

## SEA Report – Proposed Changes to the NP

The only actions identified so far required to our NP relate to the AECOM recommendations. Potential actions are as follows:

Recommendation	Action
<p>Policy SG2 could be strengthened by requiring development proposals to be accompanied with a Heritage Statement including an appraisal of the likely impact of the design, materials, layout, scale, height and mass of the proposal on the Registered Battlefield, Stoke Golding Conservation Area, Grade I listed Church of St Margaret, Grade II listed The Birches and other designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>The policy could further be strengthened by requiring development proposals do demonstrate how proposals would result in a net enhancement to the historic significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Policies SG2 and SG3 could be strengthened by requiring development proposals to be supported with a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to provide an assessment of the landscape significance of the site and the likely impact of development.</p> <p>These policies could further be supported with a clause that requires development proposals to be sensitively accommodated within the landscape, with proposals not supported if potential impacts on landscape cannot be adequately mitigated through design and landscaping.</p>	<p>Agree. But need for LVIA to be added to Policy SG11 and then SG2/3 signpost to Policy SG11</p> <p>Signposting to SG11 would achieve that</p>
<p>Policies SG2 and SG3 could also be improved by requiring development proposals to demonstrate and achieve environmental net gain.</p> <p>It is further recommended that the policies include a clause for sustainable drainage systems to seek to maximise opportunities to support wildlife and biodiversity by creating suitable habitats.</p>	<p>Signpost SG12</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Policy SG3 could be further strengthened by requiring planting along the southern boundary to be native species and to be in accordance with the local landscape character.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>Policy SG5 (Housing Mix) could be strengthened by quantifying the size and type of housing mix that will be supported for new housing developments within the policy wording (including provision for custom and self-build units subject to local need).</p>	<p>Policy SG5 already cross-references existing evidence relevant to housing mix. Paragraphs 4.31 to 4.33 concern Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding which demonstrates little or no need.</p>

<p>It is further recommended that the policy allows development proposals the option to deviate from the requirement set when supported with a housing needs assessment that demonstrates a local unmet need for the proposed housing mix. This should ensure the policy is flexible to changes in housing need in the long term.</p>	<p>Policy SG5 already does this by providing flexibility in response to fresh housing need evidence.</p>
<p>Policy SG5 (Housing Mix) states that ‘Development proposals for 10 or more dwellings should address the need for smaller and/or low-cost homes’. This provides proposals with options to either address the need for smaller homes or low-cost homes which results in potential positive effects not being realised. It is recommended that the policy wording is amended to remove the option for development to choose between the options.</p> <p>The policy should instead quantify any requirements for smaller homes and affordable housing (which should accord with any requirement set in Policy SG6).</p>	<p>Policy SG5 already cross-references existing evidence relevant to housing mix.</p> <p>See above</p>
<p>Policy SG6 (Affordable Housing) could be strengthened by setting out an affordable housing requirement that accords with the requirement set out in the Local Plan Core Strategy Policy 15 (40% affordable housing for 4 dwellings or more/ 0.13 ha or more).</p>	<p>Local Plan Core Strategy Policy 15 is out-of-date as it does not comply with NPPF para 63</p>
<p>Policy SG10 (Public Rights of Way Network) could be improved by adding a clause that requires development to ‘protect and/or enhance the value of the rights of way as a biodiversity corridor’.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>Policy SG12 (Ecology and Biodiversity) could be strengthened to require development proposals to demonstrate and achieve environmental net gain, guided by the principles set out in the NPPF (2019) and the UK Government’s 25-Year Environment Plan (2018).</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>Policy SG12 (Ecology and Biodiversity) could be improved by affording protection to all known BAP Priority Habitats in the Stoke Golding NDP area including but not limited to the following: Traditional Orchards at Highfield Farm; Deciduous Woodland south of Pine Close Solar Farm; Deciduous Woodlands east of Stoke Road; Deciduous Woodland east of St Martin Academy; and Deciduous Woodland south of St George’s Farm.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>Policy SG13 (Renewable Energy) could be strengthened and positive effects can be ensured by requiring development proposals for solar photovoltaic farms to not result in harm to important landscape features, to require all proposals to be accompanied with a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and by requiring the restoration of land to result in a net improvement in the landscape quality of the site, where feasible and appropriate.</p>	<p>When considering a development proposal, ALL the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be applied. So unnecessary to keep repeating matters relating to biodiversity, housing mix, landscape and visual impact assessment, heritage etc</p>

