

Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan
Pre-submission Regulation 14 (Part 2) Consultation Responses
Consultation held 30th January to 13th March 2017

	Chapter/ Section	Policy Number	Respondent	Comment	Response
19	2		19 – Fisher German	<p><i>“The town has experienced significant growth in recent years with planning permission for 2508 dwellings being granted since 2003 in the NP area. The attractiveness and location of the town means developers can achieve higher prices for properties in Ashby than in neighbouring towns. Average property prices within the Ashby LE65 postcode area are £255,659* compared with £183,279* in the Coalville LE67 postcode area, £224,328* in the Castle Donington postcode area and £152,131* in the Swadlincote DE11 postcode area. (*Figures are taken from Zoopla website for prices paid in 12 months up to 20th January 2017)’</i></p> <p>This paragraph is misleading and also irrelevant. The statement is made that the town has experienced significant growth in recent years outlining the number of dwellings permitted since 2003.</p> <p>Firstly there is no explanation as to why figures since 2003 have been used, and in any event these figures are skewed as in the past there have been significant issues in relation to phosphate levels in the River Mease. Phosphorous associated with development is primarily derived from household detergents and human waste. Wastewater from new development within the foul water catchment of the River Mease is ultimately discharged into the</p>	<p>Statement will remain: The text is a statement of fact, despite the River Mease restrictions which may have depressed new build to some extent, the town has experienced significant growth since 2003.</p> <p>House prices are a relevant consideration to the issue of affordability and housing mix which is an important feature of the NP.</p>

				<p>river following treatment at the local sewage treatment works. Given the high levels of phosphorous this has, and continues to, restrict development from coming forward in the catchment area.</p> <p>Monitoring data shows that there have been improvements in phosphate concentrations within the River Mease as a result of improvements to sewage treatment work discharges implemented by Severn Trent Water. A Developer Contribution Scheme funds measures to mitigate the negative effects of development on the basis of a rolling allocation whereby sequential development 'windows' are identified. This has enabled development to come forward in recent years and skews the overall period in which development where there was, in effect, a 'blanket ban' on development.</p> <p>Property prices are also outlined which are not a planning consideration and hold no relevance to the NP. Given the statement is misleading and irrelevant it should be removed from the NP.</p>	
2	3.2		2 - Resident	Reference to Section 106 funding. A brief explanation needed, as not all readers will understand this.	Reference to CIL added.
24	4.1.a		24 - Resident	Agree it's important to ensure further development does not worsen town centre congestion and put pressure on insufficient town centre parking.	Noted.
13	4.1.b	S1	13 – Civic Society	As Money Hill is an example of the intentions of the Money Hill Consortium, it is clear that existing regulations do not adequately support the future development of Ashby Town. Consequently, this wording in the NP is necessary to set the proper	Noted.

				balance, as it is clearly still within the umbrella of the total Development Plan.	
19	4.1.b		19 – Fisher German	<p>Sustainable development is defined in the NP as “ensuring that providing for the needs of the current generation does not make life worse for future generations” This is loosely the definition of ‘sustainable’ in the NPPF. ‘Development’ or ‘sustainable development’ should also be defined, akin to the NPPF definition as follows <i>“Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don’t mean worse lives for future generations. Development means growth. We must accommodate the new ways by which we will earn our living in a competitive world. We must house a rising population, which is living longer and wants to make new choices. We must respond to the changes that new technologies offer us. Our lives, and the places in which we live them, can be better, but they will certainly be worse if things stagnate.”</i></p>	Agreed the definition has been extended as proposed. The NP is supporting significant levels of development/growth and needs to ensure that sufficient infrastructure improvements are in place.
19	4.1.b	S1	19 – Fisher German	Supported	Noted.
25	4.1.b	S1	25 - NWLDC	<p><i>Presumption in favour of sustainable development</i></p> <p><i>When considering development proposals, the Plan will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF and North West Leicestershire Local Plan. The Town Council will work proactively with developers to find solutions which mean that sustainable proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the Plan area.</i></p>	Amendment made.

				<p><i>Planning applications or other land-use related decisions that accord with the policies in this Plan should be approved, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</i></p> <p><i>Where there are no policies in the Neighbourhood Plan <u>or North West Leicestershire Local Plan</u> relevant to a planning application or other land use related decision, the policies contained in the NPPF [and North West Leicestershire Local Plan] apply.</i></p> <p>The law is clear that planning decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is important therefore that the entire development plan of relevance (in this case the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan) are expressly accorded appropriate weight in decision making.</p>	
12	4.1.d	S2	12 - Resident	<p>The inclusion of the entire Money Hill area as available for building appears to contradict the objective of not building on the countryside. Clearly, existing planning permissions on the site need to be upheld, however, listing the whole area (which is agricultural land) leaves it open to overly intensive, unsustainable levels of development in the future.</p>	<p>The Local Plan designates the whole Money Hill area for development and the NP needs to be in conformity with this allocation.</p>

17	4.1.d	S2 & S3	17 - Gladman	<p>Gladman do not support the use of a settlement boundary if it is to be used as a mechanism to preclude sustainable growth opportunities located outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Gladman notes that Policy S3 only allows for development outside the settlement boundary in 'exceptional circumstances', that is not the correct test to apply as 'exceptional circumstances' only relates to development in the Green Belt. This policy will effectively apply new 'Green Belt' area inconsistent with the requirements of national policy. This matter is not within the remit of neighbourhood planning policy as such an allocation can only take place in exceptional circumstances through the preparing and adoption of a new Development Plan document dealing with matters at the strategic level. The stringent tests for allocation of such an approach are clearly not met in the present case (exceptional circumstances paragraph 82-85 of the Framework as further considered in Gallagher v Solihull MBC judgement in the High Court [2014] EWHC 1283, upheld by the Court of Appeal [2014] EWCA Civ 1630).</p> <p>Gladman considers that these policies as presented are inconsistent with basic conditions (a), (d) and (e) and recommend that it would be more appropriate if Policy S1 was amended to better accord with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and a criterion based policy is used to assess planning applications based on their sustainability merits. Gladman suggest that both Policies S2 and S3 be deleted in their entirety, and</p>	<p>The Limits to Development is a policy within the Local Plan. The NP is in accordance with the strategic policies of the submitted Local Plan and the policy will remain.</p> <p>Recent examinations have considered this wording and the following is probably more appropriate 'Land outside the defined Limits to Development will be treated as open countryside, where development will be carefully controlled in line with local and national strategic planning policies.'</p> <p>The Policy and supporting narrative has been amended in line with the recent examinations.</p> <p>The alterations proposed by Gladman are not supported as they will considerably weaken Policy S1 and the Policy would no longer be in accordance with the Local Plan.</p>
----	-------	---------	--------------	--	---

				<p>replace paragraph 2 of S1 with the following wording: <i>When considering development proposals, the Town Council will take a positive approach to new development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.</i> <i>Planning applications outside and adjoining the existing settlement boundary will be permitted provided that the adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development</i></p>	
18	4.1.d	S2	18 - Pegasus	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan at Policy S2 seeks to designate Limits to Development (as identified at Figure 4) for Ashy de la Zouch. Policy S2 sets out that within the proposed Limits to Development, development proposals will be viewed positively where it is in accordance with the other policies of the NP and relevant District and National planning policies, and subject to accessibility, design and amenity considerations.</p> <p>Figure 4 supports Policy S2 and reflects the new housing proposed by NWL Local Plan to the north of ADLZ (Policy H3a). Policy commentary to Policy S2 sets out that the NP supports the Limits to development provided in the publication version of the Local Plan. This approach is supported.</p> <p>The NWL Local Plan is at an advanced stage of preparation having now been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination. The inspector conducted a series of public hearing sessions from 5-16th January 2017 and hearing</p>	Noted.

			<p>sessions will resume again in late March 2017. Land north of Ashby de la Zouch is a draft allocation for 1,750 dwellings in the Publication Version of the Local Plan (Policy H3a), and the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications seeks to delete reference to 1,750 dwellings and replace with <u>about 2,050 dwellings</u> (MM2).</p> <p>Parag 16 of the NPPF (the framework) is clear that a NP should support the strategic development needs set out in the LP and plan positively to support local development. This includes policies for housing development:</p> <p><i>‘Neighbourhoods should...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development;</i> - <i>Plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan; and</i> - <i>Identify opportunities to use Neighbourhood Development Orders to enable developments that are consistent with their neighbourhood plan to proceed’</i> <p>Parag 184 of the Framework is explicit that NP’s and LP’s should be in conforming:</p> <p><i>‘Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p><i>area and ensure that an up to date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood Plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies’.</i></p> <p>The draft NP is therefore in accordance with the strategic policies of the submitted NWL Local Plan, which is at an advanced stage, with examination hearing sessions underway. This conformity is a requirement of Paragraph 184 of the Framework which confirms that NP’s should reflect the policies of the Local Plans and should plan positively to support them. Policy S2 Limits to Development is therefore supported.</p>	
19	4.1.d	S2	19 – Fisher German	Supported	Noted
26	4.1.e		26 - Resident	<p>I support the WEPA case for a formal policy acknowledgement of the quality and tranquility of the area on both sides of Willesley Lane. This area contains historic landscape and natural features (Fig. 9 Areas of Woodland) which, while they do not carry specific designation, do blend to provide an area of significance for the town and nearby villages.</p> <p>The recent request to NWLDC for an EIA ruling on an oil-fired generating station overlooking Willesley Lake gave some indication of how threatening such a development (acceptable under the Local Plan’s countryside policy) might be.</p> <p>If there is no prospect of a policy in the NP, then</p>	Only a Neighbourhood Plan Policy can be considered as part of planning decision making. A community action will not give any protection so is not included.

				would it be viable to have it covered by a Community Action - to the effect that Ashby Town Council recognise that the area has special local significance and would take it into account in a planning decision.	
11	4.1.f	S4	11 – The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority is pleased to see that its previous comments have been taken in to account and Policy S4: Design now includes, as one of its principles, consideration of issues of land instability and where necessary incorporation of appropriate mitigation and/or treatment measures. On this basis the Coal Authority withdraws its objection to the NDP.	Noted
15	4.1.f	S4	15 - CPRE	We welcome this policy which stresses the role of design of new development in preserving valued and distinctive features of existing development, particularly in the Conservation Area. It also stresses the need for new development to have a good design principles which are coherent and can be both modern but in sympathy with the existing character of the town.	Noted
17	4.1.f	S4	17 - Gladman	Gladman notes this policy is very prescriptive. PPG states that: <i>'A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.'</i> The policy seeks for superfast broadband connectivity to be available, this is not considered to be a design consideration and it is not the role of a developer to provide, it is the role of the relevant infrastructure body. As PPG states the Town Council should engage the relevant infrastructure	LCC support the inclusion of superfast broadband in S4 and agrees that developers should be encourage to ensure its availability.

				providers in this regard.	
19	4.1.f	S4	19 – Fisher German	<p>This policy outlines that development ‘needs’ to satisfy design principles set out. Not all development are going to be able to accord with the 15 principles outlined, and as should the policy should be reworded to:</p> <p><i>“All new development should seek to satisfy the following design principles”</i></p> <p>Criterion 3 in relation to parking requirements outlines a different sets of standards than Leicestershire County Council. This should be amended to include a minimum of one space for one bedroom dwellings.</p>	<p>Text has been amended to ‘... will need to satisfy ... where appropriate ...’.</p> <p>The specific parking requirement has been removed and the policy seeks compliance with LCC standards.</p>
2	4.1.f	S4	2 - Resident	<p>I share some of the concerns expressed, but it is very important NOT to return to the total uniformity of housing estates in the 60’s, 70’s and 80’s. A very good example of mixed styles that blend into an attractive street scene is Templar Road (Ivanhoe Fields) when viewed from Cliftonthorpe.</p>	<p>Noted, it is useful to have examples of good practice.</p>
21	4.1.f		21 - LLAF	<p>Requirements for housing developments under Connections ‘Does the scheme integrate into its surroundings by reinforcing existing connections and creating new ones’. Other than this we have spotted little to talk of improving off-road non motorised links throughout the area and perhaps more importantly into and out of the area. There are busy stretches of road with no cycle or even footway. Such considerations may however fall outside the scope of a NP although we feel that the plan can include aspirations to work with third parties to improve issues affecting the area although outside the area itself.</p>	<p>This is dealt with in the Transport Section.</p>

