

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Pre submission consultation responses

No.	Chapter/ Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment
1	-	-	The Coal Authority	<p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. As a statutory consultee, The Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.</p> <p>Our records <u>do not</u> indicate the presence of any coal mining features at surface or shallow depth within the Neighbourhood Plan area which may pose a risk to surface stability or public safety. On this basis the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted	None
2		Policy H1	Historic England	<p>Dear Mrs Richardson,</p> <p>Further to your recent Sibley Neighbourhood Plan SEA Screening request, it has become apparent that a copy of our response to the 2019 consultation was sent out in error. Please accept my apologies. The amendments to the plan, which included the removal of an allocation next to the church resolved our concerns that the plan may be at risk due to impacts on the historic environment, and I can confirm that Historic England do not now consider that there are any historic environment related considerations that would trigger the need for SEA in the current plan.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Clive Fletcher, Principal Advisor and Lead Specialist, Historic Places Mobile phone: 07771502052 Historic England The Foundry, 82 Granville St, Birmingham B1 2LH www.HistoricEngland.org.uk</p>	Recommendation that no SEA is required noted and passed on the CBC to conclude the Scoping report.	None
3			National Grid	<p>National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to local planning authority Development Plan Document consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above</p>	Noted	None

				<p>document. About National Grid National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses. National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use. National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.</p> <p>Response We have reviewed the above document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation. Further Advice National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks. Please see attached information outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>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 their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid's assets.</p>		
4			Barwood Development Securities Ltd	<p>1 Introduction 1.1 Purpose of Our Representation 1.1.1 We write to object to the emerging Sileby Neighbourhood Plan Review ('the eSNPR') on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Ltd. The reason for Barwood's particular interest is that it controls land at Peashill Farm on the eastern side of Sileby, which we consider should be allocated for residential development in the eSNPR, under Policy H1. 1.1.2 Our client's site is eminently suitable, achievable and deliverable for sustainable residential development. On their behalf we have</p>	Noted. We disagree that the respondent's site is preferable to the allocated site. Sileby PC undertook an independently led	None

		<p>Policy H1. 1.1.2</p>		<p>submitted an outline planning application for up to 175 dwellings at the site, along with associated infrastructure, accesses, landscaping and open space (CBC ref: P/21/2131/2). This application is submitted as Phase 2 of a larger development following the grant of permission by Charnwood BC for 201 dwellings on adjoining land to the west. Most of these 201 dwellings are now built and occupied, with the remainder under construction. We describe the significant benefits of the proposed Phase 2 development in section 1.2 below.</p> <p>1.2 Barwood’s Planning Application Submission – Summary of Key Points</p> <p>1.2.1 Peashill Farm Phase 2 is designed to be a sustainable development which integrates fully with the almost complete Phase 1 area adjoining, efficiently sharing its highway access infrastructure, focused around its mixed-use hub and optimising use of its sustainable drainage features.</p> <p>1.2.2 The Phase 2 development will use the new roundabout and access road from Ratcliffe Road now built as part of the Phase 1 development. Whilst scale, layout, appearance and landscaping are reserved matters, the Illustrative Masterplan provided within Appendix A of this submission shows indicatively how the site could be developed. It demonstrates how the proposals will create a high-quality, residential development with a strong sense of identity, integrated sensitively into the new south-eastern edge of Sileby.</p> <p>1.2.3 The development will be an attractive place to live, set within a high-quality network of public open spaces, including a play area. A combined LEAP and NEAP is also located within the adjoining Phase 1 site, alongside a network of green open space for informal play. The site’s valuable landscape and ecological assets will be retained and strengthened to provide a strong green context for the well-being of residents.</p> <p>1.2.4 The application proposals perform demonstrable, mutually dependent and beneficial social, economic and environmental roles which accord with the Government’s objectives for achieving sustainable development, as set out in paragraph 8 of the NPPF.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Social Benefits</p>	<p>assessment process and was not partial in reaching its conclusions, unlike the respondent.</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------	--	--	---	--

				<p>1.2.5 The proposed development will deliver a range of social benefits, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Delivery of up to 175 new dwellings, with a broad range of house types, to meet varied needs in the area of which up to 30 per cent (up to 53 dwellings in total) will be affordable homes; ■ Some 1.96 ha of open spaces and planting will be created, for the enjoyment of the whole community as part of this Phase 2 scheme, in addition to the generous open space provision within the Phase 1 development. Green open spaces and high-quality public realm will help to foster a sense of community and encourage healthy living and improved wellbeing; ■ The scheme will link into a new network of pedestrian and cycle routes, enhancing accessibility to and from the site, including connections into the Phase 1 development, giving convenient access to the play space, allotments, commercial and community hub at Peashill Farmhouse, and beyond to the local centre in Sileby; and ■ The proposals include a potential enhanced bus service to this part of Sileby. <p>Economic Benefits</p> <p>1.2.6 The application proposals will play a beneficial economic role by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Generating additional population thereby helping to ensure the vitality and viability of Sileby's shops, services and facilities; ■ Contributing to economic growth through the further expenditure generation and job creation effects of housing development, both directly in construction and indirectly; and 		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Generating potential New Homes Bonus revenues to support the delivery of public services. <p>Environmental Benefits</p> <p>1.2.7 The proposed development will also play a beneficial environmental role as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The over-arching vision for the development is to create a high-quality residential development with a strong sense of identity, integrated sensitively amongst new planting to create a green setting, particularly along the south-eastern site boundary which will form a strong green corridor; ■ The development will provide a range of functions having amenity and biodiversity value, consolidating the settlement edge and constituting a logical ‘rounding off’ of Sibley, particularly as the site has strong defensible boundaries on all four sides; ■ The high-quality environment established through Phase 1 of the development will be continued, with new development integrating sensitively with the existing development character and landscape context; ■ A high-quality green infrastructure-led master planning approach has been taken, following detailed environmental assessment of the site’s ecological, landscape and heritage context; ■ Sustainable drainage features have been designed to manage stormwater, reduce flood risk and provide an amenity and biodiversity benefit; ■ By enhancing green assets, planting new trees and hedgerows and forming new public spaces and outdoor 		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>facilities, a strong sense of place and character will be formed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Valuable landscape and ecological assets will be retained and strengthened to provide a strong green context for the well-being of residents; and ■ A highly attractive place to live will be created, set within a generous network of open spaces including enhanced woodland, hedgerow planting and wetland/wildflower meadows. <p>Sustainable Site Assessment (SSA)</p> <p>1.2.8 As set out in detail in the ‘Strategic Sustainability Assessment Response’ prepared by Environmental Dimension Partnership (‘EDP’) and provided here within Appendix B (our response to the Neighbourhood Plan Group (‘NPG’) in January 2022), we are concerned about a number of factual inaccuracies within the draft SSA and the absence of an adequate objective evidence base to substantiate the judgements made within it. EDP’s response highlights the need for the assessment to be accurate and that judgements made should be transparent and adequately reasoned. Detailed technical assessments which have been prepared in respect of the recent Phase 2 application support the commentary contained within EDP’s response, but these have not been considered within the draft SSA. EDP’s response therefore represents a more accurate and up-to-date assessment.</p> <p>1.2.9 The concerns highlighted above were overcome in part by revision to the SSA (as confirmed in the Sibley PC letter dated 18th February 2022, provided here within Appendix C) but it is evident from our further response to the NPG dated March 2022 (provided here within Appendix D) that the SSA is still flawed.</p>	<p>Opportunities were provided to comment on the initial assessment and revisions were undertaken as a result.</p> <p>Disagreeing with the assessment conclusions does not make them flawed.</p> <p>Noted – however because the site is considered by CBC</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------------------

