# Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC) comments in response to the 1st draft of the Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Plan (October 2018)

It is recognised that the document provided is a very early draft of the plan written by different authors to those who now form the Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Planning Group. The comments below are provided to assist the NP Group in their review of the current draft and help inform the next iteration of the plan. Some of the policies below read as statements or action points for the Parish Council / NP Group rather than land-use planning policies. These have been identified in the comments along with recommendations as to how the theme of the policy could be taken forward into a policy more appropriate for a NP or where Local Plan policies exist which could achieve the policy objective through the planning system.

## General Comments

### Supporting Text / Evidence base

At present the policies have no context in the form of supporting text to explain their inclusion and their purpose. For example, under the ‘Facility for the Elderly’ section, there is no context to the site being referred to. A plan should be structured that it provides narrative to the topic being discussed, giving the reader an understanding to the issues or why the topic is particularly important to the community. The text should also refer or give some context to the evidence that has been used to inform the plan and the relevant policies. The supporting text can also be used provide further explanation to the criteria contained in policy. This all helps the reader understand the context of the policy, particularly applicants and the HBBC Development Management Team who will apply the policies.

Having a clear and up-to-date evidence base is essential to inform the policies and proposals contained in the plan and meeting the ‘Basic Conditions’ against which a plan will be assessed at Examination. It is noted that in the draft plan a number of surveys have been referred to. It is information such as this that can be fleshed out in the supporting text, along with other relevant evidence (whether that be HBBC documentation, work undertaken by the NP Group and external studies). The NP Group may also wish to consider the use of supplementary papers which provide the justification behind proposals and/or policies contained within the plan. These could cover topic areas such as Local Green Spaces (including their assessment), housing allocations (including the assessment and appraisal of options) and infrastructure items the community would like to be delivered.

It is also helpful for the reader if, when referred to, the evidence base is signposted possibly through the use of footnotes or a list of evidence base documents at the end of the chapter or as an appendix.

### Plan Layout

When allocating or designating sites through policy, these should be identified on one ‘policies’ map (please see the HBBC Site Allocations DPD as an example). The plan can be supplemented by further maps such as site specific (i.e. housing allocations) or topic based (Local Green Spaces) maps.

When numbering the policies, please continue the numbering sequentially throughout the plan.