23	4.1.f	S4	23 - LCC	<p>Superfast Broadband</p> <p>High speed broadband is critical for businesses and for access to services, many of which are now online by default. Having a superfast broadband connection is no longer merely desirable, but is an essential requirement in ordinary daily life.</p> <p>All new developments (including community facilities) should have access to superfast broadband (of at least 30Mbps) Developers should take active steps to incorporate superfast broadband at the pre-planning phase and should engage with telecoms providers to ensure superfast broadband is available as soon as build on the development is complete.</p> <p>The County Council welcomes the inclusion of a broadband policy within the plan with the following comment:</p> <p>POLICY S4: DESIGN - Design Principles point 5 states <i>'High quality superfast (of at least 30Mbps) broadband connectivity should be available'</i>.</p> <p>Developers are only responsible for putting in place broadband infrastructure for developments of 30+ houses. Consideration for developers to make provision in all new houses regardless of the size of development should be considered.</p>	<p>Agree. S4 states that it applies to "all new development" so the point about 30+ does not seem to require any additional wording.</p>
23	4.1.f	S4	23 - LCC	<p>It is suggested that Policy S4 (Design item 8) is amended to read 'New development should be planned to retain existing trees and hedges' and Item 9 is amended to read 'The boundary treatment</p>	<p>Amendment has been made.</p>

				of new development plots should be carefully considered to be sympathetic to the local area’.	
24	4.1.f	S4	24 – Resident	Hugely important to improve broadband and I support ideas in the policy. Impressed with the Building for Life 12. Agree we need to provide adequate off street parking. We also need adequate garages that are big enough for a car with space for a lawn mower etc.	Noted.
25	4.1.f	S4	25 - NWLDC	<p>Have accepted recommendations regarding title of policy and how policy starts and reference to national forest.</p> <p>Part 2) wording has changed to reflect previous concerns regarding word consistency.</p> <p>Part 3) have added in purpose of policy but still conflicts with LCC requirements as it is specific for all developments</p> <p>Part 4) reworded to delete reference to ‘continue’ and reworded to reflect previous concerns</p> <p>Part 5) and part 6) essentially unchanged</p> <p>Part 9) now only refers to ‘wooden fencing’</p> <p>Part 11) substantial revisions. Is high flood risk consistent with NPPF? What arrangements are envisaged re management of SUDs?</p> <p>Part 12) is a new separate point having previously been part of old 10).</p> <p>Part 13) rewritten to reflect previous concerns.</p> <p>Part 14) recognises that smaller developments may not achieve BFL. Perhaps suggest reword to make clear that conformity refers to BFL.</p> <p>Part 15) is new.</p>	<p>Part 3 has been amended to use only the LCC requirements.</p> <p>Part 11 amendments regarding flood risk reflect changes requested by the Environment Agency. SUDS management is for individual applications.</p> <p>Part 14 – ‘conformity with BFL’ has been added.</p>
26	4.1.f	S4	26 - Resident	This principle has been amended to - ‘Contemporary and innovative materials and design will be supported where they are in keeping with the character of the area’. This last clause constrains or	This amendment has been made.

				limits the possibility of innovation! I would suggest 'where they have due regard to the context into which they are to be introduced.'	
3	4.1.f	S4	3 - WEPA	National Forest Design Charter principles – what are the 6 Design Principles?	The Design principles are listed in the National Forest Design Charter which will be a supporting document. The reference to 6 has been removed as there are more than 6 principles, when the entirety of the charter is included rather than just general principles.
3	4.1.f	S4	3 - WEPA	Where a garage counts as a parking space then the internal dimensions must conform to LCC standards.	The Policy has been amended to include conformity with LCC standards.
3	4.1.f	S4	3 - WEPA	Principle 6 on impact on general amenity – need to add 'loss of light to existing properties'.	The Policy has been extended to include 'loss of light to existing properties'.
5	4.1.f	S4	5 – Environment Agency	Point 11 of Policy S4, areas of medium flood risk are known as Flood zone 2, areas of high flood risk are known as flood zone 3. Therefore for completeness the first line of point 11 would be better written "Development should be avoided in areas of medium and high risk (flood zones 2 etc etc). The reference to the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) is welcomed. New point 12 – this is much better as a stand alone point rather than being incorporated in the section on flood risk.	The text on flood zones has been amended as suggested. Other comments welcomed and noted.
15	4.1.g	S5	15 - CPRE	We support this important policy for prioritising sites for development. This matter has been a key campaigning issue for CPRE locally and as a national charity.	Noted.

17	4.1.g	S5	17 - Gladman	<p>Gladman is disappointed to see that the Town Council still have not addressed previous concerns made in response to earlier draft policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, the opportunity is again taken to reiterate that the Framework does not distinguish the sustainability between the brownfield and greenfield sites and does not seek to prioritise the reuse of previously developed land but only seeks to encourage the effective use of land that has been previously developed.</p> <p>Neither paragraphs 14 or 47 of the Framework restrict development in favour of brownfield land and therefore progression of a policy that is directly contrary to national policy is unlikely to be found in accordance with basic conditions (a) and (d). Gladman therefore recommend the deletion of Policy S5</p>	Policy S5 has been amended to refer to support for Brownfield Sites rather than priority.
19	4.1.g	S5	19 – Fisher German	<p>This policy is not clear in how development can be delivered. It places a priority on redevelopment or change of uses of redundant land or buildings over non-brownfield sites.</p> <p>The NPPF does not place a priority of the development of such sites – albeit it does encourage such redevelopment options. However the number of previously developed sites available is extremely limited and it is inevitable that greenfield land will need to be developed in order to deliver the housing and employment land that is needed in the country and at a local scale.</p> <p>The supporting text states that development that addresses these issues (previously developed land) must be prioritised before other development sites are considered. This statement is unreasonable as limited brownfield options are available, and there are often viability issues surrounding previously</p>	See comments above.

				developed sites which means they are not often brought forward, nor quickly. Housing delivery is a key part of planning and the Neighbourhood Plan should acknowledge this by not limiting the consideration of non-brownfield sites for development in advance of brownfield sites. It is considered that the policy should be removed.	
25	4.1.g	S5	25 - NWLDC	Previous concerns regarding the meanings of “prioritised” and “limited” not addressed. In addition, conflicts with NPPF as there is no sequential approach.	See comments above.
2	4.1.g		2 - Resident	Should additional emphasis be included in this part of the plan to supporting/ encouraging the re-use and/or refurbishment of empty buildings to contribute to the removal of ‘.. drag on its vibrancy and attractiveness..’	The wording has been amended to support the refurbishment of empty buildings.
1	4.1.h	S6	1 – Cliftonthorpe Residents	Policy and Map S6 Areas of Separation – consideration should be extended to cover Cliftonthorpe/Smisby Road fields area since a new masterplan has now to be drawn up with stakeholders including the community.	Areas of separation need to be outside the Limits to Development. As these fields form part of the Money Hill development and associated Masterplan they cannot be used as an Area of Separation.
10	4.1.h	S6	10 – Residents	Policy and Map S6 Areas of Separation – consideration should be extended to cover Cliftonthorpe/Smisby Road fields area since a new masterplan has now to be drawn up with stakeholders including the community.	Areas of separation need to be outside the Limits to Development. As these fields form part of the Money Hill development and associated Masterplan they cannot be used as an Area of Separation.
15	4.1.h	S6	15 - CPRE	This policy is significant in helping to retain rural villages and the sense of place experienced by their residents.	Noted.
17	4.1.h	S6	17 - Gladman	This policy seeks to implement an area of local separation between the built-up areas of Ashby de la Zouch and the villages of Shellbrook, Smisby,	The reasons why areas the Areas of Separation have been identified has been added.

				<p>Blackfordby, Norris Hill, Boundary and Packington. This is considered an attempt to introduce a strategic policy beyond the remit of neighbourhood plans without the necessary evidence and justification to support the policy. There is no such area of separation in the emerging NWLP and therefore Gladman suggests this policy should be deleted.</p>	
19	4.1.h	S6	19 – Fisher German	<p>This policy seeks to restrict development in three areas around the periphery of Ashby. There are three supporting lines of text to the policy, one of which states that the thrust of the policy is supported in the Local Plan; this being to ensure that individual settlements retain their own character and identity.</p> <p>The NW Leicestershire Local Plan Submission Version includes Policy En5: ‘Areas of Separation’ and designates two areas of separation between Coalville and Whitwick where only agricultural, forestry, nature conservation, leisure and sport and recreation uses will be allowed. Any other proposed uses will need to demonstrate why they cannot be accommodated elsewhere within the District. The Policy was supported by Background Paper 12 prepared to provide more information in support of the policy. The Background Paper supplements two previous Green Wedge Background Papers published alongside iterations of the then Core Strategy. The first Green Wedge Background Paper was published in 2008 and the second in 2012. Prior to this the sites were identified in earlier Local Plan iteration’s, in which preparation had begun in 1989, with the sites finally being adopted as ‘Green Wedge’ in the Local Plan in 2002.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p> <p>A simpler form of words: ‘Development proposals in the identified gaps between villages should be located and designed to maintain, and wherever possible, enhance the separation of the villages’. Has been added.</p>

				<p>The history to the Coalville/Whitwick Area of Separation designation has therefore been carefully considered and assessed over a number of decades, including numerous rounds of public consultation and Examination before its adoption.</p> <p>In contrast the NP the 'Areas of Local Separation' policy was not considered or included within the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft of the NP in October 2015, rather it has been raised as part of the consultation process and then included in the Part 2 Draft. Whilst the District Council have a similar policy they have only included two sites in the Coalville/Whitwick area and have not considered there to be any need for such a policy in the Ashby area. As such there have been no assessments undertaken as to the appropriateness of the proposed designations by either the District Council or the Town Council. No Background Papers support the proposed designations.</p> <p>In specific relation to the Area of Local Separation proposed to the west of Ashby town centre, much of this area and immediately beyond is already National Forest woodland planting, or becoming such as part of the recent developments that are currently under construction. These already act as a partial barrier between the settlements, and the additional woodland planting will seek to consolidate this further. In addition new solar park development has taken place beyond the National Forest planting, further acting as a buffer between settlements. The areas of National Forest/Woodland planting and solar park areas are</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>defined below to illustrate the composition of the western side of Ashby. It is considered that the woodland and solar park schemes act as sufficient buffer/separation to the west of Ashby.</p> <p>The policy states that: <i>“Development will not be permitted which, either individually or cumulatively, would demonstrably adversely affect or diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area.</i></p> <p><i>Where development in these locations is considered to be otherwise appropriate, development proposals should be located and designed to preserve the physical and functional separation of the villages from the built-up part of Ashby de la Zouch.”</i></p> <p>PPG Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306 states: <i>“A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared.”</i></p> <p>The wording of this policy is obstructively unclear, particularly in relation as to how <i>“diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area”</i> will be assessed and measured, and by</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>whom. These are opaque and inexpert terms to use in a planning context. The proposed policy and associated designations are not supported by appropriate evidence as required. As discussed above, a natural area of separation is already apparent to the west of Ashby whereby land adjacent to the Limits to Development comprises National Forest/Woodland Planting and solar parks.</p> <p>As drafted the policy lacks clarity, cannot be applied with confidence and should be deleted. It is contrary to Basic Conditions (a), (d) and (e). It should be deleted prior to any further lawful consultation under Regulation 14.</p>	
24	4.1.h	S6	24 – Resident	<p>Important to have area of separation but it seem minimal. Need to make a buffer area with less dense development as it joins countryside.</p>	<p>The Area of Separation is considered proportionate to the area covered. However on review an area around Prestop Park Farm was felt to be too narrow when compared with other areas so has been widened slightly to include the area of woodland planting.</p>
25	4.1.h	S6	25 - NWLDC	<p>Map now included showing proposed Areas of Separation – however it is not clear how these have been defined.</p>	<p>The reasons why areas the Areas of Separation have been identified has been added.</p>
3	4.1.h		3 - WEPA	<p>Addition of words 'and adjacent to' the Plan area.</p>	<p>The NP can only cover land within the plan area.</p>
19	4.2.b		19 – Fisher German	<p>The first paragraph refers to the <i>“increasing amount of development which has occurred over recent years that has reduced the level of open space”</i> The NP does not substantiate this claim, which is questioned by the representor as we are unaware of any development of material scale that has reduced</p>	<p>This refers to the first paragraph on page 30. The reduction in open space refers to 'attractive accessible countryside' not just public open space. In paragraph 4.7a this definition of open space is given.</p>

