

From	Date	Comments	Action	Status	NPAC Proposed Response	Action
Jonathan Bateman (District Councillor)	25/02/2017	Having read your recently issued draft plan for the village of Swinford, I have only positive feedback to give you. I found the plan informative and instructive, well written, and constructed in such a manner that you clearly indicate support for development, in line with the emerging HDC local plan, whilst ensuring that appropriate development takes place where you and your parishioners want it to go. From experience with the Broughton Astley plan, just be ready to receive a swathe of developer interest where they try to get in before the plan takes effect. I wish you all the best with the Plan, I give it my full support.	Note	Closed	N/A	No action.
Shawell Parish Meeting	01/03/2017	Helen, Could you please send me a hard copy of your draft Swinford Parish Plan. Regards Frank Fisher Shawell Parish Meeting, Holdfast House Main Street, Shawell, Lutterworth, Leics LE176AG.	Post	Closed	Hard Copy provided.	No action.
Parishioner	06/03/2017	Dear Helen Further to our telephone conversation today I am writing to request a copy of the Swinford Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I would be most grateful if I could pick it up tomorrow at the Swinford Parish Meeting.	Print	Closed	Hard Copy provided.	No action.
Parishioner	07/03/2017	Hi Tina, I have some questions regarding the neighbourhood plan. How were the consultants' reports funded?	N/A	Closed	Subsequent email supersedes this.	No action.
Parishioner	07/03/2017	The recent SPC Newsletter states that the pre-submission draft is available on the PC website, "with all of the documents and evidence that have supported the development of the plan". I cannot find the consultants' reports here.	N/A	Closed	Subsequent email supersedes this.	No action.
Parishioner	07/03/2017	Is the NPAC still keeping the consultants' reports confidential?	N/A	Closed	On website	No action.
Parishioner	07/03/2017	If the reports were publicly funded, why are they being kept confidential? I look forward to an early reply as I wish to email Helen by the PC deadline.	N/A	Closed	Not confidential, on website.	No action.
Parishioner	07/03/2017	I have just looked at the PC website and it appears the consultants' reports are present. They weren't when I looked on receipt of the Feb newsletter, hence my queries. My questions are thus answered. I asked about funding, as I was concerned that reports paid for by parishioners were being kept confidential.	N/A	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	01/03/2017	Dear Parish Clerk Following receipt of the latest February Newsletter, I should be obliged if you could provide me with a hard copy of all the "pre submission draft" documents as I wasn't able to attend the recent consultation event, but nevertheless would welcome the opportunity to read through same Thanks in anticipation	Post	Closed	Hard Copy provided.	No action.
Misterton with Walcote Parish Council	10/03/2017	Dear Tina, The Parish Council would like to thank you for the opportunity to look at Swinford's draft Neighbourhood Plan. They do however, have no comments to make on the plan. Kind regards, Cathy Clerk to Misterton with Walcote Parish Council	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Page 9 - Local Planning Policy Context: Adoption is now timetabled for October 2018 (see Local Development Scheme)	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Page 14 Profile - should one of the 2011 say 2001?	Review	Open	Agreed.	Update plan accordingly.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy S2 - Limits to development will need another better map.	Review	Open	Noted.	Update plan accordingly
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy S2 - Map of conservation area needed	Review	Open	Agreed.	Insert map of the conservation area

Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy H1 - bullet point 1 should not be a bullet point. Development should be enhanced by biodiversity is a little unclear. – perhaps something that says planting should be of native species and have consideration for supporting increased biodiversity, through the use of planting, creation of habitats and incorporation of water features. Does it mean development proposals should seek to protect and, where possible, enhance the biodiversity value of a site and provide mitigation measures where necessary? It could be phrased more helpfully.	Review	Open	Bullet agreed. To change biodiversity comment as proposed.	Update plan accordingly