## Policy Comments

### Housing – Normal, Social and Windfall Sites

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introduction  The HEDNA Assessment has identified a future need in Leicestershire for all types of Housing, Conventional, Social, and Facilities for the Older and Disabled. Three sites around the village have already been surveyed by developers, for one of them, the developer has suggested that the site would be developed as a facility for the elderly. On this basis policies have been put forward for any development of this type. | It is not clear from this paragraph as to which sites are being referred to and specifically which site has been specified for elderly.  Is there an identified need for a facility for the elderly in Stoke Golding?  Whilst alternative sites may have been assessed by developers, it is the role of the NP Group to undertake an assessment of alternative sites to identify the most suitable in planning terms. The plan also the offers the opportunity for the community to have input into determining which site(s) would be preferable for development. |
| Policy 1  To maintain the rural character of the village, the creation of a disabled accessible, small copse of native trees, wildflower areas and a pond would contribute to biodiversity, create an enhanced environment and provide a meeting space for the residents of the estate. The facilities to be located, so that at maturity they do not impact on existing and new properties. All existing hedgerows and trees should be retained around developments and in their absence native hedging and trees should be planted around the perimeter of the development. Buildings and utility services should be located to avoid damage to these features. The location of new buildings should ensure that these features can “mature” and be maintained without having significant impact. (e.g. creating shady areas that could later be the justification for their removal.) | This policy is not clear as to the site that it is being referred to, nor what it is intending to achieve. If the plan is to allocate sites for development, the plan needs to include a map illustrating the allocation boundary and should be explicit as to the name of the site. The accompanying policy should be explicit as to the intended use for the site in conjunction with any specific criteria that should be considered by the applicant (unless specified elsewhere in the Local or Neighbourhood Plan). These criteria should be explored with the land owner / developer to ensure the scheme will be deliverable whilst achieving what is intended for the site by the community. |
| Policy 2  Houses of different types including bungalows to be provided. These should be designed in a variety of styles avoiding the “urban” look and feel of more recent developments and be appropriate for Stoke Golding's current and future population in a manner that promotes a sense of community linked to Stoke Golding’s community as a whole. | If the NP group wish to specify housing types then the policy should be clear as to what these should be, supported by evidence on housing need. Policy 16 of the Core Strategy sets out such an approach, allowing flexibility for the latest housing need to influence the proportion of housing types to be provided on a site. The group can work with land owner / developers to agree the type and mix and include this within policy or supporting text.  Regarding design, it is not clear as to what is the ‘urban’ look that is being referred to and how the design would promote ‘a sense of community’. Policy DM10 of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD (SADMDPD) includes criteria relating to layout, design and impact on amenity of proposals. Specifically, criteria (c) and (d) which state:  *“c) It complements or enhances the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features;*  *d) The use and application of building materials respects the materials of existing, adjoining/neighbouring buildings and the local area generally;”*  The above criteria would allow for schemes to be designed in a way which reflects the character of the existing settlement. The Plan could provide further locally specific design principles to reflect certain design characteristics or features which are currently favoured by the local community. |
| Policy 3  Building design should be sensitive to the existing and adjoining properties and minimise visual impact. | Please see comment in response to Policy 2 above. Criteria are covered in Policy DM10. |
| Policy 4  Provide additional affordable and social housing to prevent the village becoming financially “exclusive”. The provision of such houses should be line with HBBC Policy and should not be reduced after planning approval. | As noted by the policy, HBBC already has policies regarding the provision of affordable housing (CS Policies 16 & 17). Duplication of policy not required. |
| Policy 5  All future affordable housing vacancies to be prioritised to local community residents, their immediate family and those who have had their permanent place of work within the NDPA for more than one year. This can be achieved by extensively advertising to the local community, using social media etc. for at least month before being put on the open market. | The following comments have been provided by the Borough Council’s Strategic Housing and Enabling Officer.  The suggested wording does not differentiate between the different types of affordable housing. Any affordable housing for rent will have a requirement to be let from the council’s waiting lists. The policy as currently worded would be very difficult to implement from both the point of view of the Council fulfilling its duties to people in housing need, and operationally as it will not fit with the allocations system we use. The desire for properties in the first instance to be offered to someone with a local connection is supported and it is what we do now for rented, but an example of a workable operation of that policy could be:  All future new affordable housing for rent to be offered in the first instance to people with a connection to the local community. The criteria for the local connection are set out in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council’s Housing Allocation Policy. All affordable home ownership should be prioritised to local community residents, their immediate family and those who have had their permanent place of work within the NDPA for more than one year. This can be achieved by extensively advertising to the local community, for at least month before being put on the open market. |
| Policy 6  For Housing developments of 10 and above, affordable housing should be spread evenly across the development site in small clusters of one to four dwellings. | The Plan could adopt such a policy approach, however it should be noted that a similar approach is included within the Borough Council’s Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document which states (Key Policy Principle AH3: Design & Layout)  *“The distribution of the affordable housing units across a new development is essential in order to assist in the creation of sustainable communities. On larger sites the preferred option is to have small groups of affordable homes in a number of different locations on the site. The size of the cluster will be dependent on the number of dwellings on site, but the expectation is that affordable housing will be spread through the site on all developments. Developers will be expected to agree the locations with the Council and to provide details of the affordable housing distribution in the development as part of the planning application.”* |
| Policy 7  Provide each house with parking for at least two cars, excluding garages, to minimise on-street parking. | Other NP groups have sought a similar policy however we have advised against this as setting a minimum requirement is not NPPF compliant. The policy does not have proportionate regard for the types of dwellings being proposed.  Paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2018) states:  *“If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account:*  *a) the accessibility of the development;*  *b) the type, mix and use of development;*  *c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport;*  *d) local car ownership levels; and*  *e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.”*  A recent appeal decision (APP/Y2430/W/18/3196456) has overruled a similar NP policy specifying two parking spaces. The Inspector noted that the NP parking standards are at odds with those contained within the 6C’s Design Guide used by the Highway Authority (now superseded by the Leicestershire County Council’s ‘Leicestershire Highways Design Guide’).  Please see SADMDPD Policy DM18 (Parking standards). |
| Policy 8  Developments should incorporate pedestrian and cycle links to adjoining residential areas and facilities. | This is a broad requirement and it may not be feasible or appropriate for all proposals. Policy DM17 of the SADMDPD states:  *“Development proposals will be supported where they:*  *b) Seek to ensure that there is convenient and safe access for walking and cycling to services and facilities;”*  When considering site allocations you may wish to specify site specific links within the respective policy. |
| Policy 9  From contributions to the Section 106 funding, the initial priority is the purchase of land to extend the existing community recreation ground  OR as part of the 106 agreements land to be donated to the community to extend the existing community recreation ground. | As currently worded the policy sets out a preferred approach towards the spending of developer contributions rather than a land use policy. The plan can certainly identify a list of infrastructure items the local community wish to see come forward, or those items that are essential to support the delivery of the allocated sites.  Has the NP group had discussions with the land owner as to the possibility of purchasing of land to extend the existing community recreation ground? At present this is an aspiration of the plan. The land could potentially be allocated for this purpose if there was support from the landowner. |
| Policy 10  For housing developments of all types, landscaping and support infrastructure should be developed in tandem with housing, so that it is fully completed when the last houses are completed. | The policy is not clear as to what is meant by ‘support infrastructure’. The provision of infrastructure to support proposals is a complex matter. Infrastructure which is directly related to the development (such as access) will be delivered as part of the scheme. Other infrastructure is likely to be delivered as a result of developer contributions as part of a section 106 agreement, such as towards education provision will be collected and spent accordingly when it is deemed necessary by the infrastructure provider. |