				open space in the area. As such this reference should be deleted.	
19	4.2.b		19 – Fisher German	<p>The third paragraph refers to six settlements identified in the Local Plan as suitable locations for “<i>high level growth</i>”. The wording of this supporting text is not well phrased, especially for the Local Service Centre’s of Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham which the Local Plan outlines are settlements that can accommodate a “<i>reasonable amount of new development</i>”. This text should be rephrased or deleted.</p> <p>The second sentence in the paragraph then sets out some assumptions as to what proportion of residential development should be delivered between the six settlements; Coalville 30%, Ashby and Castle Donington 20% each, and 10% each for Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham which is stated to leave Ashby with a residual housing target of 320. Presumably the Town Council are referring to the 800 district wide residual housing target, however even apportioning this as set out which result in just 160 units rather than 320. In any event the proportions set out are just figures drawn from nowhere and are not supported by any appropriate evidence. The Local Plan itself does not apportion the housing requirement to these settlements and as such the NP cannot do the same. These figures are of no relevance and are not referred to again in the NP and it is therefore considered that they be deleted from the NP</p>	The text in the third paragraph has been amended to make it clear that in the absence of a housing distribution methodology in the Local Plan the NP has attempted to establish one for illustrative purposes.

15	4.2.b		15 - CPRE	This section describes the tensions between the market pressures to locate housing in Ashby and the need to ensure that the scale of this development is sustainable and does not lead to a scale of growth that changes the features that make Ashby a distinctive and attractive place to existing and new residents. As described in the Neighbourhood Plan this tension needs to be managed by the NWLDC Local Plan in allocating growth between settlements.	Noted.
23	4.2.b		23 - LCC	The County Council notes that housing numbers have been revised to reflect those set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan advises that, as a Key Service Centre, Ashby-de-la-Zouch will be required to take 'a significant amount of development'.	Noted
3	4.2.b		3 - WEPA	1 st and 4 th paragraphs – where refer to a residual target of 800 dwellings – over what period will these be built?	These will be delivered in line with the timescales set out in the Local Plan.
24	4.2.f		24 – Resident	Whilst we need to avoid inappropriate styles of development, it would not enhance Ashby to turn it into a huge housing estate of similar styles. Therefore it would be good to encourage and embrace one off designs and self build properties with unique styles.	Noted
13	4.2.b	H1	13 – Civic Society	Ashby Civic Society believes this policy reflects the best understanding of the housing requirements in the area, within the timeframe of this consultation. Should events fundamentally change this vision, then Ashby Civic Society reserves the right to refine its comments on this point.	Noted.
17	4.2.b	H1	17 – Gladman	Gladman raises concerns with this policy, as stated earlier the emerging NWLP allocates sites for 1750 dwellings to the north of Ashby. Paragraph 184 of	Following discussions with NWLDC the text has been amended to allow greater flexibility in the delivery of the 2050

			<p>the Framework states: <i>‘Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.’</i></p> <p>This policy sets a target for 547 houses up to 2031 and a further 675 dwellings to be delivered beyond the plan period. This policy would significantly undermine the strategic policy of the NWLP, promoting less growth than the plan and would significantly harm delivery of the Local Plans housing requirement. This policy would have the effect of capping development of the allocation to 1222 dwellings, with only 547 permitted during the plan period. This is despite the Local plan trajectory anticipating 2,400 dwellings to be completed during the plan period in Ashby, with only 250 still to be completed beyond the plan period.</p> <p>To meet basic conditions (a), (d) and (e) Gladman recommends the phasing and target elements of this policy are deleted and replaced with more flexible wording towards the allocations of the NWLP. Gladman has submitted new policy wording for the Town Council’s consideration below: <i>‘The Neighbourhood Plan recognises the need to provide new housing to meet the identified needs of the Plan area and contribute to the District wide housing target. To achieve this the Plan will support the allocation of 1750 dwellings from the Local Plan, of land north of Ashby de la Zouch at Money Hill (as set out on the Policies Map of the Plan). Additional sites will be considered on a site by site using the presumption in favour of sustainable development.’</i></p>	<p>dwellings planned for Money Hill. The overall housing numbers do not alter but the delivery timescale is not specified.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

18	4.2.b	H1	18 - Pegasus	<p>Policy H1 of the Neighbourhood Plan recognises the need to provide new housing to meet the identified needs of the Plan area and contribute to the District wide housing target.</p> <p>The North West Leicestershire Publication Version Local Plan seeks to provide for a minimum of 10,400 dwellings over the plan period to 2031 (Policy S1). Land north of Ashby de la Zouch is a draft allocation for 1,750 dwellings in the Publication Version Local Plan (Policy H3a), and the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications seeks to delete reference to 1,750 dwellings and replace with about 2,050 dwellings (MM2). As discussed above the Local Plan is now at an advanced stage of preparation with further examination hearing sessions taking place in late March 2017.</p> <p>Policy commentary to Policy H1 of the Neighbourhood Plan sets out that of the 2,050 dwelling requirement for Ashby “828 of the required allocation already have planning permission resulting in a net additional requirement of 1,222”. Policy H1 therefore sets out that having account of homes constructed and existing commitments (828), there is a target of 547 houses over the period to 2031 and 675 houses delivered after 2031, which will be met by development on the land north of Ashby de la Zouch at Money Hill (including the former Arla dairy site and Woodcock Way) and windfall sites that come forward as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses.</p> <p>The submitted North West Leicestershire Local Plan</p>	<p>Following discussions with NWLDC the text has been amended to state that the 1,222 houses will be delivered in line with timescales set out in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The figure of 1,222 is used as regard has been given to the 828 dwellings on Money Hill that already have planning permission. So the overall total number of dwellings for the site is still 2,050.</p>
----	-------	----	--------------	---	---

				<p>makes clear that Ashby is a sustainable location for growth; Ashby de la Zouch is categorised as a 'Key Service Centre', which is the second highest in the hierarchy. The Local Plan includes an allocation for 2,050 dwellings north of Ashby at Policy H3a. Whilst commentary to Neighbourhood Plan Policy H1 makes reference to the allocation, the policy wording of H1 seeks to implement a target of 547 dwellings over the plan period to 2031, and a further 675 dwellings post 2031, and this distribution of the Local Plan allocation north of Ashby is not considered to be justified. To ensure conformity, the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan should reflect Policy H3a (including MM2) – the allocation of 2,050 dwelling north of Ashby, and this should be clearly referenced at Policy H1.</p>	
19	4.2.b	H1	19 – Fisher German	<p>The policy sets out that having regard to homes already constructed and existing commitments the remaining housing provision for the Plan area will be a target of 547 houses over the period to 2031 and 675 houses delivered after 2031. It would appear that the 547 and 675 make up the 1222 net additional requirement as part of the Site H3a Money Hill Site Allocation (as 828 have already been consented). The supporting text does not outline why the split for delivery is set out as it is. Clarity on this should be provided.</p> <p>Windfall site provision is supported.</p>	<p>See comment above.</p> <p>Support for windfall provision is noted.</p>
25	4.2.b	H1	25 - NWLDC	<p>SUSTAINABLE HOUSING GROWTH <i>The Neighbourhood Plan recognises the need to provide new housing to meet the identified needs of the Plan area and contribute to the District wide housing target. Having regard to homes already</i></p>	<p>See comments above.</p> <p>Following discussions with NWLDC the text was amended to enable greater flexibility in the delivery of the 1,222</p>

				<p><i>constructed and existing commitments, the remaining housing provision for the Plan area will be a target of 547 houses over the period to 2031 and 675 houses delivered after 2031. Which will be met by development on the land north of Ashby de la Zouch at Money Hill (including the former Arla dairy site and Woodcock Way) and windfall sites that come forward as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses.</i></p> <p>Our concern with this is that it is not clear exactly how many homes, in total, are expected to come forward, on what land, over what time period. The risk here is that it be used to generate confusion at an appeal, as an appellant suggests that we are unable to demonstrate a five year supply because the development plan when taken together (the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan) is internally inconsistent and does not know what its five year supply figure should be. It would be preferable to simplify the Neighbourhood Plan policy wording, to address that risk.</p>	<p> dwellings without planning permission.</p>
3	4.2.b	H1	3 - WEPA	Over what period with the 675 houses post 2031 be delivered in.	This is not specified in the Local Plan and as stated above the text has been amended to provide greater flexibility in the delivery of the houses.
24	4.2	H2	24 – Resident	Agree on so many levels the importance of walking and cycling connectivity.	Noted
1	4.2.b	H2	1 – Cliftonthorpe Residents	Money Hill Masterplan – This will cover the whole ‘strategic mixed allocation’ including Cliftonthorpe ‘employment’ ? fields as requested by the Local	Masterplan process is led by NWLDC and it does include the consideration of the locating of employment land. This policy

				Plan Inspector.	only concerns housing. This has been made clearer in the text.
10	4.2.b	H2	10 – Residents	Money Hill Masterplan – This will cover the whole 'strategic mixed allocation' including Cliftonthorpe 'employment' ? fields as requested by the Local Plan Inspector.	Masterplan process is led by NWLDC and it does include the consideration of the locating of employment land. This policy only concerns housing.
13	4.2.b	H2	13 – Civic Society	This has a lot of detail in it already, but misses out the original developer intent from the planning applications. 13/00335/OUTM & 15/00512/OUTM: Development of 605 residential dwellings including a 60 unit extra care centre (C2), a new primary school (D1), a new nursery school (D1), a new community hall (D1), new neighbourhood retail use (A1), new public open space and vehicular access from the A511 and Nottingham Road (outline all matters other than part access reserved) These details should be detailed in the NP.	The text has been amended to include: 'requirements agreed through the planning process'.
15	4.2.b	H2	15 - CPRE	This provides an important mechanism for the Neighbourhood Plan to help to shape the major site for new development over the lifetime of the plan to ensure it delivers green spaces, community facilities and well-designed development in appropriate phases.	Noted.