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy H1 - Is it worth encouraging new development to achieve the home quality mark or the Building for life accreditation.	Review	Open	Noted.	Update plan accordingly.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy H1 - Similarly density, - is it worth considering similar or higher density, as many homes have large garden plots, which for smaller housing may not be appropriate, especially if older person housing is considered.	Review	Open	Density is a sensitive point for the community. To discuss.	To discuss.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Page 29 second paragraph/second sentence. Now that the HEDNA is published this can say: 'Based on the recently published Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2017) the full objectively assess housing need for Harborough to 2031 is 532 dwellings per annum, giving a total of 10,640 dwellings across the 20 year period 2011 -2031'.	Review	Open	Noted.	Update plan accordingly.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Page 29 and ENV1 - instead of Draft Local Plan say 'emerging Local Plan'. We do not yet have a Draft Local Plan.	Review	Open	Agreed.	Revise wording as proposed.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Map 1 - Map1 sites suggested by HDC – for clarification these sites are not suggested by HDC, but have been put forward as part of the SHLAA, no assessment of their suitability against HDC policy has taken place.	Review	Open	Noted.	Update plan accordingly.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Map 1 - A better quality map of sites will be needed – as it is not possible to see labels and labels are not referred to consistently. Map 1: Needs to be copyright included.	Review	Open	Noted.	Update plan accordingly.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy H3 - H 3 could be strengthened by including matters such as green space, identifying any features on the site, dealing with run-off towards the river, footpaths into the village.	Review	Closed	Footpaths mentioned, no green space close by.	No action.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy H3 - Off street parking criteria should reflect (or refer to those) those set out in parking standards set out in Policy H1 or refer to Policy H1. They say slightly different things at the moment.	Review	Open	Noted.	Update plan accordingly.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy H3 - Do the village want to consider older person housing?	Review	Closed	This is addressed in H5.	No action.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy H4: - 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet – insert 'minimum' before housing requirement for Swinford.	Review	Open	In light of windfall not being assessed as part of target (per HDC - to check) bullet 2 should probably be removed.	Update plan accordingly.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy H6 - refers 'allocation' of 'open market housing' to eligible households with a connection to Swinford parish in the first instance. How is this going to take place – allocation is not the correct word in the case of 'open market housing' – should it be 'made available' instead. How is this going to operate in practice? There is no mention of it in the accompanying text. I think it needs more explanation and thinking through.	Review	Open	Accept change to wording re made available, but the rest of the text is consistent with other plans.	Update plan accordingly
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Map 5 in ENV5 - Note one of the ridge and furrow fields Map 5 in ENV5 is actually the designated site for allocation – this should be clarified.	Review	Open	Agreed.	Remove 152 from ridge/furrow map.

Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Map 5 in ENV5 - Policy ENV5: refers to 'mapped below'. There are 2 maps below – which does the policy relate to? All or best examples?	Review	Open	Agreed.	Revise to 'mapped below in map 5'.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Map 5 in ENV5 - Map 5: Allocated site for housing is shown as Ridge and Furrow Field. I presume its loss has been assessed as not significant. This needs to be specified in text accompanying the allocation.	Review	Open	Agreed.	152 to be removed from map (Clare to revise).
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	ENV6 - are there any locally designated assets? Community action refers to a list of non-designated assets, but there is no list.	Review	Open	Yes list being compiled.	Complete section on non-des assets and include (NV Group).
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy ENV7 - Phrase 'in any way' would appear very/overly restrictive. The impacts may be acceptable/not harmful and the policy should be written in such a way as to reflect this.	Review	Open	Agreed.	Remove 'in any way' pg54 line 2.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	ENV8 - ENV8 is discussed as being a community action, but appears to be a policy	Review	Open	Agreed.	Combine policy with community action to become single policy statement.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	ENV9 - appears to be a repeat of previous policies – this should be clarified	Review	Closed	Don't agree.	No action.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy ENV10 is really covered by national policy, is it sufficiently local	Review	Closed	Agree it reiterates national policy.	No action.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	E1 - are there any sites to safeguard? If so where?	Review	Open	Not that we can see.	Check I haven't missed anything.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	E2 - really relates to the village, it does not quite work with E3 farm diversification, as that can't be within the village boundary. Policy E2 might need to be re-titled as support for new employment opportunities within the village of Swinford.	Review	Open	Happy with this suggestion.	Update plan accordingly.
Matthew Bills (HDC)	28/03/2017	Policy T1 - Typo Kilworth	Review	Open	Agreed	Update plan accordingly.