### Facility for the Elderly

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  Extensive landscaping of the complex to retain the rural character and blend in with existing features. In particular use of resilient native trees, sited so that they can grow to maturity without impacting on the complex, utility services or the adjacent properties. The creation of copses as small areas of woodland, wildflower areas and a pond would contribute to biodiversity and create an enhanced environment for the residents of the complex. All existing hedgerows and trees should be retained and buildings and utility services should be located to avoid damage to these features. The location of new buildings should ensure that these features can “mature” and be maintained without having significant impact. (e.g. creating shady areas that could later be the justification for their removal.) | Similar comments as per Policy 1 under the housing above. The policy is not clear as to which site is being referred to. |
| Policy 2  The facility should be connected to the village pavements by an accessible footpath. | This would be the case for any development within / adjacent to the settlement. |
| Policy 3  To ensure the facility is in harmony with the existing village character, the development should be in keeping with adjacent buildings, particularly height. | Please see comments provided under policies 2 and 3 above. |
| Policy 4  Developments to be designed to maximise separation from existing properties by using access road/s and landscaping to minimise the impact on existing properties and residents. | Policy DM10 of the SADMDPD provides a range of criteria to consider the impact of developments on the amenity and privacy nearby residents and amenity. Policy 4 seeks maximum separation from existing properties, however each scheme should be considered on its merits and the policy currently prioritises maximum separation of development over other considerations which are just as relevant such as siting, layout and design. |
| Policy 5  All “housing” vacancies to be offered primarily to local community residents or their immediate family and should be extensively advertised to the local community, using social media etc. for at least month before being put on the open market. | Please see comments under Policy 5 above. |
| Policy 6  Accommodation for older people should make provision for a suitable proportion of to be affordable. | This policy is not clear or specific as to what is intending to achieve or is it defined what a ‘suitable proportion’ of affordable housing is. The policy would not be implementable. |
| Policy 7  Adequate parking and facilities, including a provision for environmentally for environmentally friendly transport to be provided for staff, residents, visitors, and service vehicles. | It is not clear whether this policy is referring to a particular scheme. As per the comments. Parking will be provided in line with the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide. |
| Policy 8  Any future large development for elderly people should provide age appropriate exercise, recreational, social facilities and support services, including food and these should be made available to elderly residents and visitors from the local community. For example restaurant, exercise classes, gym and social events. | A proposal for development will be for a specified use i.e. a care home. The facility could accommodate such uses as those identified, however it would be for the operator to determine what these might be. |
| Policy 9  To help with local employment opportunities, any staffing vacancies to be filled primarily by local community residents by advertising using social media etc. for a reasonable period before being put on the open market. | The planning system is not able to specify such a requirement. |
| Policy 10  A significant contribution to be made to the Section 106 funding, of which the initial priority is the purchase of land to extend the existing community recreation ground. | It is not clear what a ‘significant contribution’ is. The Borough Council will seek developer contributions from all major residential development (10 or more dwellings). The Borough Council consults the infrastructure and service providers on the planning application to identify the amount of on and off-site infrastructure required to support the proposed development. Planning obligations are only sought where they meet the following tests of the NPPF (paragraph 56):  *“a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*  *b) directly related to the development; and*  *c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.”*  As noted under Policy 9 (Housing) above, the purchase of the recreation ground is more appropriately addressed through an infrastructure schedule of items and / or allocation in the plan. |