18	4.2.b	H2	18 - Pegasus	<p>Policy H2 sets out that the allocation of Policy H1 will be supported if the requirements listed at Local Plan Policy H3 and the relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies are provided, and in conjunction with the Town Council, a spatial masterplan is agreed.</p> <p>Miller Homes is working with the Money Hill Consortium and Arla who control the wider land interest also the subject of Local Plan Policy H3a, to formulate and deliver a comprehensively planned urban extension. Following a series of workshops, a Development Framework for Potters Hill has now been produced, and this includes land at Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre.</p> <p>Miller Homes will continue to work collaboratively with other interested parties to develop the masterplan and bring forward the Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre site as part of the wider north of Ashby de la Zouch allocation.</p>	Noted.
2	4.2.b	H2	2 - Resident	<p>In the reference to Money Hill development, why is it necessary ‘.. to avoid the potential for.. adopting different design styles and standards..’? Surely large developments are more attractive, and also appealing to a range of purchasers and age groups if there is a variety in the styles of houses and materials used?</p>	<p>The text ‘to avoid the potential for different developers adopting different design styles and standards’ has been deleted. As it is agreed that some variety is desirable.</p>
20	4.2.b	H2	20 – National Forest Company	<p>Masterplan for Money Hill site – the NFC is supportive of this Policy and the need for a Design Code for this development. Part b) refers to a Landscape Masterplan to include the distribution, use, types of habitat, management and phasing of green space.</p>	Noted

25	4.2.b	H2	25 - NWLDC	<p>Some re-ordering but essentially the same.</p> <p>Part L) re connectivity – it is not clear if it is intended that these connections should go all the way to Calke Abbey etc. What does it mean?</p>	The text has been amended to state that connectivity is with existing paths leading to open countryside.
3	4.2.b	H2	3 - WEPA	Point h – need arrangements for future maintenance of new trees and woodlands.	Reference to arrangements for future maintenance has been added.
5	4.2.b	H2	5 – Environment Agency	The revised wording of Policy H2 is very welcome, we note and approve of the additional text in relation to water quality improvements for the River Mease SAC through developer contributions.	Noted
19	4.2.c	H3	19 – Fisher German	<p>The first paragraph in this section describes windfall sites a “<i>small infill or redevelopment sites that come forward unexpectedly....and can range from small sites suitable for only a single dwelling to areas with a capacity for several houses (up to 5).</i>” This definition is considered to be factually incorrect and misleading as windfall sites are not limited in size. The NPPF definition reads as follows, “Windfall sites: <i>Sites which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process. They normally comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available.</i>” Given the Government definition of windfall sites does not limit any quantum of development this reference should be removed from the NP supporting text and from Policy H3.</p> <p>Similarly there is no reason why windfall sites need to be within the defined Limits to Development. Policy S3 provides the context for development proposals outside of Limits to Development and further reference to this within Policy H3 is unnecessary repetition and should be removed from the policy wording.</p>	This section has been retitled ‘Infill Sites’ to make it clearer that this policy covers small infill developments rather than larger ‘windfall sites’.

				<p>The policy should therefore read: Development proposals for windfall sites <i>which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process will be supported where they are in accordance with relevant policies in the plan, especially S4 and relevant national and District wide policies, and:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Help to meet the identified housing mix for the Plan area.....”</p>	
19	4.2.d	H4	19 – Fisher German	<p>The Plan sets out that as at 2011 Ashby had a greater proportion of 4 bed houses (23.6%) than the District (18.3%). This is not a huge disparity. The Town Council failed to highlight that Ashby also had a greater proportion of 1 bed homes (6.2%) than the District (5.5%). With small variances in the 2 bed and 3 bed house sizes. These figures will fluctuate and are close to the overall District figures, and in any event do not need to exactly reflect the average mix.</p> <p>The Plan highlights an ageing population in Ashby, which is true across the country. The need to cater for the ageing population is acknowledged and supported, however the variance to the overall District is again marginal.</p> <p>Policy H2 sets out that in order to meet the future needs of the residents of the Plan area, new housing development proposals should meet a number of criteria.</p> <p>Criterion (a) is supported.</p> <p>Criterion (b) is not supported. This is too proscriptive. It may not be appropriate for a development to provide this mix of housing sizes.</p>	<p>The trend for larger houses new build houses in Ashby has continued and this policy aims to redress this balance. In line with the acknowledgement in the HEDNA and Local Plan that there is a need to focus on delivering 2 and 3 bedroom properties in order to provide a better balance in the housing market.</p> <p>Consultation highlighted concerns at people struggling to get on to the property ladder in the town owing to the significant number of larger new build properties.</p> <p>For these reasons this policy has not been altered.</p> <p>H4 point c has been amended to include the phrase ‘where possible’ in respect of bungalows.</p>

				<p>i.e. it could be a high density apartment scheme in the centre of Ashby which would not be appropriate for 60% to be 2 or 3 bedroom development. As such it is considered that this should be omitted from the proscriptive policy and used in the supporting text as guidance only.</p> <p>The principle behind criterion (c) is supported but it in specific is stating bungalows be provided. It may not be appropriate in the proposed location, or the particular scheme to make provision for bungalows (i.e. it could be a high density apartment scheme in the centre of Ashby which would not be appropriate for bungalow development. As such it is considered that this should be omitted from the proscriptive policy and used in the supporting text as guidance only.</p>	
2	4.2.d	H4	2 - Resident	<p>I strongly support the wording in Policy H4 given the statistical trends in Ashby for ages of population. In particular, older people may wish to 'downsize' but stay in Ashby in smaller, desirable dwellings without having to consider 'retirement complexes' or council bungalows.</p>	Noted.
25	4.2.d	H4	25 - NWLDC	<p>Have deleted former b) which was considered inappropriate.</p> <p>Still no reference to viability.</p> <p>It is still not clear how the figure of 60% was arrived at.</p>	<p>'Where possible' has been added to help deal with any viability issues. It was not felt necessary to specifically refer to viability here as this could apply to many of the policies included in the NP. refer to viability.</p> <p>The 60% target attempts to balance the housing stock and address an over provision (69%) of 4 bedroom properties in recent new builds.</p>
12	4.2.4	H4	12 -	The figures for the required housing mix seem to	The call for one bedroom is mainly in the

			Resident	suggest there is a need for 1 bedroomed properties, yet the plan prioritises 2 bedroom plus.	affordable sector and this is covered by policy H5. One purpose of H4 is to limit 4+ bed houses.
24	4.2.h	H4	24 – Resident	The need for age appropriate accommodation is very important. We need to provide quality 1 & 2 bed retirement accommodation for older residents who in turn release 3 & 4 bed houses back onto the market.	Noted
12	4.2.e	H5	12 – Resident	The NP suggests a lower threshold of 11 dwellings for the affordable housing requirement to take effect in Ashby, compared to 14 in the Local Plan; however, no evidence is given to indicate whether this small change will have any impact of the number of affordable homes built. Have any recent developments in the town fallen in to this category of between 11 and 15 homes?	The Local Plan is being amended to 11 dwellings, therefore the policy is in accordance with the LP.
12	4.2.e	H5	12 – Resident	The SHMA indicates a need for 60% of housing in Ashby to be affordable, with 50% of that demand being for 1 bedroomed properties. The NP plan targets 30% affordable housing, 40% of which to be 1 or 2 bedroomed dwellings will lead to an even greater shortfall of 1 bedroomed properties (page 30 of the NP states that: ‘a large shortfall in affordable 1 bedroom homes in Ashby over the plan period.) Whilst I appreciate there is some political expediency in adopting a much reduced target of 30% affordable homes, it is clear that failing to address the demand will simply worsen the problem in the future.	The 60% target has been assessed through the Local Plan process as unviable. The alteration in the percentage of 1 bedroomed to cover 1-2 bedroomed dwellings is in response to comments made in previous rounds of consultation. The NP is keen to improve the amount of housing available for the ageing population and 2 bedroom rather than 1 bedroom was felt to be the greater need for older people.
13	4.2.e	H5	13 – Civic Society	This policy is the result of putting forward the best policy for Ashby, based on Ashby experience. It might not fit other Town’s experience and is not intended to do so.	Noted.
17	4.2.e	H5	17 -	This policy seeks for all developments comprising of	See above NWLDC have now adopted our

			Gladman	<p>11 or more dwellings to provide at least 30% of homes as affordable housing and only in 'highly exceptional circumstances' will commuted sums be acceptable. This does not accord with the approach of the NWLP where the threshold for affordable housing contributions is 15 or more dwellings. The NWLP also states that a lesser amount may be considered where the viability of a scheme would be threatened and other measure could not help to increase viability, without affordable provision being reduced. This policy is therefore contrary to basic conditions (a) and (d).</p> <p>This policy also seeks to restrict affordable housing for local residents through various criteria, this should be deleted.</p> <p>All affordable housing contributions should be for the benefit of the wider District area.</p>	<p>figure</p> <p>Local residency conditions are an appropriate policy within NPs</p>
19	4.2.e	H5	19 – Fisher German	<p>Policy H5 sets out that 30% of homes are affordable on sites of 11 or more dwellings, and that only in exceptional circumstances will commuted sums be acceptable.</p> <p>The 30% level of provision is in line with the NWLDC Local Plan and is therefore supported, however the 11 dwelling threshold is lower than that contained in the Local Plan, which for Ashby de la Zouch is set at 15 or more dwellings. It is considered that the NP policy should be brought in line with the Submission Version of the Local Plan and amended to 15 or more dwellings.</p> <p>The policy should state that on-site provision is a preference, akin to the Local Plan, rather than stating it must be provided. The policy should</p>	<p>See above NWLDC have now adopted our figure of 11.</p> <p>The policy does not state that the provision must be onsite, only that it should be with there being room for commuted sums in highly exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Following responses to previous consultations criterion (b) has been amended to 40% for 1 or 2 bedroom dwellings.</p>

				<p>therefore be reworded.</p> <p>Criterion (b) states that of the affordable homes provided that 40% shall be 1 bed properties, due to a high waiting list for 1 bed homes. Firstly the 'need' will fluctuate over the plan period and beyond and Ashby already had a higher percentage of 1 bed properties than the District as a whole. If the policy was adopted and implemented then there would become an overprovision of 1 bed properties within the market. Family housing is also a great need for the area.</p> <p>Secondly, depending on the site circumstances, and the scheme, it may not be appropriate for 1 bed properties to come forward, or at least not 40%. This element of the policy is too proscriptive and should be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>Criterion (c) is supported.</p>	
25	4.2.e	H5	25 - NWLDC	<p>AFFORDABLE HOUSING <i>To support the provision of mixed, sustainable communities and meet an identified need within the community:</i></p> <p><i>a) At least 30% of homes on developments comprising 11 or more dwellings shall be high quality affordable homes. Only in highly exceptional circumstances will commuted sums be acceptable and any such commuted sums shall be used to provide suitable affordable housing in Ashby de la Zouch;</i></p> <p><i>b) At least 40% of the affordable homes provided shall be 1 or 2 bedroom properties; and</i></p> <p><i>c) Development housing proposals will be expected to contribute to the provision of affordable homes</i></p>	<p>Discussions have been held with NWLDC regarding their concerns about restrictions on the use of commuted sums and the local connection policy.</p> <p>Following a presentation by NWLDC to the Council's Planning and Transportation Committee Councillors made it clear that they wished to retain the local connection policy.</p> <p>As they did not wish to hinder the development of specialist accommodation in the District. The NP Steering Group agreed that the policy would be amended</p>