			<p>1.2.10 Furthermore, we note that within Charnwood Borough Council’s latest Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (‘SHELAA’), dated December 2020, the site is identified as being suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The Council’s assessment pro-forma for the site finds that in terms of suitability:</p> <p><i>‘There are no known irresolvable physical/environmental constraints preventing development and a suitable access can be achieved’.</i></p> <p>1.2.11 The SHELAA also finds that there is a ‘reasonable prospect’ that development will be delivered within the 6-10 years’ timeframe <i>‘based on a judgement of the potential economic viability of the site and developer capacity to complete and let/sell the development over that period’.</i></p> <p>1.2.12 Whilst we acknowledge the Council’s anticipated 6–10-year timeframe for delivery at the site, we consider that the Phase 2 residential extension to Peashill Farm is deliverable within the next five years, thereby contributing towards addressing Charnwood’s current five-year housing land supply deficit.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>1.2.13 We confirm that there is no overriding technical, environmental or ownership constraints which would preclude residential development of the site and that such development is suitable, achievable and deliverable within the next five years, thereby helping to meet Charnwood’s short term housing needs and sustainable growth aspirations.</p> <p>1.2.14 We can see no objective assessment or evidence either within or supporting the eSNPR which is capable of being used to contradict the headline points outlined above.</p>	<p>as being deliverable and developable does not make it the most suitable site for allocation in the NP Review.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted – however because the site is considered by CBC as being deliverable and developable does not make it the most suitable site for allocation in the NP Review.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	-------------------------------------

		<p>Objections to Policies H1 and H2</p>		<p>Introduction</p> <p>2.1.1 In this section of our representation, we outline the requirements of national planning policy guidance insofar as they relate to the preparation of neighbourhood plans, and we provide our related observations and objections arising from them, in relation to Policies H1 'Residential Allocation' and H2 'Reserve Sites'.</p> <p>2.2 NPPF</p> <p>2.2.1 Paragraph 13 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans <i>'should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies.'</i></p> <p>2.2.2 Paragraph 29 of the NPPF states: <i>'Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan.'</i> The same paragraph also advises as follows: <i>'Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies'</i>, and related footnote 18 further advises that: <i>'Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in any development plan that covers their area'</i>.</p> <p>2.2.3 The eSNPR purports to be in conformity with the development plan. It is important to note, however, that the Core Strategy was adopted in 2015. Whilst it therefore remains part of the adopted development plan until the successor Local Plan is adopted, its content does not reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF, which advises that relevant development plan</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. The housing requirement for Sileby Parish is based on the latest evidence of housing need and agreed with CBC.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	---

				<p>policies should be considered out of date where the local authority is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, as is the case in Charnwood where deliverable housing supply is only 3.04 years at present.</p> <p>2.2.4 Thus, the eSNPR is effectively claiming to be in conformity with an adopted development plan, relevant policies of which are out-of-date under the terms of the NPPF. We consider that to be a perverse situation and one that can only be remedied by additional sites being identified which are capable of adequately meeting identified needs, both in the successor Local Plan and in the eSNPR itself.</p>	<p>As above. This comment reflects a misconception of neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>This is not a perverse situation as claimed – the draft NP Review is based on the latest evidence of need and the figure contained in the Review document has been agreed with the local planning authority.</p>	<p>None</p>
				<p>2.2.5 We therefore have the following specific objections to the eSNPR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It fails to make adequate provision for meeting housing needs, containing just one small allocation for 18 dwellings under Policy H1 and the identification of two small reserve sites under Policy H2; ■ Furthermore, the allocation under Policy H1 relates to a site of ‘Environmental Significance’ and which is an ‘Important Open Space’ such that its development would 	<p>This is not so. The housing requirement has been as agreed with CBC.</p> <p>This is not so – the wrong map was included in the</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p>

				<p>conflict with Policies ENV2 and ENV3 of both the made Neighbourhood Plan and the eSNPR;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Similarly, residential development of the Policy H2 'Reserve Site' at Barrow Road would conflict with its designation as an 'Existing Good Quality Employment Site' to be protected under Policy ENV2 of the emerging Charnwood Local Plan ('the eCLP'); ■ The eSNPR refers numerous times to the eCLP as a key justification for its planning and housing allocation strategy but the eCLP is not yet adopted. Indeed, it is still being examined and is a very controversial Plan which is the subject of multiple, fundamental and unresolved, objections, including that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It only runs to 2037 and thereby conflicts with the NPPF. It should be revised to run to at least 2039 so that it covers a minimum period of 15 years following its adoption, as required by the NPPF; - It fails to meet any of the substantial unmet housing need from the city of Leicester. This is despite the level of need and a proposal for its distribution amongst adjoining areas (including Charnwood) now being established by an evidence base published as recently as May 2022. The eCLP thereby conflicts 	<p>Regulation 14 version NP and this will be rectified prior to submission.</p> <p>The site will only come forward if needed at some stage in the future. The respondent may be aware that the NP is not examined against the provisions of a local Plan that has not been adopted.</p> <p>The NP refers to the latest evidence base as justification for its policies, which is the correct approach.</p> <p>This is incorrect. The NP is inline with the timescales for the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The NP allows for more than the minimum housing requirement and includes reserve sites to</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	---