### Disabled Persons Accommodation Policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Developers should work with disabled clients to modify homes, at reasonable cost, to meet specific need. | This policy is seeking a commitment from developers for work to be completed but it is not attached to a development scheme. It is not clear as to what homes are being referred to and when this requirement is to be implemented. |

### Employment, Business and Local Economy Policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  Any future industrial/commercial business developments should be located in or around Willow Park. They should be similar in scale to existing units. They should conform to the Borough Councils Development Policies and should have limited visual impact, utilise natural native species for screening and have minimum impact on existing historic and landscape features. | It is possible for the NP to specify where future employment (industrial / commercial) land would be permitted. The policy as currently worded is vague and allows for an unspecified amount of employment in proximity of Willow Park. This could open the site up to more development than perhaps envisaged and the policy is contrary to Policies DM4 and DM20 of the Local Plan. Reference is made to the Employment Land and Premises Review and consideration of an extension to the Willow Park Industrial Site. If the plan seeks to accommodate employment development at Willow Park, it is suggested that the group works with the operator, owner and/or adjacent land owners to establish the potential to extend the site. Any intended extension should be allocated in the plan (included on the policies map).  An alternative is to allow proposals to come forward to be assessed against Policies DM4 and DM20 of the SADMDPD. DM20 allows for extensions to existing employment sites which lie beyond the settlement boundary.  *“Proposals which stand outside the settlement boundary and on Greenfield sites will only be found acceptable where it is demonstrated that there are no suitable alternative sites identified sequentially in the following locations:*  *a) Within settlement boundaries;*  *b) On previously developed land;*  *c) Adjacent to existing employment areas;*  *d) Adjacent to settlement boundaries.”*  Additional employment provision is supported by Policy 7 and Policy 11 of the Core Strategy. |
| Policy 2  Because of its historic link to the Battle of Bosworth, the Parish Council will provide support, as appropriate, for businesses and organisations that seek to promote tourism in the Neighbourhood Plan Area. This will include the provision of additional accommodation, retail and food facilities within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. | The policy supports a range of development that seeks to promote tourism in the NP area. The criteria against which to assess such schemes are limited. A policy which sets out the support for such facilities is not considered necessary, unless the NP is to identify specific schemes. Unless a scheme is identified, proposals will be assessed against the policies of the Local Plan. Policy 23 (Tourism Development) of the Core Strategy and DM24 (Cultural and Tourism Facilities) of the SADMDPD include criteria to assess proposals for tourism development. |
| Policy 3  The Parish Council will support and encourage the establishment of “home working”. In particular by pressing for improvements in Mobile Phone Coverage and Broadband Services within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. This will also help existing businesses. | The policy as currently worded takes the form of a statement or parish action or objective rather than a policy provision. It needs to be considered how the plan can help towards establishing home working through the planning system?  Policy DM16 (Telecommunications) supports proposals for telecommunication infrastructure. |