Parishioner	30/03/2017	I refer to a hand delivered letter from yourself dated 8 March 2017 regarding the development of the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan, in particular the issue of non-designated heritage assets. In the third paragraph of your letter you refer to a draft set of criteria being available on the PC website to assist with decision making on this matter. However having tried unsuccessfully to find this data, could you assist by sending me the online link so that we may make a meaningful decision	Uploaded	Closed	Error acknowledged, document uploaded to website 30/03/17.	No action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	1. I am concerned that the current consultation does not comply with the requirements of Reg. 14 of the NP(General)Regs 2012. The Regs clearly state that the Pre-Submission consultation should include, amongst other things details of the proposals for a N.P. The Article in the PC News letter does not include this, does not state that the consultation is a statutory requirement, or specify the start date of the 6 week consultation period. The reference to the consultation event is irrelevant as at that stage there was not a draft Plan to examine.	Review	Open	The NP itself contains the details of the proposals. The website contains the words regulation 14 - regulations are statutory.	Regulation 14 Consultation completed in line with requirements. Due to significant changes to the housing policy a second round of Regulation 14 Consultation will be run in Summer 2017.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	2. My recollection is that the Steering Group (when did it change it's designation to a Committee, which as far as I know has never been approved by the PC) can only make recommendations to the PC. I can find no Resolution in the PC Minutes stating that it has considered or approved the Draft Plan for formal consultation. In my view the current consultation could be challenged as invalid as the Draft Plan has not been considered or approved by the PC.	Review	Closed	First draft was approved and minuted 13.12.16.	No action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	3. The Draft Plan does not include any explanation as to how it complies with HDC planning policies. It does not refer to saved policies in the Core Strategy, or emerging policies in the Local Plan.	Review	Open	Page 4 explains that a suitably qualified person with check NP to ensure these conditions are met before referendum. Details included within the plan are not necessary.	Consider adding comments from the review.

Parishioner	29/03/2017	<p>4. The NP is supposed to reflect village opinion and views. The two surveys of residents undertaken showed a clear preference for no new development (30%) or minimal development (30%). So why is the NP proposing 48 dwellings? Additionally the majority of the village preferred a number of small developments, acknowledged at pp 31 of the draft NP. Policy H3 allocates one large site on Lutterworth Rd., contrary to the expressed views of the village. There is no reference to density (the site is double that necessary using HDC's criterion of 30 dph, no S.106 Agreement for off site contributions to infrastructure and no assessment of the impact on local services or the school.</p>	Review	Open	<p>HDC will reject the Plan if it is not in line with their (soon to be published) Local Plan. We have been advised (and have a copy of the numbers allocated in their latest draft options paper to back this up) that the target will be 48, although this may yet be amended. We will know more on 10 June 2017. The preferences of the community in this regard are noted but a rejected Plan will not protect the village at all. Re small developments we can only work with the site options available at the time - more have now come forward so this will be reviewed. There are in fact two allocated sites in the Plan - Policy H3 does not refer to The Berries because it has already received planning consent and is taken off the overall target - something made clear in the preceding text. The density is being addressed following the error on the size of the Lutterworth Rd site. The impact on local services and the school was addressed - the school declined to comment formally. It is not within the power of the Plan to determine whether a bus service is required - this will depend on the type of houses built, the new residents, and the commercial assessment of bus companies. A s106 policy will now be included</p>	Update plan accordingly
Parishioner	29/03/2017	<p>5. The responses also stated that the village was unsuitable for development because it does not have a shop or bus service and that the provision of these facilities were essential if the village had any more development. At pp10 of the draft NP it states that one of the sustainable tests is "access to local services". At pp14 it states that "public transport is infrequent". It is actually non-existent. The issue of a shop and bus service have not been considered or addressed.</p>	Review	Closed	<p>School buses that transport children to and from school fall under specialist services within public transport. A school bus service regularly operates along a route calling at agreed bus stops in Swinford, therefore it is considered that public transport is infrequent. Swinford is designated a SRV (Selected Rural Village) by HDC on the basis of the presence of at least 2 to 6 key services of which Swinford has two (School/Pub) It is not the remit of a NPAC to provide for bus services or village shops. If these services are to exist then there has to be a commercial, business case for them. If the village had a bus service and a shop then its target housing numbers would be much higher (as in the case of North Kilworth which has these services and where over 100 houses are currently planned). No further action required.</p>	No Action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	<p>6. The NP states that there should be a minimum of 48 house which implies a possibility of more. This totally in conflict with the wishes of the village..</p>	Review	Closed	<p>As confirmed by HDC the text has to say approximately - if it says a specific number or 'a maximum of', when/if the planning application is made the developer may put forward a lower number than indicated which in turn would mean that the target would not be met. This is unacceptable to HDC.</p>	No action.