				<p>with the NPPF in respect of the requirement to meet objectively assessed housing needs and the duty to co-operate; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The eCLP should therefore not proceed. Instead, it should pause so that the new evidence base can be reviewed and the Plan revised so that it reflects higher housing requirements and makes additional housing allocations, including at the Service Centres such as Sileby. <p>2.2.6 For the same reasons, the eSNPR should therefore also not proceed to submission. Instead, the review process should pause and await the outcome of the eCLP examination and the eSNPR should be revised to make additional housing allocations, including our client's site at Peashill Farm.</p> <p>2.2.7 Finally, paragraph 71 of the NPPF advises that where an allowance is to be made for windfall sites as part of anticipated supply, there should be <i>'compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends.'</i> The eNSPR is not accompanied by any such 'compelling evidence' that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply in the future, thereby reinforcing our objection that Policy H1 should include additional allocations rather than relying on windfalls to help meet housing needs.</p>	<p>accommodate further growth if needed.</p> <p>This is an incorrect interpretation of requirements. National guidance is that NPs should not await the adoption of local plans or updated evidence.</p> <p>The windfall figure has not changed since it was approved through the Made Neighbourhood Plan. The figure was compelling then and remains so. We understand that the respondent wishes to see development to further its business case, but this is neither required nor wanted through</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------

				<p>Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>2.3.1 The PPG advises that neighbourhood plans should be ‘aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area’ (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 41-001-20190509). It is evident, however, that the eSNPR does not pay due regard to the strategic needs and priorities of the area. As we highlighted above, the document does not adequately recognise that Charnwood is unable to deliver sufficient housing to meet its own needs, let alone any part of Leicester’s unmet needs, yet it makes little attempt to allocate sites to meet identified needs. If made, the eSNPR would therefore perpetuate current under-delivery.</p> <p>2.3.2 The PPG further advises that plans should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable (Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 41-005-20190509). For the reasons that we have outlined above, we believe that the eSNPR is neither ‘prepared positively’ nor ‘aspirational’. The inclusion of only one small allocation, simply in a misguided effort to engineer some benefit from paragraph 14 of the NPPF, is the clearest illustration of that position.</p> <p>2.3.3 The PPG also states that a neighbourhood plan can allocate additional sites to those in a local plan (or spatial development strategy) where this is supported by evidence to demonstrate need above that identified in the local plan or spatial development strategy (Paragraph: 044 Reference ID: 41-044-20190509). Again, for the reasons outlined above, the available evidence points towards a clear need to identify additional sites in sustainable locations such as Barwood’s site in Sileby, but the eSNPR makes no attempt to do so.</p>	<p>the Neighbourhood Plan Review.</p> <p>The NP meets the housing requirement as set by the local planning authority, as legislation requires it to do.</p> <p>The NP is positively prepared and exceeds its housing requirement, which demonstrates this.</p> <p>The NP HAS allocated a site additional to the Local Plan. The concern seems to be that the respondent’s site was not the preferred site, which is not a concern for the NP.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------------------

				<p>Summary</p> <p>2.4.1 For the reasons outlined above, we believe that the eSNPR and its Policies H1 and H2 fail to satisfy the requirements set out in the NPPF and the accompanying PPG and we therefore object to it accordingly.</p> <p>3 Summary</p> <p>3.1.1 For all of the reasons described in this representation, we conclude that the eSNPR fails to adequately provide for relevant housing needs in that it makes only one small allocation, despite CBC’s acceptance that it cannot demonstrate anywhere near a five-year supply of housing and the acknowledged sustainability of Sileby given its definition as a Service Centre.</p> <p>3.1.2 Accordingly, the eSNPR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ fails to have due regard to national policy in the NPPF and related guidance in the PPG; ■ purports to conform with the development plan, relevant policies of which are out-of-date under the terms of the NPPF. We consider that to be a perverse situation and one that can only be remedied by additional sites being identified which are capable of adequately meeting identifying needs, in the successor Local Plan and in neighbourhood plans; and ■ fails to plan positively and to incorporate sufficient flexibility to respond to housing needs and thereby contribute to achieving sustainable development. <p>3.1.3 The document therefore fails to meet at least three of the basic conditions required for a neighbourhood plan, as set out in paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country</p>	<p>We disagree, for the reasons set out above.</p> <p>This summary is partial and reaches false conclusions based on the exclusion of the respondent’s site from the NP.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	-------------------------

				<p>Planning Act 1990, as applied by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>3.1.4 We therefore object to the eSNPR and propose that, to meet the basic conditions required, the review process should pause to allow the emerging Plan to be revised and the Peashill Farm Phase 2 site allocated for residential development under Policy H1, in order to help meet identified housing needs in a location that is acknowledged to be sustainable.</p>		
5			<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Having reviewed the submitted documents, we have the following comments to make.</p> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <p>Whilst there is a significant area of flood risk within the Plan area (located to the West of the settlement of Sileby), we note that within the Limits of Development the areas of flood risk (Flood Zones 2 and 3) is limited to land immediately adjacent to the Sileby Brook. We also note the Plan acknowledges the need for a sequential approach to be taken when proposing new development and the application of the exception test, when required. We further note that neither the Housing Allocation site nor either of the Reserve sites are located in an area identified as being at flood risk (i.e., is located in Flood Zone 1).</p> <p><u>Biodiversity net gain</u></p> <p>Whilst there are two Policy's associated with biodiversity included within the Plan, neither explicitly mention the requirement for biodiversity net gain, which is currently in the process of being mandated and will require Major developments to provide a biodiversity net gain of at least 10%. The refreshing of this Neighbourhood Plan would have been an opportunity to make reference to this requirement. However, we do acknowledge that where a Neighbourhood Plan is silent on an issue then development will need to be conformity with the Local Plan / National Policy.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. We will include a reference to the need for biodiversity net gain to be included.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated.</p>	