### Leisure and Wellbeing Policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  The Parish Council in conjunction with the Village Hall Management Committee and appropriate community groups will continue to support the replacement/provision of existing and new facilities/services at the village hall and on the recreational ground. This will include the replacement of the existing Sports Pavilion. | As noted in previous comments, it is useful for the plan to identify a list of infrastructure items (new, replacement or improvements) where evidenced. The sites being referred to are already safeguarded in the Site Allocation DPD (Policies DM8 and DM25).  The group may wish to be more specific as to the proposals that will be supported on the sites and have a supporting policy for each. What uses or development would the group like to see? This could translate into policy that supports the delivery of the intended facilities, whether this be redevelopment, improvements or new provision.  The policy could be supplemented by a site profile which sets out principles for development on the sites identified or the schemes being proposed, the key stakeholders in their delivery, potential funding streams and timescales for delivery. |
| Policy 2  The Parish Council, in conjunction with the Borough Council, and Sports Groups as appropriate, will seek to provide a community all weather-playing surface, and sports hall on land at St Martin’s School. Reasonable access for the community will be provided outside of normal school hours. | As per comments above, it is beneficial for the plan to include a list of infrastructure items that the community would like to see delivered.  The provision of an all weather playing surface could be justified in the request for developer contributions if it is to be of benefit and accessible to the local community. Has the group been in contact with the school to discuss the whether the provision of the pitch is supported? Have they identified funding streams?  The plan will not be able to specify that “reasonable access for the community will be provided outside of normal school hours”. This is at the discretion of the school although limitations on opening times could be considered as a planning condition attached to a planning application. |
| Policy 3  The Parish Council will seek to purchase additional land, adjacent to the existing Recreational Ground, to enable additional facilities such as football pitches, skateboard etc. to be provided in order to cater for the growing community and identified needs. | Similar comments apply as to those under Policies 1 and 2. Do the group wish to safeguard this land? If so, this would need to be evidenced including confirmation from the landowner.  If it is an aspiration of the Parish Council this shouldn’t be in policy and is more appropriate as a ‘Community Action’. |
| Policy 4  Provision of a suitably located skateboard facility will be considered. | Following on from the comments under Policy 3 above. Is this an aspiration or is there a site the group have identified which could be safeguarded for this use?  This could be included on a list of infrastructure items the group would wish to see come forward. |