<p>Policy SG13 (Renewable Energy) could further be strengthened by requiring all renewable energy proposals to demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The policy could go further to suggest measures such as boundary hedge and tree planting and wildflower planting underneath and between panels on sites not proposed to be used for agriculture, subject to no adverse effects on landscape character.</p>	<p>When considering a development proposal, ALL the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be applied. So unnecessary to keep repeating matters relating to biodiversity, housing mix, landscape and visual impact assessment, heritage etc</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Policy SG14 (Features of Local Heritage Interest) should seek to afford greater protection to the identified features of local heritage interest by setting out a presumption against the loss or harm to the heritage asset unless if it can be demonstrated that the public benefit of the development proposal significantly outweighs the harm caused.</p> <p>The policy should further require development proposals to achieve enhancements to the significance of these heritage assets including their setting.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Policy SG15 (Design) could be improved by defining the area that is considered as the 'Historic Core'. It is further recommended that the protection afforded to the 'Historic Core' is extended to all development in the Conservation Areas and their settings.</p>	<p>Minor change so that 'historic core' refers to Conservation Area</p>
<p>It is considered that the Stoke Golding NDP could be positively improved through a new policy or by revising Policy SG15 (Design) to support the protection and enhancement of heritage assets and features and their setting. The policy should require development proposals within or in proximity to the Stoke Golding Conservation Area and/or the Ashby Canal Conservation Area to demonstrate how it will positively conserve and enhance the unique characteristics of its location as identified in respective Conservation Area appraisals. For development proposals in or within the setting of the Registered Battlefield, these should demonstrate how they would conserve and where possible enhance the significance of the designation and its setting with reference to the Bosworth Battlefield: The Way Forward report<sup>2</sup> and any other evidence available.</p> <p>It is recommended that the policy requires development proposals in the wider Parish to demonstrate how they will respect heritage assets and their setting and enhance the character of the area. The policy should set out a presumption against the loss or harm to any heritage asset</p>	<p>No. NPPF para 4.4.11: need to avoid duplication of national and local planning policies e.g. with respect to heritage (NPPF para 16). Status of designated heritage assets is explained at paras 6.11-6.13</p>

<p>unless if it can be demonstrated that the public benefit of the development proposal significantly outweighs the harm caused. Significant harm or the loss of Listed buildings and the Schedule Monument should only be supported in wholly exceptional circumstances. The policy should further require development proposals to demonstrate enhancements to the significance of heritage assets including their setting.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the policy requires development proposals that affect a heritage designation or its setting to be accompanied with a Heritage Statement to identify the heritage assets, provide a clear assessment of its significance, an appraisal of the likely impact of the proposal on the heritage assets and their setting and to justify the design approach undertaken including how opportunities for conserving and enhancing the heritage assets and their setting has been capitalised.</p>	
<p>Policy SG19 (Infrastructure) could be improved by setting out the scale of development that is expected to contribute towards new or improved infrastructure.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>Policy SG19 (Infrastructure) requires that ‘contributions are governed by the provisions of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010’. Under CIL regulations, the only organisation authorised to levy is a local planning authority. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council do not currently have a CIL in place and do not currently intend to implement a CIL. Therefore, it is unclear how the CIL regulations could be applicable to the Stoke Golding NDP. It is recommended that the policy is amended to support contributions through alternative mechanisms such as through Section 106 agreements.</p>	<p>No. Part 11 of the CIL Regulations sets out a number of limitations on the use of planning obligations under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Therefore the CIL regulations are applicable to the Stoke Golding NDP (also see NPPF para 56)</p>
<p>Policy SG20 (Tourism) could be strengthened by requiring development proposals that fall outside of the settlement boundary for new tourism facilities associated with Bosworth Battlefield and Ashby Canal to be supported with a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).</p> <p>The policy can further be strengthened by setting out a requirement for development proposals to not result in significant harm to landscape character.</p>	<p>Requirement for LVIA to be part of Policy SG11 instead</p> <p>Agree- but through SG11</p>