				Thank you again for giving the Environment Agency the opportunity to comment on this submission.	Noted	None
		SEA Document		We don't disagree with the conclusion that no SEA is required	Recommendation that no SEA is required noted and passed on the CBC to conclude the Scoping report.	None
6			Natural England	Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 23 May 2022. 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. Screening Request: Strategic Environmental Assessment It is our advice, on the basis of the material supplied with the consultation, that, in so far as our strategic environmental interests (including but not limited to statutory designated sites, landscapes and protected species, geology and soils) are concerned, that there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposed plan. Neighbourhood Plan Guidance on the assessment of Neighbourhood Plans, in light of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (as amended), is contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance. The guidance highlights three triggers that may require the production of an SEA, for instance where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a neighbourhood plan allocates sites for development • the neighbourhood area contains sensitive natural or heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals in the plan • the neighbourhood plan may have significant environmental effects that have not already been considered and dealt with through a sustainability appraisal of the Local Plan. We have checked our records and based on the information provided, we can confirm that in our view the proposals contained within the plan will not have significant effects on sensitive sites that Natural England has a statutory duty to protect. We are not aware of significant populations of protected species which are likely to be affected by the policies / proposals within	Recommendation that no SEA is required noted and passed on the CBC to conclude the Scoping report.	None

				<p>the plan. It remains the case, however, that the responsible authority should provide information supporting this screening decision, sufficient to assess whether protected species are likely to be affected. Notwithstanding this advice, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all potential environmental assets. As a result, the responsible authority should raise environmental issues that we have not identified on local or national biodiversity action plan species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites or local landscape character, with its own ecological and/or landscape advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local landscape and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by this plan, before determining whether an SA/SEA is necessary. Please note that Natural England reserves the right to provide further comments on the environmental assessment of the plan beyond this SEA/SA screening stage, should the responsible authority seek our views on the scoping or environmental report stages. This includes any third-party appeal against any screening decision you may make. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Natural England agrees with the report's conclusions that the Sileby Draft Neighbourhood Plan would not be likely to result in a significant effect on any European Site, either alone or in combination and therefore no further assessment work would be required. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p>		
7			Leicestershire County Council	<p>Sileby Neighbourhood Plan Comments Requested – 16 May 2022 Leicestershire County Council is supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process and welcome being included in this consultation. Highways Specific Comments General Comments The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth. 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,</p>	<p>These general comments, unrelated to the Sileby NP Review, are noted.</p>	<p>None</p>

