve what was intended. The group has considered the possibility of establishing a ‘Local List’ but has decided not to add to those structures already statutorily listed.	Amendment have been made as proposed.

				the significance of that property. (This may not be necessary as the CA is quite extensive however, there may be some buildings (ie the School) outside of the village but within the plan area which are of local value)		
30			Resident	<p>Thank you for organising the meeting on Thursday last week.</p> <p>Update on Contractual Position</p> <p>I am now able to update you on the contractual position regarding; (i) Barnsdale House and adjoining land; and (ii) the disused railway line and willow tree field as follows:</p> <p>The acquisition of Barnsdale House and adjoining land was completed on 10 October 2016 and is owned by a combination of Uppals, Cripps and Langton Homes Limited.</p> <p>Completion of the acquisition of part of the disused railway line took place on 12 October 2016 and contracts have been exchanged on the remainder of the railway line and the willow tree field with completion of those parcels of land to take place on 6 January 2017. The acquiring party is Bybrook Builders Limited (owned by Tracey and me).</p> <p>Holistic Approach</p> <p>Whilst I continue to believe that the holistic approach</p>	Noted	

			<p>presented on my behalf by Jon Golby back on Saturday June 25th represents the best value proposition for the village as a whole I understand that it has not attracted the support of the NPC . Instead the development at Barnsdale House and a single dwelling at Castle View Stables are supported in the NP but appear to have been inadvertently linked to the delivery of both: (a) three units of affordable housing; and (b) the creation of the proposed “...circular village walk...” .</p> <p>Barnsdale House and Castle View Stables Both you and Ian Drummond have confirmed that the Barnsdale House and Castle View Stables development is supported by the NPC regardless of whether a circular village walk or other non-statutory benefits are provided.</p> <p>I would ask that: (i) the reference to the provision of a circular footpath be removed from the housing section of the draft NP; and (ii) the reference to affordable housing at Barnsdale House be expressed to be either 2 units out of a total of 6 new units or 3 units out of a total of 7 new units.</p> <p>The site needs to be allowed to breath and the precise number of new units at Barnsdale House that optimises the design may be 6 rather than 7 – the policy should not be overly prescriptive as to the precise number.</p> <p>I would also ask that the reference to the tied house at Castle View Stables be substituted with the wording set</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>out later in this letter under the heading “Land at Castle View Stables” in order to clarify what is meant by tied.</p> <p>Alternative Proposition</p> <p>There was a debate at the meeting about the possibility of support being given for a proposed development that did <u>not</u> include the provision of affordable housing in the context of some other benefit being obtained. I would in this context be willing to create a permissive footpath along the disused railway line (and to grant this permission in perpetuity) provided that planning permission were granted for 6 or 7 units of open market housing at the Barnsdale House site and a single dwelling at Castle View Stables.</p> <p>I am advised that this is an approach that is open to the NPC and if on balance this is considered to be a better option by the NPC I would respectfully suggest the following adjustments to the draft NP:</p> <p>First, inclusion within the draft NP - in substitution for the current wording of the heading “b. Land adjacent to Barnsdale House” (which is in turn under the heading in bold text in the current draft “Allocations are as follows: “.. – of a more accurate heading as follows :</p> <p>“ b. Barnsdale comprising : (1) Land adjacent to Barnsdale House (6 or 7 units) ; and (2) Land at Castle View Stables (1 unit) .</p>	<p>Noted. It was agreed to recommend to accept the alternative proposition for a revised housing mix at Barnsdale and the reinstatement of the permissive footpath, as outlined in the comment.</p>	<p>The Housing chapter of the submission version of the NP has been amended to incorporate the revised wording as detailed in the Alternative Proposition.</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p>Second, in draft policy H3 under the heading “Barnsdale House” in substitution for the current wording: “b. Barnsdale (1) Land adjacent to Barnsdale House The development should provide for 6 or 7 houses in the grounds of Barnsdale House. The housing mix shall be in line with Policy H6. The design of the development shall comply with Policy DBE1. A planning obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 shall provide for a permissive path for pedestrians only to be made available in perpetuity along the section of disused railway line between point “A” and point “B” on plan [] as a contribution towards the establishment of a circular walking route . The planning obligation shall contain such other terms as shall be agreed between the local planning authority and the owner of that section of disused railway line.</p> <p>(2) Land at Castle View Stables The development should provide 1 house whose occupancy shall be limited to: (i) a person or persons solely or mainly employed or last employed in the business occupying the stables or a widow or widower of such a person or any resident dependants; and/or (ii) a person or persons solely or mainly working or last working in the locality in agriculture or in forestry, or a widow or widower of such a person, or any resident dependants. The design of the development shall comply with Policy</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>DBE1.”</p> <p>Disused Railway Line Interim Measure Whilst these discussions and the NP process is continuing I would propose that an agreement is entered into as soon as possible with Harborough District Council for a 6 month period of use of the disused railway line as a permissive footpath.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me if you require further information or clarification.</p>		
31			Resident	<p>Hi, Two points within the plan cause me a little concern.</p> <p>The first is the approach to flooding within the village and the apparent lack of positive action to ensure future development within the village does not have an adverse effect. By this I mean that the village dam and brook may require additional improvement to cope with future growth. Just planting a few more trees etc. may not work.</p> <p>My second concern is there is no mention of sewage disposal within the plan. Clearly additional growth brings additional waste. Is this something the village sewage works can cope with? If not should there be some sort of planning with regards to improvements?</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>Policy NHE9 deals with flooding issues, noting the documented history of flooding from the large catchment area to the NW of the village. The policy addresses issues relating to all new developments.</p> <p>Work is currently being undertaken, led by the Parish Council, to address the current infrastructure and Anglian Water have recently (Sep 2016) surveyed all the existing drains and sewers and completed a number of outstanding repairs.</p>	None