			<p><i>that are suited to the needs of older people and those with disabilities.</i></p> <p><i>Where possible, affordable housing within the Plan area shall be allocated to eligible households with an Ashby connection defined as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Was born in Ashby de la Zouch or;</i> <i>b) b) Presently reside in the plan area and has, immediately prior to occupation, been lawfully and ordinarily resident within the plan area for a continuous period of not less than twelve months; or</i> <i>c) c) Was ordinarily resident within Ashby de la Zouch for a continuous period of not less than three years but has been forced to move away because of the lack of affordable housing; or</i> <i>d) d) Is presently employed or self-employed on a full time basis in Ashby de la Zouch and whose main occupation has been in Ashby de la Zouch for a continuous period of not less than twelve months immediately prior to occupation; or</i> <i>e) f) Has a need to move to Ashby de la Zouch to be close to a relative or other person in order to provide or receive significant amounts of care and support.</i> <i>f) e) Has a close family member who is lawfully and ordinarily resident within Ashby de la Zouch and who has been lawfully and ordinarily resident within the Plan area for a continuous period of not less than three years immediately prior to occupation and for the purposes of this clause a “close family member” shall mean a mother, father, brother or sister.</i> 	<p>to enable the use of commuted sums for specialist accommodation in the wider district.</p> <p>To ensure those with high levels of housing need were able to access accommodation. The Steering Group also agreed that the local connection policy should be amended to allow allocation by band on the housing register.</p> <p>These amendments were shared with NWLDC who stated they were in broad agreement with the changes and suggested some further minor amendments that were included in the revisions.</p> <p>The policy now allocates newly developed affordable housing in Ashby to eligible households, within each Housing Register band in turn with an Ashby connection. If there are no priority band households with an Ashby connection that the properties will be made available to other applicants in the Priority Band.</p> <p>NWLDC have stated that they will incorporate this in to their wider Allocations Policy.</p> <p>The Policy will also be reviewed at least every two years.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p><i>Only where no households can be found that meet any of the above criteria shall affordable housing within the Plan area be allocated to otherwise eligible households from the wider District.</i></p> <p>This is a case of unintended consequences: if this restrictive policy were to apply to new affordable housing developments in Ashby, two key unintended consequences would be of particular concern:</p> <p>The first of these is that other Neighbourhood Plans may wish to follow suit, and we would end up with people who need affordable housing effectively stuck in the town they currently live in, as they would be precluded from moving to a different town by the same policy.</p> <p>The second is that the reduced pool of potential occupiers of the new homes would increase the borrowing costs for Registered Providers, to the point that viability would be threatened. Under that scenario, fewer affordable homes, possibly with a different sub-optimal tenure mix, would be provided.</p>	
8	4.2.e	H5	8 - Councillor	The local connection requirements in Policy H5 should be extended to include people with connections to the whole parish rather than just the plan area, as it seems unfair to exclude Blackfordby residents from affordable housing in Ashby.	The text has been amended to say 'Ashby de la Zouch' rather than the Plan Area.
12	4.2.f	H6	12 – Resident	Promoting Self build – Whilst policy H6 purports to be 'promoting self build' the accompanying restrictions that self-builders must have a local	To encourage and support self build projects the Policy has been amended to remove the criterion for developing self

				<p>connection and live in the property once it is complete seem to discourage those who own land from building.</p> <p>I suspect that policy H6 is intended to apply to the provision of serviced plots on large commercial property development sites; if this is the case it must be clearly stated in the policy; if it is not then, it appears to place undue restrictions on self-builders, and favours property developers.</p> <p>I am concerned that this policy lacks rigour and leaves a number of questions unanswered. A few immediately spring to mind: What are the consequences of a failure to adhere to the restrictions? What happens if a self-builder's circumstances change? How long must someone live in the property after completion? How will the restrictions on the policy be enforced?</p>	build properties.
25	4.2.f	H6	25 - NWLDC	<p>This goes a long way beyond the eligibility requirements that are set out in the regulations. Issues regarding conflict with self-build initiative not addressed.</p> <p>Have now removed reference to 6 months period and reference to fair price.</p>	See above, restrictions have been removed.
24	4.3	Employment - General	24 – Resident	Some interesting points.	Noted
3	4.3.a	Employment - General	3 - WEPA	5 th paragraph – the comment that ‘many have been unable to find work’ – is contrary to the reference in the 2 nd paragraph to ‘low levels of unemployment’.	Wording has been amended to emphasise that it is finding work within the plan area that is the problem.
3	4.3.b		3 - WEPA	Reference should be also be made to the loss of the biscuit factory and soap factory, which have been developed for housing.	Reference has been added to the former biscuit and soap factories.
3	4.3.b	E1	3 - WEPA	Shouldn't reference to Money Hill employment provision be also made in the Masterplan section	The Master Plan policy H2 is a housing not employment policy.

				and Policy H2?	Policy E1 supports employment opportunities as set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan states that the Money Hill Master Plan needs to include employment provision. Therefore it is not felt necessary to add it here.
3	4.3.b	E1	3 - WEPA	Should there be a reference/ policy in respect of working/ a business operation from residential dwellings. There needs to be a restriction on inappropriate/ unacceptable/ additional vehicles/ deliveries or storage of goods or materials to the detriment of the environment. Perhaps this is covered by the following section c) small & Start up businesses? However, this section & Policy E2 makes no reference to preventing businesses that are a nuisance etc operating from residential properties.	Covered by general planning policy and LP
25	4.3.c	E2	25 - NWLDC	Is ambiguous - does this support any site in any location for small businesses, regardless of impacts? Point re LTD not addressed.	Added reference to “where in conformity with the other provisions of the Local Development Plan”
19	4.3.d	E3	19 – Fisher German	The fundamentals of the policy are supported however the obligations the criteria put on developers is considered to be unacceptable. This is mainly true of criterion (a) which requires major new employment related developments to contribute to the provision of education and training. The legal tests for when you can use a s106 agreement (which is how such contributions are likely to be made) are set out in regulation 122 and	The text has been amended to state: ‘Employment generating development proposals should incorporate provisions to help create employment and business opportunities within the Plan Area to meet local need’. It has been made clear that the list below are only examples.

				<p>123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 as amended.</p> <p>The tests are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms 2. directly related to the development; and 3. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. <p>As well as the legal tests, the policy tests are contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):</p> <p><i>"203. Local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition.</i></p> <p><i>204. Planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>directly related to the development; and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development."</i> <p>It is considered that the provision of education and training would not be necessary to make certain developments acceptable in planning terms and would not therefore be CIL compliant. As such this clause should specifically be removed.</p> 	
25	4.3.dd	E3	25 - NWLDC	<p>Title is slightly misleading as it suggests it applies across whole parish even though this is not the plan area. Policy wording itself is OK in this respect.</p>	<p>The title has been amended to 'Plan Area'.</p>

				and b) are both new	
15	4.4		15 - CPRE	Policies: TC1, TC2, TC3: These policies all make an important contribution to ensuring a vibrant and distinctive town centre retail presence which is both in line with the historic character of Ashby and provides strong reasons for people to visit the town.	Noted
24	4.4	TC1	24 – Resident	We need to encourage the town centre to thrive. Give support to independent businesses. Address problems with business rates and avoid increase in charity shops. Agree with need to monitor number of hot food outlets.	Noted
25	4.4.b	TC1	25 - NWLDC	Part e now removed whilst d) has been re-worded so only applies to hot food takeaways Proposed wording in respect of where policy applies is confusing and implies that it only applies outside the primary shopping area? d) is poorly drafted, does this mean 10% of total number of units? Frontage? Floorspace? Would benefit from tightening up. There is also still no justification for figure of 10%. Still not clear what 'other uses' is referring to – this runs counter to established national policy that housing is a main town centre use.	Part d) has been reworded to add greater clarity that it applies within the Town Centre. With the wording on 10% taken from NWLDC Retail Supplementary Planning Document (2010) regarding take aways in Ashby de la Zouch. Removed reference to 'other uses' as covered by the categories identified in the opening paragraph.
8	4.4.b	TC1	8 - Councillor	There seems to be a problem with the logic in Policy TC1 which as written only applies the overconcentration of take aways clause to the Town Centre outside the Primary Shopping Area though the main concern on this is within the Primary Shopping Area. Is the 'outside the Primary Shopping Area' phrase only meant to apply to	See above.

				community development? If so this needs to be carefully repunctuated or rewritten.	
24	4.4.c		24 – Resident	Agree we need to support the town centre shopping area.	Noted
25	4.4.c	TC2	25 - NWLDC	<p>Policy re-written to address previous concerns regarding part ii) (as was). However, part b) needs a comma after necessary.</p> <p>Change of use away from A1 is not clear. Does this mean only if, across the entire primary shopping area, non-A1 uses are 51% (of the number of units? Floorspace? Frontage?) then you would seek to resist? Does that include or exclude vacant units? What is a cluster?</p>	The aim of the policy is for the Primary Shopping area to maintain the current level of retail premises.
20	4.4.d	TC3	20 – National Forest Company	The NFC welcomes Policy TC3 concerning Shop frontages. Ashby is a popular destination for visitors to the National Forest due to the range of services available but also due to the character of the town centre. While this Policy will place some control on shop fronts which are subject to planning applications, the NFC considers that a shop front enhancement scheme, similar to that currently being run in Coalville should be considered. This would encourage the improvement and enhancement of all shop fronts within the Plan area not just those which may be subject to a planning application.	Shop front enhancement schemes are outside the remit of the NP.
20	4.4.e	TC4	20 – National Forest Company	Supported	Noted.
25	4.4.e	TC4	25 - NWLDC	<p>Still not totally clear re issue of access.</p> <p>Additional words “where it “ now included.</p>	<p>The comma has been deleted to improve clarity.</p> <p>The issue of access has been raised by</p>

				Is it correct that the reference to an existing retail use means an A1 shop? What is the purpose of this, if that is the case?	the Environment Agency during the consultation and the revised text addresses their concerns. Within the Primary Shopping area there is a desire to protect existing retail uses.
3	4.4.e	TC4	3 - WEPA	It is suggested that where upper floor premises are developed for residential use and parking for occupiers cannot be provided then consideration should be given to the requirement for a payment towards future car parking provision.	Unfortunately this cannot be imposed through planning policy.
5	4.4.e	TC4	5 – Environment Agency	Policy TC4 is welcomed as it addresses the dilemma of safe access and egress to a property that itself may not be at flood risk (upper floor) but to enter that property in times of flood could be very dangerous – eg depth of flood water, flood flow route.	Noted
20	4.4.f	TC5	20 – National Forest Company	Supported	Noted
24	4.4.f		24 – Resident	Important to promote tourism as this assists economic growth.	Noted
25	4.4.f	TC5	25 - NWLDC	Policy now includes leisure as well. Issue re loss of tourist or leisure facility to another tourist or leisure facility not addressed. There is a risk that the caveats undermine the objective.	'net loss' has been added to address the issue raised by NWLDC.
24	4.4.g		24 – Resident	Agree we need to improve signage in town centre and at the approaches to town centre.	Noted
25	4.4.g	TC6	25 - NWLDC	Reference to 'corporate, clear and attractive signage' now removed. There is an opportunity here to describe what is	Covered in the Community Action

				sought, and what is to be avoided	
3.	4.4.g	TC6	3 - WEPA	'Swan neck' – not sure what type of lighting this is referring to, but if it is what I think (lighting units above the sign illuminating back on to the sign face), then I thought these would be acceptable.	Noted. This policy was supported in consultation
15	4.5	Transport - General	15 - CPRE	<p>We support the general balance of this section in terms of encouraging alternatives to car travel – particularly promoting walking and cycling through, for example, promoting travel plans and safer routes to schools schemes. However, we feel that these aims are not sufficiently integrated into the sections on car travel – particularly those promoting additional car parking. It is important to recognise that the presence of cars is a major factor that makes people wary of walking or cycling and further that the Strategic Environmental Assessment that accompanies the NP suggests that air quality could well be of concern if car traffic continues to increase.</p> <p>There may be scope for more Community Action initiatives here to understand better why people use their cars to come into town and how that could be reduced rather than just focusing on reviewing car parking provision.</p>	<p>This general support is welcomed. We will consider further the extent to which encouraging alternatives to car travel is integrated across the Plan.</p> <p>The supporting text on Travel Plans has been amended to include reference to 'an emphasis on reducing reliance on the private car, particularly single occupancy car travel'.</p>
24	4.5	Transport - General	24 – Resident	With the increase in housing it will be even more important to offer improved public transport to residents.	Noted.
16	4.5	Transport - General	6 – Highways England	In its response to the Council in relation to its draft Pre-Submission NP in June 2016, Highways England considered that this scale of development had the potential to impact on the operation of the SRN, particularly at A42 J13. However, we acknowledged that LCC and NWLDC had been working with Highways England to address this issue through the implementation of an	Noted.

				improvement scheme at the junction in order to support growth at Ashby de la Zouch and Coalville. Given the scale of growth remains unchanged from the previous consultation, Highways England's position remains the same and will continue to work alongside the Councils in the delivery of a scheme at A42 J13.	
15	4.5.a	Transport – General and T1	15 - CPRE	In this section the proposed route of HS2 through the Plan area is mentioned. It is noted that the NP cannot directly influence it. While accepting this formal status we would point out that this development has consequences for other NP policies. While HS2 is arguably irrelevant as a transport policy for the NP area it definitely does have consequences for section 4.7 Natural Environment where it is not mentioned at all. Specifically, Lount Meadows SSSI to the North of Ashby is specifically mentioned in HS2 documentation as being impacted by HS2. Section 4.7 also gives significant attention to the Mease SAC but fails to note that crossing this is one of the major environmental challenges for HS2 in the area. HS2 will also have consequences for links with Packington where children walk to school in Ashby and more generally in creating a barrier between these communities and impacting on Ashby housing developments in this area both visually and from noise. The Neighbourhood Plan could actively engage in mitigation discussions with HS2 over these issues.	The implications of the construction of HS2 will be dealt with then the Neighbourhood Plan is reviewed.
23	4.5.b		23 - LCC	a) Whilst recognising the right of individuals and bodies, the County Council does not believe that there is any evidence to support the statement that transport investment in infrastructure 'has	Reference to 'aggravated a transport situation, which was already difficult' has been removed as has the reference in the subsequent paragraph to 'and exacerbate the existing problems'.