			<p>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. 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. 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 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. In 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. The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third-party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third-party funding. 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. Flood Risk Management The County Council are fully aware of flooding that</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>has occurred within Leicestershire and its impact on residential properties resulting in concerns relating to new developments. LCC in our role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertake investigations into flooding, review consent applications to undertake works on ordinary watercourses and carry out enforcement where lack of maintenance or unconsented works has resulted in a flood risk. In April 2015 the LLFA also became a statutory consultee on major planning applications in relation to surface water drainage and have a duty to review planning applications to ensure that the onsite drainage systems are designed in accordance with current legislation and guidance. The LLFA also ensures that flood risk to the site is accounted for when designing a drainage solution. The LLFA is not able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation. • Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development. • Require development to resolve existing flood risk. <p>When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)). • Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map). • Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding. • How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff. • Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk. All development will be required to restrict the discharge and retain surface water on site in line with current government policies. This should be undertaken through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Appropriate space allocation for SuDS features should be included within development sites when considering the housing density to ensure that the potential site will not limit the ability for good SuDS design to be carried out. Consideration should also be given to blue green corridors and how they could be used to improve the bio-diversity and amenity of new 		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>developments, including benefits to surrounding areas. Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained. LCC, in its role as LLFA will not support proposals contrary to LCC policies. For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning Practice Guidance webpage. Flood risk mapping is readily available for public use at the links below. The LLFA also holds information relating to historic flooding within Leicestershire that can be used to inform development proposals. Risk of flooding from surface water map: https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk Flood map for planning (rivers and sea): https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/ Planning Minerals & Waste Planning 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. 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. You should also be aware of Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan (Leicestershire.gov.uk). These safeguarding areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect minerals 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</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>waste provision. Property Education 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. 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> <p>Strategic Property Services No comment at this time. Adult Social Care It is suggested that reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and that development seeks to include bungalows etc of differing tenures to accommodate the increase. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.</p> <p>Environment General Comments With regard to the environment and in line with Government advice, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) would like to see Neighbourhood Plans cover all aspects of archaeology and the historic and natural environment including heritage assets, archaeological sites, listed and unlisted historic buildings, historic landscapes, climate change, the landscape, biodiversity, ecosystems, green infrastructure as well as soils, brownfield sites and agricultural land.</p> <p>Archaeology and the Historic Environment The planning process provides one of the most effective tools to manage the impact of land use change upon the historic environment. This is achieved both through the shaping of development plans (Local and Neighbourhood Plans) and the delivery of development management advice on individual planning applications. In that context, the inclusion of heritage in your Neighbourhood Plan, and the provision of relevant and effective policies, will significantly strengthen the management of these issues,</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>and will be an effective way of the community identifying its own concerns and priorities. Ideally, Neighbourhood Plans should seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver this strategic objective, based on robust local evidence and priorities. We recommend that each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential development or management decisions on the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. The historic environment is defined as comprising all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving evidence of past human activity, whether upstanding, buried or submerged, as well landscapes and their historic components. The Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (LRHER) can provide a summary of archaeological and historic environment information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include gazetteers and maps describing the locally identified non-designated heritage assets, typically archaeological sites (both earthworks and buried archaeological remains), unlisted historic buildings and historic landscapes (parks and gardens). We will also provide information on medieval ridge and furrow earthworks to help you evaluate the surviving earthworks in your area. Information on Designated assets (Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens, Battlefields) is available from the National Heritage List for England (NHLE). https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/ Consideration of the historic environment, and its constituent designated and non-designated heritage assets, is a material consideration in the planning process. While the data held by the LRHER is constantly maintained and updated, it is unlikely that the record represents an exhaustive list of all assets with the plan area. We suggest that information provided by the LRHER should be taken into account when preparing the Neighbourhood Plan and contribute to any list of locally identified heritage assets. Based upon a structured assessment process, this will be the basis of any non-designated heritage assets identified within the plan and given force through the preparation of appropriate heritage policy. Contact: her@leics.gov.uk, or phone 0116 305 8323 For help with including heritage in your Neighbourhood Plan please see the following guidance: CBA Toolkit</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>No. 10, Neighbourhood Planning (2017) https://www.archaeologyuk.org/asset/6FE3A721-B328-4B75-9DEBBD0028A4AEED/ National Trust Guide to Heritage in Neighbourhood Plans (2019) https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/documents/neighbourhood-planning-and-heritageguidance.pdf Climate Change The County Council through its Environment Strategy is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Leicestershire and increasing Leicestershire’s resilience to the existing and predicted changes in climate. Furthermore, LCC has declared a climate emergency along with most other UK councils. The County Council has committed to becoming carbon neutral as a council by 2030 and to working with others to keep global temperature rise to less than 1.5 degrees Celsius, which will mean in effect needing to achieve carbon neutrality for Leicestershire by 2050 or before. Planning is one of the key levers for enabling these commitments to be met and to meeting the legally binding target set by the government for the UK to be carbon neutral by 2050. Neighbourhood Plans should in as far as possible seek to contribute to and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and to increasing the county’s resilience to climate change. Landscape The County Council would like to see the inclusion of a local landscape assessment taking into account Natural England’s Landscape character areas; Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy; the Local District/Borough Council landscape character assessments and the Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study for Leicester and Leicestershire (2017) which examines the sensitivity of the landscape, exploring the extent to which different areas can accommodate development without impacting on their key landscape qualities. We would recommend that Neighbourhood Plans should also consider the street scene and public realm within their communities, further advice can be found in the latest ‘Streets for All East Midlands’ Advisory Document (2006) published by English Heritage. LCC would encourage the development of local listings as per the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and LCC have some data on the social, cultural, archaeological and historic value of local features and buildings (https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>andcommunity/history-and-heritage/historic-environment-record) Biodiversity The Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006 places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their duties, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly outlines the importance of sustainable development alongside the core principle that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, providing net gain for biodiversity, and reducing pollution. Neighbourhood Plans should therefore seek to work in partnership with other agencies to develop and deliver a strategic approach to protecting and improving the natural environment based on local evidence and priorities. Each Neighbourhood Plan should consider the impact of potential development or management of open spaces on enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity, such as hedgerows and greenways. Also, habitat permeability for habitats and species which addresses encouragement of movement from one location to another such as the design of street lighting, roads, noise, obstructions in water, exposure of species to predation and arrangement of land-uses. The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LRERC) can provide a summary of wildlife information for your Neighbourhood Plan area. This will include a map showing nationally important sites (e.g., Sites of Special Scientific Interest); locally designated Wildlife Sites; locations of badger setts, great crested newt breeding ponds and bat roosts; and a list of records of protected and priority Biodiversity Action Plan species. These are all a material consideration in the planning process. If there has been a recent Habitat Survey of your plan area, this will also be included. LRERC is unable to carry out habitat surveys on request from a Parish Council, although it may be possible to add it into a future survey programme. Contact: planningecology@leics.gov.uk, or phone 0116 305 4108 Green Infrastructure Green infrastructure (GI) A network of multi-functional green and blue spaces and other natural features, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental, economic, health and wellbeing benefits for nature, climate, local and wider communities and prosperity (NPPF definition). As a network, GI</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, street trees, cemeteries/churchyards allotments and private gardens as well as streams, rivers, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and living walls. The NPPF places the duty on local authorities to plan positively for a strategic network of GI which can deliver a range of planning policies including: building a strong, competitive economy; creating a sense of place and promote good design; promoting healthier communities by providing greater opportunities for recreation and mental and physical health benefits; meeting the challenges of climate change and flood risk; increasing biodiversity and conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Looking at the existing provision of GI networks within a community can influence the plan for creating & enhancing new networks and this assessment can then be used to inform CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedules, enabling communities to potentially benefit from this source of funding. Neighbourhood Plan groups have the opportunity to plan GI networks at a local scale to maximise benefits for their community and in doing so they should ensure that their Neighbourhood Plan is reflective of the relevant Local Authority Green Infrastructure strategy. Through the Neighbourhood Plan and discussions with the Local Authority Planning teams and potential Developers communities are well placed to influence the delivery of local scale GI networks. Brownfield, Soils and Agricultural Land The NPPF encourages the effective use of brownfield land for development, provided that it is not of high environmental/ecological value. Neighbourhood planning groups should check with Defra if their neighbourhood planning area includes brownfield sites. Where information is lacking as to the ecological value of these sites then the Neighbourhood Plan could include policies that ensure such survey work should be carried out to assess the ecological value of a brownfield site before development decisions are taken. Soils are an essential finite resource on which important ecosystem services such as food production, are dependent on. They should be enhanced in value and protected from adverse effects of unacceptable levels of pollution. Within the governments "Safeguarding our Soils" strategy, Defra have produced a code of practice for the sustainable use of soils</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>on construction sites which could be helpful to neighbourhood planning groups in preparing environmental policies. High quality agricultural soils should, where possible be protected from development and where a large area of agricultural land is identified for development then planning should consider using the poorer quality areas in preference to the higher quality areas. Neighbourhood planning groups should consider mapping agricultural land classification within their plan to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. Natural England can provide further information and Agricultural Land classification. Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) Information for Neighbourhood Planning groups regarding Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) can be found on the Neighbourhood Planning website (www.neighbourhoodplanning.org) and should be referred to. As taken from the website, a Neighbourhood Plan must meet certain basic conditions in order to be 'made'. It must not breach and be otherwise compatible with EU obligations. One of these obligations is Directive 2001/42/EC 'on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment' (Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations, 2004, available online). This is often referred to as the SEA Directive. Not every Neighbourhood Plan needs a SEA, however, it is compulsory to provide when submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of reasons as to why SEA was not required • An environmental report (a key output of the SEA process). <p>As the UK has now left the EU, Neighbourhood Planning groups should remain mindful of any future changes which may occur to the above guidance. Impact of Development on Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) Neighbourhood planning groups should remain mindful of the interaction between new development applications in a district area and Leicestershire County Council. The County's Waste Management team considers proposed developments on a case-by-case basis and when it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the local HWRC infrastructure then appropriate projects to increase the capacity to offset the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire's Planning</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Obligations Policy (2019) and the relevant Legislation Regulations.</p> <p>Public Health Health is shaped by many different factors throughout our lives. Health is affected by the settings in which we live, work, learn and play. These influences start to determine health and opportunities for better health from birth and throughout the whole life course, for example the environment, community, transport, education and income. This complex range of interacting social, economic and environmental factors are known as the wider determinants of health or the social determinants of health. When there is a difference in these conditions it contributes to health inequalities- “Health inequalities are the preventable, unfair and unjust differences in health status between groups, populations or individuals that arise from the unequal distribution of social, environmental and economic conditions within societies” (NHS England) The diagram below illustrates types of wider factors that influence an individual’s mental and physical health. The diagram shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • personal characteristics at the core of the model and this includes sex, age, ethnic group, and hereditary factors • The layer around the core contains individual ‘lifestyle’ factor behaviours such as smoking, alcohol use, and physical activity • The next layer contains social and community networks including family and wider social circles • The next layer covers living and working conditions include access and opportunities in relation to jobs, housing, education and welfare services • The final outer layer is general socioeconomic, cultural and environmental conditions and includes factors such as disposable income, taxation, and availability of work <p>Research by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, looked into the major contributors to health and wellbeing and found that: Health Behaviours contribute to 30% of health outcomes made up of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smoking 10% • Diet/Exercise 10% • Alcohol use 5% • Poor sexual health 5% <p>Socioeconomic Factors contribute to 40% of health outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education 10% • Employment 10% • Income 10% • Family/Social Support 5% • Community Safety 5% <p>Clinical Care contributes to 20% of health outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to care 10% • Quality of care 10% <p>Built Environment contributes to 10% of health outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Quality 5% • Built Environment 5% <p>Source: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute, Used in US to rank Counties by health</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Status Therefore, due to the complex way in which the built environment and communities we live in impact on our health any opportunity to mitigate negative impacts and enhance positive outcomes should be taken. Completing a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a good practice to ensure neighbourhood concerns and recommendations are considered. Undertaking a HIA as part of your neighbourhood plans has the potential to influence all these areas, alongside influencing decisions made about access to care through transport and infrastructure. To aid you in undertaking a HIA please visit: https://www.healthyplacemaking.co.uk/health-impact-assessment/ At the bottom of this page there are also links to a number of local data sheets at a district level. You can also familiarise yourself with the health profile for your area by visiting: https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/health-profiles Dahlgren G, Whitehead M. (1991). Policies and Strategies to Promote Social Equity in Health. Stockholm, Sweden: Institute for Futures Studies. NHS England, "Reducing health inequalities resources," [Online]. Available: https://www.england.nhs.uk/about/equality/equality-hub/resources/ [Accessed February 2021]. Communities Consideration of community facilities is a positive facet of Neighbourhood Plans that reflects the importance of these facilities within communities and can proactively protect and develop facilities to meet the needs of people in local communities. Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carry out and report on a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. 2. Set out policies that seek to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect and retain these existing facilities, • support the independent development of new facilities, and, • identify and protect Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations. 3. Identify and support potential community projects that could be progressed. You are encouraged to consider and respond to all aspects of community resources as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. Further information, guidance and examples of policies and supporting information is available at www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/np/useful-information. <p>Economic Development We would recommend including economic development aspirations with your Plan, outlining what the community</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>currently values and whether they are open to new development of small businesses etc. Fibre Broadband High-speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a fast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life. All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to ultrafast broadband (of at least 100Mbps) and allow mechanisms for securing a full fibre broadband provision for each premise and business from at least one network operator, provided on an open access basis. Such provider must deploy a Fibre to the Premise (FTTP) access network structure in which optical fibre runs from a local exchange to each premise. Developers should take active steps to incorporate adequate broadband provision at the preplanning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure fibre broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete. Where practical, developers should consider engaging several telecoms providers to encourage competition and consumer choice. The Council supports a 'dig once' approach for the deployment of communications infrastructure and a build which is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Council encourages telecommunications build which does not significantly impact on the appearance of any building or space on which equipment is located and which minimises street clutter. Equalities While we cannot comment in detail on plans, you may wish to ask stakeholders to bear the Council's Equality Strategy 2020-2024 in mind when taking your Neighbourhood Plan forward through the relevant procedures, particularly for engagement and consultation work. A copy of the strategy can be view at: https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2020/7/10/Equality-strategy2020-2024.pdf The Neighbourhood plan should comply with the main requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty. This requires public bodies to have due regard of the need to: Eliminate discrimination Advance equality of opportunity Foster good relations between different people Accessible Documents The document does not appear to meet WCAG 2.1 guidelines. In today's working environment more and more information is being produced</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>digitally. When producing information, which is aimed at or to be viewed by the public, it is important to make that information as accessible as possible. At least 1 in 5 people in the UK have a long-term illness, impairment or disability. Many more have a temporary disability. Accessibility means more than putting things online. It means making your content and design clear and simple enough so that most people can use it without needing to adapt it, while supporting those who do need to adapt things. For example, someone with impaired vision might use a screen reader (software that lets a user navigate a website and 'read out' the content), braille display or screen magnifier. Or someone with motor difficulties might use a special mouse, speech recognition software or on-screen keyboard emulator. Public sector organisations have a legal requirement to make sure that all information which appears on their websites is accessible. As Neighbourhood Plans have to be published on Local Planning Authority websites, they too have to comply with government regulations for accessibility. Guidance for creating accessible Word and PDF documents can be found on the Leicestershire Communities website under the heading 'Creating Accessible Documents':- https://www.leicestershirecommunities.org.uk/sr/ NIK GREEN (MRS) Policy Officer E: neighbourhoodplanning@leics.gov.uk Policy, Economy & Community, Chief Executive's Department, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA For further information visit: http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/neighbourhoodplanning.htm</p>		
8			Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>Gladman specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development and associated community infrastructure and have considerable experience in contributing to the Development Plan preparation process having made representations on numerous planning documents throughout the UK alongside participating in many Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan examinations. It is based on that experience that these representations are made. Gladman has been involved throughout the preparation of the Sileby Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) thus far having submitted representations at both the regulation 14 and 16 stage of the now 'made' Sileby</p>	Noted	None