Parishioner	29/03/2017	7. Pp 29 of the draft NP is totally inaccurate. The original "Berries" SHLAA was a small site encompassing the farmyard and small paddock. The planning approval relates to a much larger site that is south of, and excludes most of the SHLAA site which is now a prospective infill site for 4-5 dwellings. I cannot understand why the NPSG did not even consider, let alone comment on the adverse implications of this proposal on the proper consideration of potential housing sites in the NP.	Review	Closed	We disagree. Firstly, The Berries is one of the allocated sites in the Plan, and a sustainability assessment was carried out which is published on the website. Therefore it is incorrect to say it was ignored. In terms of the differences between the SHLAA site and the one that has received planning consent, we have been advised that there is nothing we can do to alter or change that consent - therefore we have accepted it as a site that contributes to our target. Secondly, Policy H4 is very clear on windfall sites and does not allow more than 3 dwellings on one site, so a prospective infill site of 4-5 dwellings would fall foul of the Plan. The limits to development boundary has also been redrawn around the approved site.	No action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	8. Policy H3 then goes on to require 40% of the housing to be affordable despite this not being backed up by the Affordable Housing Survey.	Review	Closed	40% affordable housing is national policy. We have sought clarity on whether the survey referred to would provide evidence to reduce this in the Plan, and we were advised not. A developer will clearly assess whether there would be demand for this type of housing, taking into account local services, and if they wanted to build less they would have to deal with the planning authority on this matter (possible leading to a S106 contribution for use by the village).	No action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	9. It seems to be illogical to exclude the Mourant paddock on Stanford Rd from Policy ENV 1 when it is one of the important open spaces identified as being important to the character of the Conservation Area in the original CA assessment report. Unfortunately, as a result of the inaction of the NPSG pp has now been granted for the development of this paddock creating a precedent for the development of the other important open spaces on Stanford Rd.	Review	Closed	NPAC had no powers to prevent planning permission on Mourant paddock.	Owners do not give consent to its inclusion as planning permission has been granted.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	10. I am not sure why pages 48-50 and Policy 5 are devoted to ridge and furrow fields. They are not Scheduled Ancient Monuments and are highly unlikely to be the subject of development pressures. A farmer is, as far as I know, entitled to plough them up if he wishes as they have no Statutory protection.	Review	Open	Agreed.	Proposed policy is that the community should value as an asset.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	11. ENV 6 refers to the safeguarding of the setting of Listed Buildings but there are no Policies to protect their fabric or to ensure any alterations or new buildings in the Conservation Area are in keeping or retain or incorporate traditional features.( there are numerous plastic windows that are totally out of character)	Review	Closed	Fabric of listed building protect already. Not within remit of NP.	No action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	12. Policy ENV 9 at pp56 seems irrelevant as the NP only allocates one site of over 5 houses and other policies relate to infill's of 3 or less (which have not been taken into account in the Housing Allocation)	Review	Open	Agreed but there will be two sites and maybe more in future?	Retained as additional safeguard.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	13. As the flood plain is well outside the identified village development site and the new village limit why is there a need for policy ENV 10.	Review	Open	Recognised but supports national policy.	Retained as additional safeguard.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	14. The comments about facilities on pages 62-64 are purely subjective and bearing in mind recent conflicts between village groups are misleading.	N/A	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	15. Bearing in mind the inability of the PC to designate the Rowland's Cricket Club field as an Asset of Community Value in 2016 this policy is pointless.	N/A	Closed	Noted.	No action.

Parishioner	29/03/2017	16. There in no date or other reference to the status or publication time of the draft NP.	N/A	Closed	Published	No action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	17. The Environmental Inventory is inaccurate. Entry 242 – the Mud Wall in only about 40 yrs. s. Old. Entry 244 – the Cemetery extension was purchased in 2009. or thereabouts	Review	Open	Agreed.	NV team to amend inventory.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	18. The Sustainable Housing Site Assessment is crude in it's scoring and does not give adequate weight to environmental and visual impacts.	Review	Closed	We are advised that it represents best practice and we have no comments from HDC or elsewhere that suggests otherwise.	No action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	19. The Lutterworth Road site is wrongly described as a redundant site. It is a paddock in open countryside, scores badly on environmental criterion, but the Assessment makes it clear that this is irrelevant as the site has already been included for development inside the revised village limits.	Review	Open	The assessment is being revised.	Waiting for revised assessment.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	One can have little faith in a Housing Site Assessment that admits that the Lutterworth Rd site has already been included in the village limits for development, dismisses the original "Berries" site, does not even consider the "Berries" site that has obtained Planning Permission and the NPSG did not consider other possible sites or even bother to comment on the "Berries" or Mourant Planning Applications that both compromised the consideration of sites in the NP. The whole site assessment exercise lacks objective credibility.	Review	Closed	We disagree. The site assessment for Lutterworth Road makes it clear that it is inside the proposed limit to development boundary. The Berries site has been assessed, and having been approved it supersedes the original SHLAA site. The 'Stanford Road Westside Paddock site that we believe is being referred to is an infill site, which we are advised does not contribute to the HDC target. Consideration of it in the context of the Plan is therefore irrelevant. No further action.	No action.