			<p>aggravated a transport situation, which was already difficult’.</p> <p>b) Whilst the County Council recognises that communities often have concerns about the traffic impacts of proposed new development, and has every right to express those concerns, it is concerned that the wording of Policy T1 (as currently drafted) is in conflict with the Council’s statutorily defined role within the planning system.</p> <p><i>POLICY T1: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT – Development proposals must be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the District Council and/or the Highway Authority in dialogue with the Town Council that any traffic generation and parking impact created by the proposal does not result in an unacceptable severe direct or cumulative adverse impact on congestion or road and pedestrian safety.</i></p> <p>In the vast majority of cases it is the Local Planning Authority (i.e. North West Leicestershire District Council in this particular case) that is responsible for determining proposals for new developments. There is concern that Policy T1 places a commitment on the County Council (as the Highway Authority) to carry out dialogue with the Town Council on development proposals. This is effectively</p>	<p>It is however still acknowledge that the traffic situation in the Plan area is a significant issue.</p> <p>Policy T1 has been redrafted to address the concerns raised by LCC.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>creating a new role for the Authority, which would be at odds with its role as a statutory consultee in the development control process (as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Control Procedure) (England) Order 2015), which is to provide highway comments to the Local Planning Authority. The County Council therefore objects to Policy T1, as it is currently drafted.</p>	
25	4.5.b	T1	25 - NWLDC	<p>Policy retitled. New title better</p> <p>Other rewording refers to whom applicants need to demonstrate that proposals are OK.</p> <p>Wording ‘unacceptable severe’ is confusing – can something severe be acceptable?</p> <p>Duplicates other existing policies.</p>	See above, this policy has been redrafted.
25	4.5.c	T2	25 - NWLDC	<p>Deleted reference to “ be expected to be” with “should be”.</p> <p>The consideration of wider needs and reducing town centre traffic, while laudable, go beyond the scope of what we can reasonably require of developers. The policy would benefit from robust justification to set out what is unusual about Ashby’s roads to require such expansive travel plans.</p>	<p>Concerns about the impact on Ashby’s medieval road system of recent and planned development have been identified throughout the document.</p> <p>During consultation residents were clear that travel plans needed to be specific to their town and not generic ones.</p>
1	4.5.e	T4	1 – Cliftonthorpe Residents	<p>Cycling and footpath network should safeguard Cliftonthorpe footpath and surrounds and improve access across the very dangerous A511 crossing.</p>	<p>These comments can be fed in to the Masterplan process. Within Policy T4 emphasis is given to connecting with the surrounding countryside which is designed to cover the links described in the response.</p>

10	4.5.e	T4	10 – Residents	Cycling and footpath network should safeguard Cliftonthorpe footpath and surrounds and improve access across the very dangerous A511 crossing.	See comment above.
2	4.5.e	T4	2 - Resident	Promoting Walking and Cycling – Very important that, if footpaths are retained or provided, they are maintained in a state fit for use. Some wording in Policy T4 should refer to monitoring the condition and promoting regular maintenance of footpaths. This is where the Town Council may be able to put more effective pressure on the County Council to fulfil its responsibility.	The sentiment is supported but falls outside the remit of the NP.
21	4.5.e	T4	21 - LLAF	The plan talks about promoting walking and cycling for leisure purposes this means opportunities for people in the area to escape into the wider countryside and for those in the villages outside the area to get into Ashby. This is where the elephant in the room comes in by the name of HS2. It skirts the Plan area but will have a major impact on access to and from the area. ADLZ is the biggest community along the Leicestershire section of the proposed route. If additional capacity had been the aim rather than speed, we would have advocated the reinstatement of the Ivanhoe Line from Ashby to Leicester with a station for HS2 by Ashby to intercept the service and still support the introduction of passenger traffic on this line.	Text has been added that the implications of the construction of HS2 will be dealt with when the Neighbourhood Plan is reviewed and more details on the construction of HS2 will be available.
21	4.5.e	T4	21 - LLAF	A number of the rights of way around Ashby are potentially cut by the suggested HS2 route and whilst mostly outside the area, given they are part of the network into and out of the area we feel you need to engage with the HS2 company to try and mitigate the impacts.	See comment above.
21	4.5.e	T4	21 - LLAF	Path M60 is a valuable route avoiding the need to walk alongside the busy and dangerous A512 from Coleorton Farm Town to Ashby. It appears the	The Plan area has a range of public footpaths and it is felt referring to just one would be inappropriate. When the

				A512 will need some diversion to cross HS2 and the need to divert M60 may also arise. A footway from its exit point on to the A512 westwards to the A42/A511 roundabout is long overdue, and should be included in the scheme and we would advocate that you press for this and include that ambition in your plan. This valuable route gets walkers off the busy and dangerous A512 and should be maintained. Path 072 to the south (GR SK362154) from Coleorton Lane to Packington – Ashby Road is a popular local circuit with the bridleway P20 from Ashby to much the same point and a sensible diversion is required.	Neighbourhood Plan is reviewed the implications of the construction of HS2 will be considered.
3	4.5.e	T4	3 - WEPA	Add: iv) Improved connectivity to the Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre.	This amendment has been made.
20	4.5.f	T5	20 – National Forest Company	Supported	This support is welcomed.
21	4.5.f	Community Action T2	21 - LLAF	In the absence of the Ivanhoe Line, perhaps you should include in your ambitions to have a limited bus service from Burton to Leicester. Ashby is roughly halfway along the current 'divert to serve everywhere' route, so it is over an hour from the major shopping/ further education/ employment areas of Leicester and Burton.	Reference to the need for a limited bus service from Burton to Leicester is too specific for the Plan.
25	4.5.g	T6	25 - NWLDC	Policy reworded. As worded i) would only enable proposals exacerbating existing shortfall to be resisted. Is this what they want? Surely should be concerned with where result in a shortfall as result of development irrespective in any event not just where there is already a shortage?	The Policy has been amended to take into account these comments.

				<p>Not clear who would provide parking using funding referred to.</p> <p>No reference to additional parking proposed by district Council.</p>	
26	4.6	HE - General	26 - Resident	<p>The Consultation Draft now offers a better perspective of heritage assets beyond the confines of the Town Centre / Conservation Area (particularly after the 'discovery' of Heath End). In my view, the NP overlooks the subtle role of transport heritage within (and adjoining) the Plan area. The Local Plan does identify this at a District level and it seems appropriate to develop this within the NP.</p>	<p>This support is welcomed.</p> <p>Reference to tramways has been added to the list of non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>The NP can only deal with assets within the Plan area.</p>
15	4.6.b	HE1	15 - CPRE	<p>We welcome this policy of identifying and preserving non-designated heritage assets that make a contribution to the historic character of the town.</p>	<p>This support is welcomed.</p>
2	4.6.b	HE1	2 - Resident	<p>The addition of land at Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre at a very late stage in the preparation of the Local Plan for publication increased the housing numbers for Money Hill from 1750 to 2050. If this land is approved and developed there will be no discernible 'area of separation' between the housing and Cliftonthorpe. There is also a small site designated for employment land bordering the access drive to Cliftonthorpe and the Equestrian Centre. If this is developed, Cliftonthorpe Hall and its dwellings would be completely surrounded, affecting the landscape and visibility of a non-listed heritage asset for Ashby.</p>	<p>Concerns are noted.</p> <p>The NP needs to be in conformity with the Local Plan so this cannot be changed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
25	4.6.b	HE1	25 - NWLDC	<p>Part of a new section on heritage rather than being part of a broader section as previously.</p> <p>Issues raised previously not really addressed.</p>	<p>This Policy has been redrafted to provide greater clarity.</p>

				The policy suggests that the Town Council and Civic Society will compile the list, but the Community Action points to the District Council updating the Conservation Area Character Appraisal. This inconsistency could be exploited at appeal. The issue would benefit from dialogue to ensure we each understand the position	
3	4.6.b	HE1	3 - WEPA	Add reference to the Burton & Ashby Light Railway (tramway), the Ticknall Tramway, and the Ashby Canal Tramway to Willesley Basin.	These have been added to the list of non-heritage assets.
24	4.6	HE2	24 – Resident	Very important to do something with the Royal Hotel. It could be such an asset to the town if it were developed.	Noted
5	4.7.a	NE1	5 – Environment Agency	P64 a) Introduction .. is duplicated	Text has been amended
12	4.7.a	NE1	12 – Resident	Given the town is under-resourced in provision of green space, it is reassuring to see the following protected: a list of the green spaces is provided.	Noted. This support is welcomed.
22	4.7.a	NE1	22 - Resident	The term used in the NPPF parag 76 is ‘very special circumstances’. Rather than ‘special circumstances’ to be changed to ‘very special circumstances’ to match the NPPF.	Minor amendment made.
22	4.7.a	NE1	22 - Resident	Change final para to: ‘Development proposal(s) within a designated Local Green Space, as shown in Figure 7, will only be acceptable, in <u>very</u> special circumstances. <u>Very</u> special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the designated space by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The construction of new buildings on Local Green Spaces is inappropriate.	Minor amendment made.

				<p>Exceptions to this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and cemeteries, as long as it does not conflict with the purpose of designating the Local Green Space; or • The extension or alteration of a building, provided that it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building, or • The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces’. <p>NB based on South Gloucestershire’s NP and uses wording from the NPPF para 89 Green Belt as per NPPD para 78.</p>	
25	4.7.a	NE1	25 - NWLDC	<p>It is not clear how the identified spaces were chosen, and could therefore be subject to challenge. This would benefit from robust evidence to withstand such a challenge</p> <p>Points raised previously seem to have been addressed.</p>	Pleased that previous points have been addressed. We can confirm that their selection be supported by robust evidence.
6	4.7.a	NE1	6 - Resident	In each case ‘special circumstances’ should be changed to ‘very special circumstances’ to reflect the wording used in NPPR Para 76.	Minor amendment made.
6	4.7.a	NE1	6 - Resident	<p>The final paragraph should be amended by changing ‘special circumstances’ to ‘very special circumstances’.</p> <p>In addition Policy NE1 should reflect the guidance and wording within NPPF paragraphs 78, 88 & 89 as follows:</p> <p>Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the designated space by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly</p>	Minor amendment made.