			<p>Neighbourhood Plan. Sileby Parish Council (SPC) are aware of Gladman’s land interest in Sileby at ‘Land off Barnards Drive’. Legal Requirements Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the SNPR must meet are as follows: “(a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order. (d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. (e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area). (f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations. (g) Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Order (or plan) and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order (or neighbourhood plan).”</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through plan-making and decision-taking. This means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed housing needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans. The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account of the most up-to-date evidence. This is so that Sileby Parish council can assist Charnwood Borough Council (CBC) in delivering sustainable development and be in accordance with basic condition (d). The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have</p>	Noted	None
				Noted	None

			<p>implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 13 of the Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development. Paragraph 15 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a succinct and positive vision for the future of the area. A neighbourhood plan should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth. Paragraph 29 of the Framework makes clear that a neighbourhood plan must be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities. Sileby Neighbourhood Plan Review The Sileby Neighbourhood Plan Review consultation document describes how it is considered that not all parts of the neighbourhood plan need updating, rather the review provides an opportunity for the Parish Council to ensure that the SNP remains relevant in the context of a shifting policy framework. Our response, therefore, focuses on those policies and sections that are proposed to be amended. Relationship to Charnwood’s Local Development Framework Chapter 3 of the SNPR details that the new Charnwood Local Plan (2021-2037) is now at examination and therefore the SNPR has taken any policy variations into account so that the Neighbourhood Plan remains up to date when the new Local Plan is adopted. This approach is supported by Gladman. The new Local Plan for Charnwood includes Policy DS2 which provides a mechanism for the Plan to be reviewed following the publication of a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) that apportions unmet housing and employment need arising from Leicester City. It is pertinent to note that as recently as mid-May 2022, the SoCG relating to Housing and Employment Land Needs was first published, along with a new Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HENA) and an associated Sustainability Assessment (SA).</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
				<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

			<p>The SoCG is now due to be considered formally by all the Leicestershire authorities over the coming months. In the case of Charnwood, the SoCG establishes that the Borough will need to accommodate an additional 1,248 dwellings arising from Leicester's unmet need for the period 2020-2036. The implications of the SoCG and respective apportionment to Charnwood were the subject of rigorous debate on the first day of the Plan examination on the 28th of June. Indeed, Charnwood BC indicated at the hearing session that it would, in principle, now be willing to accommodate their apportionment of Leicester's unmet housing need in the submission Local Plan being examined, rather than addressed through the review trigger mechanism as proposed in Policy DS2. As this represents a significant change in circumstances compared with the submitted Plan, the Inspectors took the decision to adjourn the examination and further consideration is now being given to how this matter can be addressed and the progression of the Plan Examination overall. We suggest, therefore, it would be pertinent for the Parish Council to pause progress of the preparation of the SNPR until such a time that the Inspectors Report into the Local Plan is published, with such an approach providing enhanced certainty in terms of the plan period which the SNPR should be aligning to, the potential implications of an uplifted strategic housing requirement, and the direction of the SNPR's policies and proposals. Policy G1: Limits to Development Gladman support the proposed amendments to the Limits to Development boundary for the village. Gladman note that the new boundary considers recent developments that have taken place adjacent to the settlement and the additional allocation of land for development. This includes Land off Barnards Drive which secured outline planning permission subject to the signing of a S106 Agreement in December 2021. Whilst the approach to amending the settlement boundary is supported, Gladman consider that the policy approach taken is not in accordance with the hierarchical requirements of national policy which sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and the national policy imperative which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing. Gladman recommend that Policy G1 is modified to be consistent with the requirements of national policy to ensure flexibility</p>	<p>Noted, however in including a site allocation policy, a policy on reserve sites and an allowance for windfall the Neighbourhood Plan more than meets its minimum requirement for housing over the Plan period. The Neighbourhood Plan can only address the latest evidence of housing need, and as the PPG states, Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509,</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	-------------

				<p>and to enable the SNPR to react in changes in circumstance over the plan period. Accordingly, the following proposed wording is put forward for the Parish Council's consideration: "The Sileby Neighbourhood Plan will support new development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Applications that accord with the policies of the Development Plan and the Sileby Neighbourhood Plan will be supported particularly where they provide: - New homes including market and affordable housing; or - Opportunities for new business facilities through new or expanded premises; or - Infrastructure to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the neighbourhood area. Development proposals adjacent to the existing settlement will be supported provided that any adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development."</p> <p>Policy H2: Reserve Sites Policy H2 sets out that residential development on two sites will be supported where it is required to mediate a shortfall in housing land supply, or it becomes necessary to provide for additional homes in the Parish. Both sites are located within the current and updated limits to development and therefore there is already a policy framework which supports development at these locations. The approach of Policy H2 which adds further criteria is therefore not supported, as we believe it introduces potentially unnecessary policy requirements and tests. Gladman wish to remind the Parish Council that the housing requirement is not a ceiling, and further development opportunities should be accommodated where suitable.</p>	<p>neighbourhood plans can be brought forward in advance of a new Local Plan.</p> <p>This form of wording is not accepted. To enable development adjacent to the Settlement Boundary would be in direct conflict with the provisions of the adopted and Regulation 19 version Local Plan.</p> <p>This is correct, however the sites are currently employment sites, therefore the presumption in favour of development is not automatic as is implied. This is the same as with the Made Neighbourhood Plan, where reserve sites for residential development on</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------

				<p>Policy H3: Windfall Echoing our concerns to Policy G1 above, Gladman consider Policy H3 is too restrictive as it limits windfall development to within the defined settlement boundary. Furthermore, Gladman do not support the 9-dwelling limit which is proposed in the policy as this arbitrarily restricts otherwise sustainable development opportunities from coming forwards. The nine-dwelling limit would, if put in place, also curb the delivery of much needed affordable housing as the affordable housing policy threshold starts at 10 dwellings or more. Given this, we contend that the policy should be reworded to remove the 9-dwelling limit and to implement additional text that supports sustainable growth opportunities which are well related to the existing settlement.</p>	<p>commercial land were approved by the examiner.</p> <p>It is entirely appropriate to limit development to within the settlement boundary. The nine-dwelling limit is to be retained.</p> <p>Whilst there is no specific guidance on what scale of development is suitable for a windfall site, the NPPF (paragraph 69) notes that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and that local planning authorities, amongst other things, should support the development of windfall sites</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	---