### Environment, Heritage and Areas of Open Space Policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  The Parish Council will protect the Landscape Character within the Neighbourhood Plan Area by retaining existing trees and hedgerows wherever possible. Protecting the hedges adjacent to roads to and from the village is a key element in preserving the rural character of the Neighbourhood Plan area. Where removal is proposed, due consideration shall be made to the Hedgerow Regulations and where removal is justified the impact shall be mitigated by the provision of additional appropriate planting of native British species. | Has the group considered the information in the HBBC ‘Landscape Character Assessment’ (2017) and the supplementary Landscape Sensitivity Study (2017)?  The studies define the character of the landscape and identify those features which are considered important in the local context. The studies are there to help inform the preparation of Local and Neighbourhood plans and the determination of planning applications.  The studies set out notable outputs including:   * Key characteristics of the area * Key sensitivities and values * A landscape strategy for the character area   The parish of Stoke Golding is situated within the Landscape Character Area (LCA): E Stoke Golding Rolling Farmland and in proximity to LCA: G Sence Lowlands.  The settlement of Stoke Golding is considered further under its Urban Classification Area (UCA), Area 11. The UCA provides a further assessment of the historic designations, landmark buildings and general architectural styles. Key settlement characteristics are identified along with a recommended townscape strategy intended to protect and promote local distinctiveness and unique townscape qualities.  The supplementary Landscape Sensitivity Study (2017) identifies landscape areas that are most sensitive to built development around key settlements based on landscape character. The assessment areas include guidance for any potential development. Stoke Golding lies adjacent to the Bosworth Battlefield assessment area.  The group may wish to explore including some of the outputs from these two studies into the NP as policy and/or guidance. This could apply to all proposed development or applied to allocated sites. The NP group could explore the information provided in the studies in more detail or supplement this with a further local assessment. |
| Policy 2  The rural character of the village is enhanced by its setting. The views from Stoke Golding including the vistas approaching the village from Dadlington, Hinckley, Wykin, Higham, Upton and along the Ashby Canal Towpath should be protected by ensuring that any developments are appropriately in scale and not significantly intrusive. | If the plan is to identify views and vistas, these should be identified on the policies map.  How have the NP group identified the vistas? The views and vistas and the protection afforded to them should be evidenced, whether this is through the HBBC studies referred to above or further assessment commissioned by the NP Group.  The Group may wish to look at the Market Bosworth NP, one example of a plan which has identified views and vistas and locally identified character areas with supporting policies. |
| Policy 3  The Parish Council strongly supports the protection of existing and provision of new open spaces within the settlement boundary, as they are significant features in retaining the character of the village. | Policy DM9 (Safeguarding Natural and Semi-natural Open Spaces) of the SADMDPD seeks to safeguard such existing spaces and the criteria against which development within these spaces will be assessed.  Are there any further sites the NP group have identified? If so these could be included on the NP policies map (supplemented with evidence to justify their inclusion). |
| Policy 4  In line with NPPF Paras 76 and 77 and HBBC Site Allocations Policy DM4, Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation Policy .The Parish Council designates the area between Stoke Golding Settlement Boundary and Dadlington Settlement Boundary as a “Local Green Space”. | It is not clear from the policy which site is being referred to. As with other proposed designations, LGS allocated through the NP should be identified on the policies map and be clearly justified through supporting evidence.  Paragraph 100 of the NPPF sets out the criteria against which a proposed LGS should be assessed and should meet to justify its designation. Paragraph 100 states:  *“The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:*  *a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;*  *b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and*  *c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”*  The process for selecting LGS should be thorough and robust with clear evidence to support their selection and designation.  The policy should be explicit in designating LGS. The policy should provide a list of the sites (locations) being designated, supplemented by a map of the LGS, with a separate location plan and/or on a policies map.  The group may also wish to consider the inclusion of site profiles as appendices, including a site location plan, a description of the site and its special characteristics. |
| Policy 5  The Parish Council would support proposals to enhance bio-diversity within the Neighbourhood Plan Area and in particular the existing “wildlife corridor” that lies along the Ashby Canal. | It is not clear whether the policy supports development proposals that contribute to the enhancement of existing habitats and result in biodiversity gain.  Policy DM6 (Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest) of the SADMDPD sets out criteria to assess development proposals and their potential impacts on sites of biodiversity and geological interest at varying levels. The third paragraph of DM6 states: *“Proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity or geological interest will be permitted where they comply with other relevant policies in the plan.”*  The plan could designate the local wildlife site if this is the intention of the plan. This would need to be included on the policies map. |
| Policy 6  The Parish Council strongly supports the protection of designated Heritage Assets within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. In particular, the Borough Council should implement the National and Local Policies designed to protect irreplaceable assets and resist the pressure to develop new homes on such sites, if alternative sites are available and the village has met Borough housing targets that have been established through public consultation. | This policy is requiring the Borough Council to protect designated heritage assets through implementing national and local policies. This is the purpose of the Local Plan which is used to assess all proposals notably through policies:  DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment  DM12: Heritage Assets  DM13: Preserving the Borough’s Archaeology |
| Policy 7  The Parish Council would be strongly in favour of requiring that all new developments incorporate some means of generating energy (e.g, solar panels) and harvesting rain water. | The NP could set out requirements for sustainable design features, however these will need to be justified and the policy would need to be reasonable in its request for such features. Policy DM10 (f) (Development and Design) of the SADM DP states:  *“Developments will be permitted providing that the following requirements are met:*  *f) It maximises opportunities for the conservation of energy and resources through design, layout, orientation and construction in line with Core Strategy Policy 24.”* |
| Policy 8  Solar panel farms may be developed providing they conform to the Borough Councils Development Policies and have limited visual impact, utilise natural native species for screening and have minimum impact on existing historic and landscape features. | Suggest deleting this policy as there is overlap and repetition with Policy DM2 (Delivering Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development) of the SADMDPD. |
| Policy 9  When a development becomes redundant the owners at time of decommissioning ensure that area of development should be restored to its original condition or landscaped to improve the appearance and its biodiversity compared to its original state. | This policy cannot be implemented, unless the use is temporary and a condition is attached to the planning application, although the policy does not specify this. The policy as worded is not clear whether it is referring to specific uses, and if a site becomes redundant it could come back in to use. |