Emma Stewart (Highways England)	30/03/2017	Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft for the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period 2017-2031. It is noted that the document provides a vision for the future of the Parish of Swinford and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Emma Stewart (Highways England)	30/03/2017	Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is the role of Highways England to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Emma Stewart (Highways England)	30/03/2017	In relation to the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan, Highways England's principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the M1, M6 and A14 Junction I the adjacent area.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Emma Stewart (Highways England)	30/03/2017	Highways England notes that there is no direct access from Swinford to the SRN and that the nearest access points to the SRN are M1 J20, M6 J1 and the A14 J1, all of which are at least three miles from Swinford.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Emma Stewart (Highways England)	30/03/2017	Highways England understands that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for Swinford is required to be in conformity with the Harborough Local Plan and this is acknowledged as a requirement within the document.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Emma Stewart (Highways England)	30/03/2017	Highways England notes that an indicative housing target of 48 dwellings has been set for Swinford to be developed across the plan period. Given the distance of the nearest SRN connections from the plan area and the small scale of growth being planned, Highways England considers that the Plan will have no impacts on the operation of the SRN.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Emma Stewart (Highways England)	30/03/2017	Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.

Emma Stewart (Highways England)	30/03/2017	Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Emma Stewart (Highways England)	30/03/2017	Highways England has no further comments to provide, and trusts the above is useful in the progression of the Swinford Neighbourhood Plan.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	29/03/2017	Hi A query with regards to the Neighbourhood Plan, specifically the number of new houses proposed in it. Can you please explain how the number of new houses proposed (48) was decided upon, when data from the questionnaire (as published on the Parish Council website) states that a total of 61 responses suggest 0-30 new houses, and just 17 suggest 30-51+? I am currently very confused as to how the plan, in this case, succeeds in representing the opinions of the village. 48 additional houses is very close to the maximum put forward, whereas the vast majority of residents clearly stated otherwise. These are worrying times for villagers, and I feel further explanation, as well as absolute transparency, is required in this instance.	Responded	Closed	Responded via email 30/03/17.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 3 (Foreword) - Does Harborough District Council (HDC) receive a copy of any stakeholder comments relating to this 'Pre-submission' version of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP)? And do we receive a copy of the revised Plan prior to its forwarding to HDC?	Review	Closed	Yes and yes.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 4 (Background and Context-Neighbourhood Plans) - 1st para- Can the phrase 'carry full legal weight' please be explained fully.	Review	Closed	A neighbourhood plan attains the same legal status as part the Local Plan once it has been agreed at a referendum and is made (brought into legal force) by the local planning authority. At this point it becomes part of the statutory development plan. Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise (see section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 13 (Swinford Village-Profile) - 4th para- typo re second date quoted-it is given as same as 1st one? 7th para- typo- 'A high' should read 'A higher'.	Review	Open	Change 2011 to 2001. Agreed re higher.	Update plan accordingly
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 18 (Vision-Vision Statement) - 3rd para-'We plan to maintain its uniqueness' means what exactly? Please clarify. Every village, town city, etc is unique, as is every human being. Therefore specifically what is it about Swinford's uniqueness that the NP is aiming to maintain?	Review	Closed	Swinford is unlike any other village and planning around the types of development in regards to how the village looks and feels is paramount to retaining this.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 21 (Limits to Development) - Last para- The newly proposed limits to development boundary will impinge into the local countryside therefore this is an inaccurate statement-why put in?	Review	Open	Accept this is not clear.	Update plan accordingly.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 22 - The first two paras are very repetitive of what has been said already.	Review	Open	Take out the paragraphs 'The purpose of.....from inappropriate development' on pages 21-22.	Update plan accordingly.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page24 (Housing Policy-The Built Environment) - 1st para-typo in last sentence-it should say 'setting of the more densely developed village core to the north'. 4th para-it could be added here that on the positive side the extra housing may increase the likelihood that a shop would be sustainable, arguably there may be less school traffic on a very congested part of the village centre as logically the school would be used by more village children rather than those travelling in from surrounding villages. The Church and pub would hopefully get used more and maybe we might even get a bus service back?! New houses bring opportunities as well as challenges.	Review	Open	Add the word 'of'. Other points noted, but this section is more around design principals than local services.	Update plan accordingly.

Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 25 - 1st para-Will not new development proposals be designed to sit ALONGSIDE not WITHIN the existing settlement patterns of the village. This more accurately reflects the extremely limited opportunities for much new development within the existing settlement pattern. The allocated Lutterworth Road site is NOT within the existing settlement boundary.	Review	Open	Agreed.	Update plan accordingly.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 26 - Last point under Policy H1: states 'development should be of a similar density to properties in the immediate vicinity'- not sure that the proposed new main site to take the quota from HDC will allow this-will it not be significantly denser and therefore is splitting over two largish sites not more sensible. Will the density required allow the developer to provide a 'richness and variety of styles and materials'? Please comment.	Review	Open	Site allocation being revised and density issue will be reviewed.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 27 (Village Profile-Housing) - Point 5-Possibly the reason re vehicles per household is a reflection of the type of houses in the village rather than lack of bus service-who is to say?? Last point-stats and percentage comparisons are quoted elsewhere in comparison to national and local numbers-why not here?	Review	Closed	Accept that this could be interpreted differently. The statistics are available in the reports posted on the website - we have referred to the ones that we are the most relevant. No further action.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 28 (Implications of Housing Needs Reports) - I'm not clear what this paragraph is driving at? I'm not sure for example that an aging population would generally stay in Swinford if it continues to lack services like bus service, shop, Doctors surgery and dentist. Often people move to towns or villages where these facilities are easily accessible. It will surely be a gamble when building houses as to what mix will appeal with the existing facilities. The implications are not clearly expressed.	Review	Closed	The paragraph pulls together the salient points from the housing needs report which may have an impact on the housing provision paragraphs that follow. No further action.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	(Housing Provision) - Point 4-this point regarding housing provision seems confusing in relation to the comment: 'there is and identified need for 4 open market homes and 3 affordable homes for rent' (earlier on this same page). Does the way this has been stated mean there has been identified a need for a total of 7 houses 3 of which would be affordable? Firstly I understand more houses than that are required and secondly if that is the correct way to interpret it would it not drastically alter the current housing mix. Please could you clarify the conflict here?	Review	Closed	We do not think there is a conflict here. There is a relatively low number of affordable housing currently, and the consultation process concluded that housing mix is about right. The MRH report nonetheless identified a specific need for homes for local people and affordable homes. No further action.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 29 - 2nd para-'half 6,000 of the 11,000' in the sentence does not seem to make sense?	Review	Open	This will change as noted in line 19 above.	Update plan accordingly.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 31 - Last para- What does the following actually mean: 'The residents made it clear in their response to the questionnaire that they would prefer to meet the target with smaller infill developments'. It seems to be a subjective and relative statement. The site that the Neighbourhood Plan group considers deliverable on its own with I guess about 39 houses on it seems to be much denser than the current village density and therefore contrary to the comments on page 28-residents are concerned that house building does not take the form of a single large development or housing estate.	Review	Open	.This is being revised	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 32 (Windfall Development) - Last para-Is it legal and in line with National Planning Policy to state and make the following be adhered to: 'single or two -house developments may be of a suitable scale to the site but developments of three homes should include at least one that is affordable'?	Review	Open	Legal but not enforceable.	Remove it.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 36 - 2nd para-Is this a typo-'The modern natural'-doesn't make sense? The rest of the paragraph could be written about any village and therefore is it really useful to put in?	Review	Open	Change to current natural, historical.	Update plan accordingly
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 38 - Please can we have a copy of the notes for the 150 parcels of land having notable environmental features please?	Review	Closed	See inventory and scoring grid	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 42 - c) Please can we have a copy of the inventory for the fifteen natural and historical environment sites? (Ties up with the map on page 44).	Review	Closed	On the website.	No action.

Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 46 (Biodiversity) - Biodiversity is stated to be relatively low-but compared to what? However in general terms the policy is good.	Review	Closed	Agreed.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 47 - 1st para- Please can we have a copy of the environmental inventory mentioned here?	Review	Closed	Agreed.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 46 - Cricket Club/Sports Field It is important that all involved understand the position regarding this field. The field is Let to Rowland United Cricket Club. RUCC have then given SCFC a Licence to use the field for their home games outside the cricket season. The field is maintained as a sports field by the members of those two clubs, currently entirely at their cost, although the Parish Council and others have contributed in the past. In the event that RUCC no longer wished or were able to continue to rent the field there is currently no fall-back position such that a rent would be paid and the mowing and other field maintenance continued.	Note	Closed	Agreed.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 57 - Last para- please clarify '(and fields southwards)-which fields-which field numbers on the map to clarify?	Review	Open	Add the field numbers into section.	Provide Tina with Field numbers.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Page 69 (Employment Policy) - 1st para- 'relatively remote from major employment centres' is a very subjective phrase. Many would say it is very accessible to a significant number of towns and cities therefore a very good place to commute from. 2nd para-'Swinford has an ageing population meaning less and less residents need to work'. This statement assumes that no one will move in and out of Swinford. The ageing population might move away to places that provide facilities more relevant to their needs i.e. where there are dentists, doctors, shops and post office.	Review	Open	Consider adding commutable with surrounding road networks. Note in plan acknowledgement some move away to access more facilities.	Update plan accordingly.