				<p>outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>The construction of new buildings on Local Green Spaces is inappropriate.</p> <p>Exceptions to this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and cemeteries, as long as it does not conflict with the purpose of designating the Local Green Space; or • The extension or alteration of a building, provided that it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building, or • The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. 	
8	4.7.a	NE1	8 - Councillor	<p>Policy NE1 – Local Green Space – the way it is currently worded only applies where a development would result in ‘the loss of or have a significant adverse effect’ on the LGS and even then it could be mitigated by providing an alternative space. I am concerned that this leaves too large a potential for interpretation and argument about what is ‘a significant adverse effect’. For instance Oaklands Hotels could argue that some houses on the Bath Grounds might not have a significant adverse effect on the Bath Grounds as a whole and this would then come down to interpretation and judgement. The NPPF gives us the opportunity to provide much greater protection and the chance to provide similar protection to LGS as to the green belt. I have suggested some alternative wordings, the one I like best being taken from South</p>	Text has been revised to address these concerns.

				Gloucestershire's NP. This turns it round the other way and lists only the circumstances in which development would be allowed and rules out new buildings except in a few specified circumstances. The NPPF also says that development should only be permitted in 'very special circumstances' rather than just 'special circumstances' as our Policy currently states.	
9.	4.7.a	NE1	9 - WEPA	A completed Local Green Space assessment for the western fringe of Ashby, to the north of Willesley Lane.	The assessment has been reviewed and the area concerned does not meet the criteria for a LGS designation.
15	4.7.b	NE1	15 - CPRE	We support the designation of Local Green Spaces as part of this Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted
17	4.7.b	NE1	17 - Gladman	This policy does not accord with the Framework and the functions of Local Green Space designation. Local Green Spaces should only be designated where they meet the three tests of the Framework and as Paragraph 76 of the Framework states: <i>'Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.'</i> This policy would allow development of these defined Local Green Spaces where the plan area would gain equivalent benefit from replacement green space or gain significant social, economic or environmental benefits from an alternative facility. This does not accord with the policies of the Framework regarding development on LGS and Green Belt. Gladman submits that if it is considered acceptable to lose the LGS where equivalent green space is provided these designations would not meet the three tests for LGS designation. Gladman suggests an Open Spaces Policy may be more appropriate where development in such circumstances would be permitted.	The wording of this policy has been amended to address these concerns and other concerns raised by consultees.

25	4.7.b	NE2	25 - NWLDC	Reference to 50 dwellings reflects local plan policy IF3.	Noted
20	4.7	NE2	20 – National Forest Company	The NFC considers that section b) should make reference to the NFC's planting guidelines as set out in the Guide for Developers and Planners: http://www.nationalforest.org/woodlands/woodlandcreation/development/ And required by emerging policy EN3 of the NWL Local Plan. This policy expects between 20-30% of the development site to be woodland planting and landscaping. This provides open space which promotes activity and recreation across all age groups as aspired to by this policy. Reference to the Planting Guidelines could also be carried through to Policy NE2 or NE4 to refer to the need for new development to incorporate Green Infrastructure particularly National Forest planting. Such an amendment would make this policy more locally specific as suggested by the SEA.	Mention is made in Policy NE4 on enhancement of tree coverage will be encouraged. Reference to the National Forest Company's Planting Guidelines has been added to Policies NE2 and NE4, (now NE5).
25	4.7.b	NE3	25 - NWLDC	This policy would benefit from robust evidence, in particular of demand / need for allotments within the town, as well as an appropriate site size threshold that is demonstrably viable. Would this be in addition to the open space requirements included within the overall total?	A threshold of 50 dwellings is in the policy. Evidence has been submitted by the Allotments Association regarding demand for Allotments. Recommending '20 plots together of 100/200 m2 max'. More families are getting involved as many new houses have small gardens, so cannot grow their own veg.
3	4.7.b	NE2	3 - WEPA	There is a need to state the requirements for the future maintenance of the open spaces and recreation facilities. This also needs to be included in policy NE2.	This is a matter for individual planning permissions
15	4.7.c	NE3	15 - CPRE	See comments under 4.5 Transport above.	Noted
3	4.7.c	NE3	3 - WEPA	Need to add reference to Shell Brook and Willesley Lake.	Focus in text is on SSSI's, Special Areas of Conservation and Priority Habitats. It is acknowledged that there are many other non-designated areas of interest, but in

					the interest of brevity they do not need listing.
5	4.7.c	NE4	5 – Environment Agency	Policy NE4 is welcomed and in particular the reference to improving water quality in the River Mease.	Noted
20	4.7.d	Figure 9	20 – National Forest Company	Figure 9 shows areas of woodland around the plan area. This significantly underrepresents the amount of woodland within and around the Plan area, some of which can be seen on the underlying OS map. We would be able to provide some more accurate plans of woodland cover within the NP area if that would assist.	A map provided by the National Forest Company has been inserted to provide a more accurate plan of woodland cover in the Plan area.
25	4.7.d	NE5	25 - NWLDC	Second part of policy now reduced, but would still benefit from tightening. Still not clear how aboricultural value is measured and what makes it good.	Noted.
3	4.7.d	Fig 9	3 - WEPA	This plan of areas of woodland does NOT include the areas of woodland that have been planted since the establishment of the National Forest. Surely they should be shown.	A map has been provided by the National Forest Company which provides a better reflection of woodland coverage in the Plan area.
3	4.7.d	NE4	3 - WEPA	There should be a Community Action here with wording such as 'The Plan supports the introduction of Tree Preservation Orders to protect trees of good arborical, ecological or amenity value not covered by such orders, and the Town Council will work with LCC and NWLDC to achieve this.	This wording has been added to Policy NE4.
25	4.7.e	NE4	25 - NWLDC	Reference to River Mease presumably reflects advice from Habs Regs Assessment? Now says 'should' as per previous comments.	Noted
24	4.8	CF1	24 – Resident	Agree community facilities are so important to the town and the well being of the residents.	Noted
1	4.8.b	CF1	1 – Cliftonthorpe Residents	Community facilities – The Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre location and countryside leisure opportunities should be considered in conjunction	We understand that the Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre is one of the housing sites identified in the Money Hill area. It is

				with the forthcoming Masterplan.	sad that this will be lost, but the Masterplan will include areas for leisure.
10	4.8.b	CF1	10 – Residents	Community facilities – The Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre location and countryside leisure opportunities should be considered in conjunction with the forthcoming Masterplan.	We understand that the Ivanhoe Equestrian Centre is one of the housing sites identified in the Money Hill area. It is sad that this will be lost, but the Masterplan will include areas for leisure.
25	4.8.b	CF1	25 - NWLDC	Drafting would benefit from clarification, to set out criteria for 'loss' of community facilities, and a definition of what types of facilities fall within the ambit of the policy. Including list addresses previous concerns. Issue of marketing addressed. Where is 'the allotment site'?	Policy CF1 has been amended to give greater clarity. Ashby Allotments are at Willesley Gardens.
25	4.8.b	CF1	25 - NWLDC	Making this a community objective addresses previous concerns. However, this might work better as a component to DC1 (Community Infrastructure)	Noted. Reference to a community facility is part of section DC1.
24	4.8.c	CF1	24 – Resident	It's important we need to encourage the development of a quality community centre for the town.	Noted.
3	4.8.c	Community Objective CF1	3 - WEPA	I do not consider there needs to be a particular emphasis on 'the arts'.	Reference to 'the Arts' has been removed.
25	4.8.d	CF3	25 - NWLDC	Use of word 'resisted' is more appropriate for a neighbourhood plan. Should it be 'and' in respect of 'viability and community value'? How will enhancement of community value be measured – how significant does any enhancement have to be?	CF3 has been redrafted and is now CF2.

				Need to satisfy CIL requirements in terms of issue of enhancing viability.	
2	4.9.b	CF4	2 - Resident	<p>During the last 10 years or so, in several local council districts of Leicestershire, secondary schools have been completely replaced or considerably remodelled and enlarged e.g. Brockington College, Enderby (Blaby DC), Wigston Academy and Wigston College, Oadby Gartree High School (Oadby and Wigston BC), Castle Rock High School, Whitwick(NWLDC).</p> <p>Given the projected increase in demand over supply for education places in the Ashby area, there should be a commitment to working with LCC, developers and education sponsors to locate and provide a new or remodelled and enlarged secondary school to replace Ivanhoe College, either on its present site or at a new location.</p>	Noted not Neighbourhood Plan matter.
1	4.10		1 – Cliftonthorpe Residents	Developer contributions towards ‘green lung’ and open space networks should include Cliftonthorpe as part of the Masterplan.	Reference is already made under the list of infrastructure requirements to ‘Improvements to footpaths and cycleways, including linked footpaths, footways and cycleways and a ‘green lung’. As the only significant area of development of is at Money Hill then this will include the network of paths near Cliftonthorpe. The Master Plan also refers to ‘walking and cycling connectivity’ to the wider countryside.
10	4.10		10 – Residents	Developer contributions towards ‘green lung’ and open space networks should include Cliftonthorpe as part of the Masterplan.	See comment above.
13	4.10		13 – Civic Society	It should be made clearer that Developer Contributions must cover, not only the local developmental impact, but also cover the improving	Developer contributions can only be used to mitigate the impact of new development.

				of the existing over burdened roads and infrastructure impact on the whole town.	
23	4.10.b		23 - LCC	<p>a) It is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be <u>fully</u> funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (s106) developer contributions. 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 be sought to address existing problems.</p> <p>Where potential s106 measures would require future maintenance, which would be paid for from the County Council's funds, the measures would also need to be assessed against the County Council's other priorities and, as such, may not be maintained by the County Council or will require maintenance funding to be provided as a commuted sum.</p> <p>With regard to public transport, securing s106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services</p>	Noted.

				<p>being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.</p> <p>With regard to s106 contributions for waste management infrastructure proposed developments are considered on a case by case basis. When it is identified that a proposed development will have a detrimental affect on the local civic amenity infrastructure then appropriate projects to increase the capacity to off-set the impact have to be initiated. Contributions to fund these projects are requested in accordance with Leicestershire's Planning Obligations Policy and the Community Infrastructure Legislation Regulations.</p> <p>b) With regard to 20mph zones (Traffic Management measures) these would need to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • self-enforcing • supported by the police • funding (to implement and enforce the measures) must be available before the County Council could support the measures <p>c) With regard to Zebra crossings (Traffic Management measures) the type of pedestrian crossing should conform to Department for</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Transport (DfT) guidance and be able to demonstrate an actual need for the crossing.</p> <p>d) The 'Infrastructure Requirements' list contains a number of specific items. It should be noted that any measures that have an impact on the highway (e.g. crossings, footways/cycleways, parking, pedestrian and road safety improvements and any measures that amend traffic flow (such as one-way the long term maintenance of the proposed measures systems) would all be subject to further consideration, including conformity with guidance, benefits, impact on the highway, costs and funding and the long term maintenance of the proposed measures.</p>	
25	4.10.b	DC1	25 - NWLDC	<p>Policy now simplified but issue re viability not addressed.</p> <p>This would benefit from clarification of whether the requirements listed are in priority order</p>	The text has been amended to make it clear that the list is not in priority order. In the introduction reference to being subject to 'CIL tests' is included to cover viability issues.
8	4.10.b		8 - Councillor	I don't think that the order of priorities in section 4.10.b reflects most people's wishes. The traffic management measures have been tacked onto the end whereas they need to be much higher up the list.	The list is not in priority order.
1	General		1 – Cliftonthorpe Residents	Can you indicate how the Cliftonthorpe area has been, and can be, represented in drafting the NP	At this stage the plan has been drafted and is amended in response to consultation. So there is no longer an opportunity to be involved in the actual drafting. However responses submitted to the consultation can influence changes

					made to the current draft.
11	General		11 – The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority has previously made comments on the draft NDP in November 2015 and June 2016. According to the Coal Authority Development High Risk Area Plans, there are recorded risks from past coal mining activity in the form of 6 mine entries, recorded shallow coal workings, unrecorded probably shallow coal workings, thick coal outcrops, past surface mining and 2 reported surface hazards. This mining legacy is generally concentrated in the north east and south west ends of the NDP area.	Noted
12	General		12 – Resident	The issue of parking is a theme running through the NP. It may be worth considering schemes to reduce car-dependency, such as Park & Ride scheme, with the aim of tackling the limited parking in the centre of the town whilst simultaneously easing congestion; indeed page 30 of the NP highlights concern for the 'over burdened transport network' and 'unsustainable levels of commuting by car'	Not practical for NP to address this.
12	General		12 – Resident	Omission: renewable energy There is a requirement to include renewable energy policy priorities, aspect which was identified by the housing focus group. New property developments might be required to arrange site layout to avoid over-shadowing so that solar photovoltaic panels might be installed.	Policy S4: Design (11) includes expectations around renewable energy and sustainable design and construction techniques.
12	General		12 – Resident	Omission: Energy-efficient building The current NP draft lacks specific guidance on energy-efficient building, an aspect which was covered by the housing focus group.	See above.
12	General		12 – Resident	Omission: Electric vehicle infrastructure needs The current NP draft lacks any guidance on electric vehicle infrastructure needs, such as the provision of charging points in new developments.	Policy S4 on design now makes reference to electrical charging points.