### Policies for Community Infrastructure and Facilities (Excluding Transport and Movement)

### Schools

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  The Parish Council will support proposals, as appropriate, to improve and enhance facilities at St Margaret’s and St Martins for the benefit of the children in the Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Plan Area. | Has the group engaged with LCC Education Authority regarding a proposed extension? If the plan is to allocate for housing, the education authority should be consulted regarding the impacts of proposed growth in the village.  As noted in the meeting with HBBC, the Council will be contacting the education authority (and all infrastructure providers) to inform the preparation of the Local Plan to identify infrastructure capacity issues and opportunities. The NP group may wish to continue with their own work or draw upon the Council’s emerging work depending on timescales. |
| Policy 2  The Parish Council will, in response to development proposals, stress that unless additional educational facilities are made available outside of the catchment area of St Margaret’s, children from this area could only be accommodated locally by a reduction in standards i.e. increased class sizes. | It is not the role of the Parish Council or the NP to determine how a school should function. It is for the education authority to determine how it will accommodate pupils from within or outside of the catchment area. |

### Healthcare

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  The Parish Council and Borough Council will endeavour to retain a doctors surgery (ideally incorporating a dispensary)within Stoke Golding Village and will support, as appropriate, the surgery to increase capacity to prevent degradation in healthcare provision in the Neighbourhood Plan Area, caused by new housing developments and other increasing pressures on general practice | Has the NP group contacted the West Leicestershire Clinical Commissioning Group to understand the regarding the GP surgery further?  As noted in the meeting with HBBC, the Council will be contacting the CCG (and all infrastructure providers) to inform the preparation of the Local Plan to identify capacity issues and opportunities. The NP group may wish to continue with their own work or draw upon the Council’s emerging work depending on timescales. |

### Water, Electricity, Gas, Communications Services

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  The Parish Council will continue to lobby for, and support, as appropriate, proposals that improve broadband speed and mobile phone coverage for the benefit of the whole community including local businesses throughout the Neighbourhood Plan Area. This is in line with NPPF Para 5. Any proposals must be in line with HBBC Site Allocations Policy DM 16 Telecommunications. | It is not necessary that such a policy is included as Policy DM16 of the SADMDPD supports proposals for telecommunications infrastructure and criteria against which proposals should be assessed. There is however no harm in the inclusion of a policy or ‘Community Action’ (which is more appropriate in the PC seeking to lobby for such provision) which supports such schemes and supporting text and evidence which identifies a need in the NP area. |
| Policy 2  The Parish Council will continue to press for a long term solution to the reoccurring flooding at the junction of Main Street, Wykin Lane and Hinckley Road as and when it occurs, and will press for improvements if other long term service infrastructure problems including drainage, sewerage, electricity, gas, broadband and telecoms occur. | This policy is akin to a ‘Community Action’ rather than a planning policy. The issue regarding the flooding should be explored with Leicestershire County Council as the highways authority. If a specific improvement scheme is identified this ideally should be added to an infrastructure policy/schedule (along with other items identified elsewhere in the plan).  The latter part of the policy referring to pressing for improvements if other long term infrastructure problems arise is a broad statement and relates to an action by the NP Group / Parish Council. Neighbourhood Plans can identify and plan for infrastructure schemes where they are identified. |
| Policy 3  As the housing provision within the village increases, all utilities are required to remain effective throughout The Neighbourhood Plan Area. | This is a broad statement rather than policy. It is not clear what ‘remain effective’ means. All utility providers are consulted through the plan preparation or planning applications processes. |

### Community Facilities

### Pubs & Social Club

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  The Parish Council will support, as appropriate, proposals to ensure the viability of the three pubs and Social Club in the Neighbourhood Plan area and resist having the sites being developed for Housing. | It is not clear as to what is meant by “…support, as appropriate, proposals to ensure the viability of the three pubs and social club…” and how this would be achieved.  The policy seeks to resist the loss of the sites being referred to for housing development. Policy DM25 (Community Facility) of the SADMDPD provides the policy to do this. The Council seek to allocate public houses as community facilities. The existing facilities would however still fall under the provision of Policy DM25. Two public houses (The George and Dragon & Three Horseshoes including Mango Tree) are safeguarded against their loss under Policy DM22 (Vitalising District, Local and Neighbourhood Centres) as they lie within the allocated Neighbourhood Centre.  The plan could identify and allocate the sites mentioned on the policies map and safeguard these (and other community facilities) that are not identified on the Borough Council’s Policies Map and provide a policy hook to DM25 and where appropriate, DM22.  Beyond the scope of the NP, the NP Group or Parish Council may wish to nominate the Public Houses or other community facilities as Assets of Community Value (ACV). If designated, this allows the nominating group to be notified of the sale of the property and to submit a bid to purchase it with the intention of maintaining the property for the ongoing benefit and use to the community. |