				<p>Policy H5: Affordable Housing Gladman believe that affordable housing is vital in enabling residents the choice to stay in their settlements, especially given the backdrop of rising house prices, therefore we agree with the SNPR that the provision of much needed affordable housing should be supported. However, Paragraph 16 of the Framework states plans should avoid unnecessary duplication of policies that apply in a particular area. It is confusing and unnecessary, therefore, for the SNPR to replicate affordable housing policy which is already set out in the adopted and emerging Development Plan, particularly as Gladman note that Policy H5 does not fully align with emerging CBC Policy H4. Gladman consider that Policy H5 is an unnecessary duplication of adopted and emerging policy. Policy H5 should therefore be deleted from the SNPR.</p>	<p>through their policies and decisions. Appendix 2 of the NPPF notes that ‘major developments’ are those which consist of ten dwellings or more, therefore it is reasonable to make the assumption that small and medium sized sites will include developments up to and including 9 dwellings. This will be stressed in the narrative.</p> <p>If the NP Policy H5 is a mere duplication of the Local Plan Policy H4 then it can’t be in conflict, as is suggested.</p> <p>Any deviation from emerging LP Policy H4 is not relevant as the NP will not be examined against a Local Plan if not yet adopted.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	-------------------------

			<p>Conclusion and Next Steps Gladman recognises the Government’s ongoing commitment to neighbourhood planning and the role that such plans have as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that the SNPR must be consistent with national planning policy and needs to take account of up-to-date evidence. If the Plan is found not to meet the Basic Conditions at Examination, then the Plan will be unable to progress to referendum. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relationship of the SNPR as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the strategic policies for the wider area. Gladman would like to take this opportunity to highlight that the above response is not a criticism of the work put into the SNPR so far. Instead, we commend SPC in seeking to update its plan to reflect updated national and local policy. The suggestions made are to help the SNPR in its examination and to be found sound. Should further clarification be needed on points raised above, the Parish Council are welcome to contact Andrew Collis at A.Collis@gladman.co.uk Yours sincerely Andrew Collis Andrew Collis. (Planner)</p>	Noted	None
--	--	--	--	-------	------

9			<p>Charnwood Borough Council</p>	<p>Charnwood Borough Council Comments Sileby Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation</p> <p>Policy G1 Policy G1 wording is consistent with the existing neighbourhood plan. The proposed limits to development are broadly consistent with those proposed in the Charnwood Local Plan 2021-37. In relation to discrepancies between the neighbourhood plan and the proposed Charnwood Local Plan 2021-37:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North of Stanage Road – this limit boundary is consistent with proposed allocation HA53. • South of Park Road – should this limit boundary be extended to reflect proposed housing allocation HA54 and for consistency with the approach taken for the limit boundary for HA53? • Should proposed housing allocation HA55 be reflected within the limits to development boundary, for consistency with the approach taken for the limit boundary for HA53? <p>Policy H1, H2 and H3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Borough Council welcomes Sileby’s positive and proactive approach to planning for future growth. The neighbourhood plan has a role alongside the Borough-wide Local Plan in securing sustainable development for Sileby. The neighbourhood planning body should note that whilst they have taken a positive approach to this review and have explicitly sought to meet the requirements of national planning policy and guidance, that guidance itself is subject to change, and indeed may be amended by the Government at any time • Policy H1 – delete references to ‘around’ and provide for 18 dwellings specifically, or ‘at least’. In the supporting text clarify that 18 dwellings is the indicative housing figure requested under NPPF 	<p>Noted</p> <p>On reflection this area is yet to receive a planning permission so will be excluded from the limits to Development.</p> <p>This is an intention to permit but is not yet active</p> <p>This remains a live planning application not yet determined.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p>
---	--	--	---	---	--	---

			<p>paragraph 67, and state that the neighbourhood plan agrees with this figure. The neighbourhood plan should note that the proposed site allocations identified is an addition to allocations being proposed through the Charnwood Local Plan. The purpose of the proposed neighbourhood plan housing allocation being to address local housing needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Windfall – reference evidence for the proposed windfall figure and ensure this is published in the online evidence base. Refer to the windfall within policy text (possibly in Policy H3?) to prevent any future doubt about its status (i.e. clarifying the windfall is a formal policy position). It will be necessary for the neighbourhood planning body to demonstrate through evidence that any windfall allowance is defensible over the life of their Plan. • Site Selection – ensure that the evidence base for selecting sites satisfies relevant criteria from Planning Practice Guidance – i.e. it has considered all sites and perhaps using the SHLAA / call for sites as a starting point, a standardised methodology has been used to score and select sites. • Allocations – ensure landowners and consultees such as County Highways agree with allocations. • Policy H2 – consider formally allocating these sites to give them allocated status and further demonstrate the local need has been met ‘above and beyond’ to give flexibility. This would mean combining Policy H1 and H2. May strengthen the plan in the context of NPPF paragraph 14. 	<p>Justification for windfall policy is now included in the narrative.</p> <p>Agreed. This will be emphasised in the narrative.</p> <p>Landowners are in agreement and stakeholders have had the opportunity to comment through this process.</p> <p>We will retain them as reserve sites to help address future housing need</p>	<p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>Change to be made as indicated</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy H3 – considering proposed Local Plan allocations, need to ensure that the ‘up to nine dwellings’ provision does not conflict with the site capacities proposed. 	The LP allocations are not windfall. This figure of 9 is as proposed by CBC and this will be made clear in the narrative.	Change to be made as indicated
			<p>Policy H5 Include reference in the supporting text that provide justification for affordable housing to be delivered in ‘clusters of up to 4’. Perhaps use the text in the consideration of modifications letter. More detailed comments on the acceptability of this amended policy will be provided through the Regulation 16 consultation.</p>	We will amend the narrative accordingly.	Change to be made as indicated
			<p>Policy ENV2 Policy wording has been strengthened to ‘other than in exceptional circumstances’ which was not noted in the Reg 14 consultation. Clarify this within the submission letter and consider using the wording approved in the current neighbourhood plan.</p>	Agreed	Change to be made as indicated
			<p>ENV10 No change has been made to the policy as suggested in the modification letter?</p>	This is an error – it is intended that the policy remains the same. The supporting documentation will be changed to reflect this.	Change to be made as indicated
			<p>Policy T2 Ensure the reasoning that this policy was deleted by the Examiner has been addressed. Ensure County Highways have been consulted on the policy.</p>	This will be stressed in the narrative	Change to be made as indicate
			<p>Policy INF1 No comment on new policy.</p>	Noted	None