13	General		13 – Civic Society	Both the SEA & HRA are accounted for in the NP as stated at the top of page 8, so not commented on individually. How/ who did account for them?	The recommendations from the SEA and HRA have been incorporated in to the Examination Neighbourhood Plan. Following consultation on the documents as part of the Reg 14 consultation.
13	General		13 – Civic Society	The NP was created by a set of sub committees, but the NP overview scrutiny sub committee (my words) appears not to have me to discuss the latest draft. Can't this be rectified.	Meeting being set up to discuss results of consultation.
14	General		14 – Town Traders	Informing TC of the formation of a new Town Traders Committee. With the proposal for SHOPDLZ. An online platform to communicate local needs, wants and aspirations of Ashby's community, endorses local businesses, supports local initiatives and actively promotes, funds and implements positive changes in real time.	Noted
15	General		15 - CPRE	We welcome the major achievement that is the Ashby de la Zouch NP 2011-31 Draft. It provides a comprehensive vision of the future of Ashby that has engaged local people and has sought to integrate their concerns and priorities within the constraints of national and local planning and other policies. We welcome the vision of a vibrant market town which values its countryside setting and rural environment.	Noted
16	General		16 – Highways England	In its response to the draft Pre-submission NP, Highways England noted an increase in the level of development growth being proposed from 1,376 dwellings in the draft NP to 2,050 dwellings in the draft Pre-Submission consultation document. It is noted that the level of housing growth being proposed in the current consultation document remains at 2050 dwellings.	Noted
17	General		17 -	Gladman has previously raised concerns with	Noted. Individual concerns responded to.

			Gladman	several of the policies within the plan during previous pre-submission consultations of the ADLZNP and submits that many of these concerns remain outstanding. these will be detailed below.	
17	General		17 - Gladman	Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic conditions (a), (d) and (e). The plan supports less growth than set out in the Development Plan and undermines the strategic aims of this plan. In doing this it is also considered not to conform with the strategic policies of the Development Plan and will not sufficiently contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.	Noted. Housing target agreed with the LPA
20	General		20 – National Forest Company	The National Forest Company (NFC) is particularly grateful that the majority of the comments we have raised previously (below) have been adopted into this version of the Plan and welcomes the extensive references and support for the National Forest through the document.	Noted
21	General		21 - LLAF	The draft plan is a well produced document which we applaud but we do feel there are points not covered or given sufficient emphasis and there is an elephant in the room.	Noted
23	General		23 - LCC	a) The County Council is pleased to note stronger consistency between the draft Ashby Neighbourhood Plan and the North West Leicestershire Local Plan.	Noted
23	General		23 - LCC	b) The Council is also pleased to note greater precision in draft policies, such as: <i>POLICY S6: AREAS OF LOCAL SEPARATION - To retain the physical and visual separation between Ashby de la Zouch and nearby villages,</i>	Noted

				<p><i>the open land between the built-up areas of Ashby de la Zouch and the villages of Shellbrook, Smisby, Blackfordby, Norris Hill, Boundary and Packington will be designated as Areas of Local Separation, Figure 5.</i></p> <p><i>Development will not be permitted which, either individually or cumulatively, would demonstrably adversely affect or diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area.</i></p> <p><i>Where development in these locations is considered to be otherwise appropriate, development proposals should be located and designed to preserve the physical and functional separation of the villages from the built-up part of Ashby de la Zouch.</i></p>	
23	General		23 - LCC	<p>c) 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) generally prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. The current</p>	Noted

				<p>financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.</p>	
23	General		23 - LCC	<p>d) Flood Risk Management: The County Council is aware of flooding that 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</p>	Noted

			<p>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 	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>of the site as well as manage surface water runoff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk. <p>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 developments, including benefits to surrounding areas.</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.</p> <p>LCC in our role as LLFA will object to anything contrary to LCC policies.</p> <p>For further information it is suggested reference is made to the <u>National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)</u>, <u>Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014)</u> and the <u>Planning Practice Guidance webpage</u>.</p>	
23	General		23 - LCC	<p><u>Education</u></p> <p>We would not normally expect the Town Council to make observations regarding the condition and suitability of local schools, given they will not have detailed information in this respect.</p> <p>Nevertheless the comments appear to be well meaning and intended to bring in further capital investment to schools in the locality. In this respect, recognising the fact the Local Authority has responsibility for the planning of school places, the comments are worthy of support.</p>	Noted.
23	General		23 - LCC	<p><u>Strategic Property Services</u></p> <p>With the exception of the former school field at Prior Park road, which we will be transferring to the Parish Council, we have no further property or land interest to comment on.</p> <p><u>Adult Social Care</u></p> <p>It is suggested that reference is made to</p>	Noted.

				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.	
23	General		23 - LCC	<u>Environment</u> No comment at this time.	Noted
23	General		23 - LCC	<u>Communities</u> Comprehensive policies included the Plan, we therefore have no further comments to make.	Noted
23	General		23 - LCC	<u>Economic Development</u> The Employment and Economic Growth section of the plan is very inclusive. It is good to see the policies are thinking about expansion, attracting in new employment opportunities. It is supporting growth of existing businesses in the town. It is good to see it is also thinking about the workforce, opening up opportunities for education and training initiatives to ensure there is a skilled workforce. The policies also consider travel to work too, which can be a barrier to people access to work.	Noted.
25	General		25 - NWLDC	We have three fundamental concerns with the Neighbourhood Plan, as published. We discussed these in some depth with representatives of the Town Council, and understand that, while	Noted. Individual issues responded to where raised.

				agreement was reached with those representatives, the Town Council will still need to formally consider its position with respect to these issues. It is for that reason that we reproduce those issues and their implications now, to inform that formal consideration.	
25	General		25 - NWLDC	Lack of policy on Listed Buildings takes on board previous advice.	Noted.
25	General		25 - NWLDC	Other changes requested to supporting text have generally been made, with exception of page 77, where a reference to CIL has been included (penultimate paragraph), but not in terms of needing to ensure that have to meet CIL tests.	Added 'subject to CIL tests' for clarity.
26	General		26 - Resident	I support the many changes made to the policies and supporting justification, partly in acknowledgment of the SEA and the Publication version of the Local Plan, that provide a coherence to the overall NP document and a strength and clarity to its policies.	Noted
26	General		26 - Resident	The decision to present separate sections (4.6 - 4.9) on the Historic and Natural Environments, Education and Community Facilities has provided a better balance and perspective to these important subjects. It has provided a clearer account of their significance to the Plan area and given a stronger, evidencebased foundation for the related policies.	Noted.
3	General		3 - WEPA	A range of typographical and drafting points are made. These have been summarised separately on a copy of the NP.	Noted.
4	General		4 - Resident	NWLDC has altered the Local Plan regarding the R. Mease. Words are added 'or there is no capacity within the DCS in operation at the time an	Noted.

				application is determined'. The Ashby policy needs amending to reflect the change in paragraph 4.3 of the NWLDC paper, but the amendment does nothing to address the current apparent failure of the existing measures. I support the statement by the Civic Society with regards to Policy CS33: knowledge of the effectiveness of measures will increase over time and we should be prepared in our Policy for dealing with failure of the scheme longer term.	
5	General		5 – Environment Agency	Fully support the decision to divide the section on 'Education, Leisure and Well being' in to four sections – Historic Environment, Natural Environment, Community Facilities and Education and Provision. The section on Developer Contributions is now much clearer and in particular we are pleased to see the inclusion within the prioritised infrastructure requirements 'water quality improvements to avoid adverse impact on the River Mease SAC.'	Noted.
7	General		7 – Natural England	Natural England has already commented on previous draft of the Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan. We have nothing to add to the comments provided in our letter of 4 December 2015.	Noted.
8	General		8 - Councillor	A range of typographical and drafting points are made. These have been summarised separately on a copy of the NP.	Noted.
23	Planning		23 - LCC	Developer Contributions The latest version of the Plan has comprehensive paragraphs and a policy on planning obligations. The Ashby PC committee report of middle 2016 on the consultation results, makes reference to the developer contributions policy and that text should be improved. This latest draft Plan has undertaken	Noted.

			<p>the improvement and we therefore have no further comments to make in this regard.</p> <p>Mineral & 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.</p> <p>Although neighbourhood plans cannot include policies that cover minerals and waste development, it may be the case that your neighbourhood contains an existing or planned minerals or waste site. The County Council can provide information on these operations or any future development planned for your neighbourhood.</p> <p>You should also be aware of Mineral Consultation Areas, contained within the adopted Minerals Local Plan and Mineral and Waste Safeguarding proposed in the new Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Plan. These proposed safeguarding areas and existing Mineral Consultation Areas are there to ensure that non-waste and non-minerals development takes place in a way that does not negatively affect mineral resources or waste operations. The County Council can provide guidance on this if your neighbourhood plan is allocating development in these areas or if any proposed neighbourhood plan policies may impact on minerals and waste provision.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Comments on SEA

	Chapter/ Section	Respondent	Comment	Response
5	Page 8 – Support the resilience of the ADLZNP rea to the potential effects of climate change	5 – Environment Agency	Some types of development have to be within Flood Zone 3 – e.g. water compatible. I suggest that the first bullet point is re-written: 'Ensure that no inappropriate development takes place in areas etc	Agreed
7	General	7 – Natural England	Natural England welcomes the ADLZNP SEA and considers that the methodology and baseline information used appears to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive and associated guidance. Since the NP area lies within the catchment of the River Mease SAC and likely significant effects cannot be ruled out, we are pleased to note that this has been taken into account, as have the potential impacts on Lount Meadows SSSI.	Noted
12	SEA 2.2.3 – Climate Change	12 - Resident	The NP overlooks the potential impact of climate change, a point which needs to be addressed. There are significant areas ear-marked for development currently used for agriculture; this will lead to increased surface water run-off when built upon, unless steps are taken to mitigate against the flood risk potential to existing houses. The NP includes an additional 2,050 households in Ashby, based on extant planning permissions. Each new dwelling will lead to an increase in carbon dioxide emissions, both during the build process	Reference to SUDs deals with this in Policy S4: Design. As previously highlighted Policy S4: Design has a section on sustainable design and construction techniques and low carbon energy technology.

			and, more significantly, when occupied. The majority of these emissions will be attributable to energy used in heating. Hence, it is important to include specific measures to achieve more energy efficient building.	
15	SEA	15 - CPRE	CPRE applauds the serious and substantive work that has been carried out to produce this document. While unable to comment on the detailed findings it is clear that such a document provides an important basis for defending specific policies and for monitoring changes over time.	Noted