### Venues for Community Use

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  The Parish Council will support, encourage and help, as appropriate, local groups/businesses/individuals to use local facilities and services to run their activities/events. | This is a statement rather than a land-use policy and is not considered appropriate for the NP. |

### Shops & Farm Shops

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  The Parish Council will encourage the community to use and support all local businesses to ensure that they thrive and can continue to provide a locally based service. | This is a statement rather than a land-use policy and is not considered appropriate for the NP. |
| Policy 2  The Parish Council will work with Post Office Ltd to ensure that a viable Post Office is reinstated and retained in Stoke Golding. | This is a statement rather than a land-use policy and is not considered appropriate for the NP. The Post Office in Stoke Golding is presently safeguarded against its loss under Policy DM22 (Vitalising District, Local and Neighbourhood Centres) as it lies within the allocated Neighbourhood Centre. |

### Transport and Movement Policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  Provide sustainable movement & transport choices that make efficient use of resources, minimise the impact on the environment and respect the rural character of the village. | The policy reads as an objective rather than a policy. It is not clear what sustainable transport choices are being referred to, what their mechanisms are for delivery and who will be providing these.  The NP Group could work with Leicestershire County Council (Highways Authority) to identify opportunities such as cycle paths; these in turn could potentially be funded by new development.  Policy DM17 (Highways and Transportation) supports proposals where they deliver or contribute towards sustainable transport choices. |
| Policy 2  Provide accessible movement and transport choices that are inclusive, convenient and affordable and contribute to a connected, healthy and vibrant community. | As per the comments in response to policy 1 above. It is not clear what is intended by this policy. Are there schemes or improvements in connections identified by the community they wish to see delivered?  Policy DM17 supports proposals which seek to ensure that there is convenient and safe access for walking and cycling to services and facilities. |
| Policy 3  Provide safe (real and perceived) movement and transport choices for both travellers and residents having regard to traffic speed and volume, quality of pavements, pavement parking and congestion. | As per comments under Policies 1 and 2 above, no specific schemes or opportunities have been identified. The criteria identified are addressed through Policy DM17, DM18 (Vehicle Parking Standards) and the application of the latest highways design guidance adopted by the County Council. |
| Policy 4  Ensure new development supports sustainable travel and creates a sense of place. New development should encourage sustainable transport and create quality, vibrant places.  Specifically, development proposals should:  1. Ensure layouts and designs provide a safe, attractive, permeable, legible and useable public realm for all users, putting people first. Designs should adhere to the principles and standards specified in the current version of the DfT’s Manual for Streets.  2. Provide links to existing village amenities allowing movement by sustainable means.  3. Developers proposals should:  a. Demonstrate how the development aligns with the movement & transport vision and associated policies.  b. Demonstrate how new residents can sustainably access amenities, services and places of work.  c. Indicate how people will be encouraged to travel sustainably and how this will be monitored and delivered.  4. Local policy is to develop safe, accessible and sustainable movement and transport options.  A number of transport projects to deliver these policies have been identified. New developments will be expected to make proportionate contributions to these projects. | A number of criteria in this policy overlap with Policies DM17 and DM18 referred to above.  Criteria 3a refers to movement and transport vision and associated policies, but these are not set out in the plan.  Policy 4 refers to a number of transport projects which have been identified to deliver the local policies to develop safe, accessible and sustainable movement and transport options. These projects are not set out in the plan. |

### Appendix 1 to Neighbourhood Plan – Transport Policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy 1  a) The Parish Council will seek funding so that professional advice can be obtained to identify interventions that will have a positive impact on managing traffic in the Neighbourhood Plan area | This is an action for the Parish Council rather than a plan policy.  It is not clear why there is an appendix for this single policy, it is assumed this is a layout issue as it is an early draft. |