					<p>This work, including reviewing the existing sewage capacity, is in hand by the Parish Council and includes local landowners and also the local Lead Flood Agency to agree measures to alleviate future risk.</p> <p>Anglian Water have commented on sewerage capacity and raised no concerns. They will make further comments once detailed planning applications are submitted.</p>	
32		Anglian Water	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Great Easton Neighbourhood Plan. The following comments are submitted on behalf of Anglian Water. I would be grateful if you could confirm that you have received this response.</p> <p>Policy H3 – Housing Allocations All of the proposed housing allocations sites identified in Policy H3 are expected to require improvements to be made to the water supply network to enable development to come forward.</p> <p>The allocation sites at 2 High Street and land adjacent to Barnsdale House are not expected to require improvements to the foul sewerage network.</p> <p>Anglian Water has previously provided comments (Anglian Water reference 00013247) to Harborough District Council</p>	<p>Noted. The extent of these improvements will be confirmed at the point of formal detailed planning applications being submitted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>	

			<p>in relation to a planning application for 13 dwellings at the land rear of 28 Broadgate (planning application reference 16/00380/FUL).</p> <p>Policy H5 – Reserve site Station Yard, Caldecott We note that a reserve site for housing has been identified in the event that the housing sites outlined in Policy H3 do not come forward as expected.</p> <p>At this stage it is not known whether this will be required to meet housing need. However Anglian Water would assess the available capacity of the foul sewerage network in the event that a planning application is submitted for this site.</p> <p>Policy DBE1 - Design We support the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and would like to see their use to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding. Therefore we support the requirement to use SuDS as part of development within the Parish.</p> <p>Before agreeing the discharge of surface water into the public sewer network we would require evidence from the applicant that alternatives as outlined in Part H of Buildings Regulations have been fully explored.</p> <p>Policy NHE 9 – Rivers and Flooding We support the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	--	-------------

				<p>(SuDS) and would like to see their use to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding. Therefore we support the requirement to use SuDS as part of development within the Parish.</p> <p>Before agreeing the discharge of surface water into the public sewer network we would require evidence from the applicant that alternatives as outlined in Part H of Buildings Regulations have been fully explored.</p> <p>It would also be helpful to include a requirement for applicants to demonstrate that there is available capacity within the foul sewerage network for their development or that capacity can be made available prior to occupation.</p> <p>Should you have any queries relating to this response please let me know.</p>		
33			Environment Agency	<p>Thank you for being given the opportunity to comment on your pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan. I sincerely apologise for the delay in replying to your request and am grateful for the extension of time allowing us to respond.</p> <p>The Environment Agency welcomes the opportunity to engage with local communities to promote environmental enhancements at a local level. Please find our comments as follows:</p> <p>Site Allocations The Draft Plan is proposing, through a number of Policy's</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The reserve site has been reduced to the brownfield element only in order to remove the concerns expressed. A more detailed explanation is provided in no. 3 above.</p>	<p>Reserve site boundary has been reduced.</p>

			<p>to allocate land for housing in a number of locations. Due to the issue of flood risk, we have the following comments to make on Policy H5.</p> <p>Policy F13 : RESERVE SITE – Station Yard, Caldecott.</p> <p>Our records indicate that approximately the eastern half of the site lies within Flood Zone 3, the area of land deemed at highest risk of flooding according to the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Paragraph 101 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that “Development should not be allowed or permitted for development if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding”. This process is known as the flood risk Sequential Test and it aims to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding.</p> <p>In order for you to progress with the proposed housing land allocation at Station Yard, Caldecott the Neighbourhood Plan will need to demonstrate that there are no reasonably available alternative sites that could be allocated for housing and are at a lower probability of flooding. The basis for applying the flood risk Sequential Test to the Neighbourhood Plan should be the Harborough District Council Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Final Report April 2009.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that Harborough District Council, as Local Planning Authority, should provide advice to you on where and how it should be demonstrated that policies and any site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans would satisfy the Sequential Test and, if necessary, the Exception Test, including the appropriate area to apply the Sequential Test.</p> <p>There are two elements to the Exception Test which are expressed in more detail in Paragraph 102 of the NPPF. In summary, any development that requires the Exception Test to be undertaken must demonstrate that it provides wider sustainable benefits that outweigh flood risk, and a site specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate the development will be safe for its lifetime.</p> <p>As defined by Paragraph 023 of the PPG, “The Exception Test, as set out in Paragraph 102 of the Framework, is a method to demonstrate and help ensure that flood risk to people and property will be managed satisfactorily, while allowing necessary development to go ahead in situations where suitable sites at lower risk of flooding are not available”.</p> <p>If the site does become deemed to have passed the Sequential Test then we would recommend some additional wording to Policy H5, for example “The development should take into account the risk of flooding and ensure that it is safe for its lifetime without increasing</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within eight metres of the top of the bank of the Great Easton Brook which runs through Great Easton or the Eye Brook near Caldecott, both of which are designated a 'main river'. This was formerly called a Flood Defence Consent. Some activities are also now excluded or exempt. A permit is separate to and in addition to any planning permission granted. Further details and guidance are available on the GOV.UK website: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits.</p> <p>We hope you find the above comments useful and again I apologise for the lateness of the reply</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--