Nick Wakefield (Environment Agency)	31/03/2017	Hello Tina, Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the attached document. Unfortunately I have been unable to locate the on-line comments form regarding this consultation. However I would like to confirm that, taking into consideration the proposed limits of development of the Plan area, the Environment Agency has no adverse comments to make on the Plan as currently submitted.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Leicestershire County Council is supportive of the Neighbourhood plan process. Due to the current resources available, we are only able to provide general comments at this stage:-	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Highways General Comments - The County Council recognises that residents may have concerns about traffic conditions in their local area, which they feel may be exacerbated by increased traffic due to population, economic and development growth.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Highways General Comments - Like very many local authorities, the County Council's budgets are under severe pressure. It must therefore prioritise where it focuses its reducing resources and increasingly limited funds. In practice, this means that the County Highway Authority (CHA), in general, prioritises its resources on measures that deliver the greatest benefit to Leicestershire's residents, businesses and road users in terms of road safety, network management and maintenance. Given this, it is likely that highway measures associated with any new development would need to be fully funded from third party funding, such as via Section 278 or 106 (S106) developer contributions. I should emphasise that the CHA is generally no longer in a position to accept any financial risk relating to/make good any possible shortfall in developer funding.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.

Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Highways General Comments - To be eligible for S106 contributions proposals must fulfil various legal criteria. Measures must also directly mitigate the impact of the development e.g. they should ensure that the development does not make the existing highway conditions any worse if considered to have a severe residual impact. They cannot unfortunately be sought to address existing problems.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Highways General Comments - 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 provide as a commuted sum.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Highways General Comments - With regard to public transport, securing S106 contributions for public transport services will normally focus on larger developments, where there is a more realistic prospect of services being commercially viable once the contributions have stopped i.e. they would be able to operate without being supported from public funding.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Highways General Comments - The current financial climate means that the CHA has extremely limited funding available to undertake minor highway improvements. Where there may be the prospect of third party funding to deliver a scheme, the County Council will still normally expect the scheme to comply with prevailing relevant national and local policies and guidance, both in terms of its justification and its design; the Council will also expect future maintenance costs to be covered by the third party funding. Where any measures are proposed that would affect speed limits, on-street parking restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders (be that to address existing problems or in connection with a development proposal), their implementation would be subject to available resources, the availability of full funding and the satisfactory completion of all necessary Statutory Procedures.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Flood Risk Management - The County Council are fully 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 for when designing a drainage solution.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	The LLFA is not able to: • Prevent development where development sites are at low risk of flooding or can demonstrate appropriate flood risk mitigation.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	The LLFA is not able to: • Use existing flood risk to adjacent land to prevent development.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	The LLFA is not able to: • Require development to resolve existing flood risk.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: • Locating development outside of river (fluvial) flood risk (Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)).	Review	Open	Agreed.	NV 10 wording to be added to the housing policy.

Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: • Locating development outside of surface water (pluvial) flood risk (Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map).	Review	Open	Agreed.	NV 10 wording to be added to the housing policy.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: • Locating development outside of any groundwater flood risk by considering any local knowledge of groundwater flooding.	Review	Open	Agreed.	NV 10 wording to be added to the housing policy.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: • How potential SuDS features may be incorporated into the development to enhance the local amenity, water quality and biodiversity of the site as well as manage surface water runoff.	Review	Open	Agreed.	NV 10 wording to be added to the housing policy.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	When considering flood risk within the development of a neighbourhood plan, the LLFA would recommend consideration of the following points: • Watercourses and land drainage should be protected within new developments to prevent an increase in flood risk.	Review	Open	Agreed.	NV 10 wording to be added to the housing policy.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	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.	Review	Open	Agreed.	NV 10 wording to be added to the housing policy.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Often ordinary watercourses and land drainage features (including streams, culverts and ditches) form part of development sites. The LLFA recommend that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path, and are retained in public open space to ensure that access for maintenance can be achieved. This should also be considered when looking at housing densities within the plan to ensure that these features can be retained.	Review	Open	To include in HS3 specific requirement that existing watercourses and land drainage (including watercourses that form the site boundary) are retained as open features along their original flow path wherever possible.	Update plan accordingly.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	LCC in our role as LLFA will object to anything contrary to LCC policies.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	For further information it is suggested reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Sustainable drainage systems: Written statement - HCWS161 (December 2014) and the Planning Practice Guidance webpage.	Review	Open	Agreed.	Consider incorporating in NV 10. Seek advice John Martin.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Planning, Developer Contributions - If there is no specific policy on Section 106 developer contributions/planning obligations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, it would be prudent to consider the inclusion of a developer contributions/planning obligations policy, along similar lines to those shown for example in the Draft North Kilworth NP and the draft Great Glen NP albeit adapted to the circumstances of your community. This would in general be consistent with the relevant District Council's local plan or its policy on planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of new development and enable appropriate local infrastructure and service provision in accordance with the relevant legislation and regulations, where applicable.	Review	Open	Include s106 policy in plan.	Update plan accordingly.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	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.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.

Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	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.	Review	Open	Agreed.	Consider incorporating in NV 10. Seek advice John Martin.
Nik Green (LCC)	<u>31/03/2017</u>	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.	<u>Review</u>	<u>Open</u>	<u>Agreed.</u>	Contact LCC for advice.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Education - Whereby housing allocations or preferred housing developments form part of a Neighbourhood Plan the Local Authority will look to the availability of school places within a two mile (primary) and three mile (secondary) distance from the development. If there are not sufficient places then a claim for Section 106 funding will be requested to provide those places.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	It is recognised that it may not always be possible or appropriate to extend a local school to meet the needs of a development, or the size of a development would yield a new school. However, in the changing educational landscape, the Council retains a statutory duty to ensure that sufficient places are available in good schools within its area, for every child of school age whose parents wish them to have one.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Property Strategic Property Services - No comment at this time.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Adult Social Care - Suggest reference is made to recognising a significant growth in the older population and look for developments to include bungalows etc of differing tenures. This would be in line with the draft Adult Social Care Accommodation Strategy for older people which promotes that people should plan ahead for their later life, including considering downsizing, but recognising that people's choices are often limited by the lack of suitable local options.	Review	Closed	Covered in H5.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Environment - No comment at this time.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Communities - Consideration of community facilities in the draft Plan would be welcomed. We would suggest where possible to include a review of community facilities, groups and allotments and their importance with your community. Consideration could also be given to policies that seek to protect and retain these existing facilities more generally, support the independent development of new facilities and relate to the protection of Assets of Community Value and provide support for any existing or future designations.	Review	Open	Agreed. TB add a CA and Update a policy to incorporate this.	Update plan accordingly
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Communities - The identification of potential community projects that could be progressed would be a positive initiative.	Review	Open	Agreed.	Lets lists some!
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Communities - P27 'Village Profile - Population states that the percentage aged 20-29 is lower than national and regional averages and indicates this is due to leaving for jobs and university; however, this could also be because they find it difficult to buy smaller/affordable housing.	Note	Closed	Noted	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Economic Development - We would recommend including economic development aspirations with your Plan, outlining what the community currently values and whether they are open to new development of small businesses etc.	Review	Closed	Not relevant for Swinford.	No action.

Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Superfast Broadband - We welcome the inclusion of a broadband policy within the plan. 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.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Nik Green (LCC)	31/03/2017	Superfast Broadband - 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. Developers are only responsible for putting in place broadband infrastructure for developments of 30+ properties. Consideration for developers to make provision in ALL new houses regardless of the size of development for example small in-fill sites, should be considered.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	We wish to comment on the pre submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	The area of the Lutterworth Road site is quoted as 2.34 HA. THIS IS WRONG, BY A FACTOR OF MORE THAN 100%. Using Google Earth, with the cricket wicket as calibration, I estimate the area to be 0.947 HA. It appears no member of the NPAC has noticed that the Lutterworth Road site is 2.34 ACRES, not hectares as listed. This reduces the size of the plot by more than 50% and renders the housing section of the draft NP unworkable.	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	It is proposed to build 39 houses on Area 4, Lutterworth Road. We strongly object to the DENSITY of housing proposed on the Lutterworth Road site. We suggest building some houses on Lutterworth Road and some on Rugby Road/another site. If they were spread across the sites and given reasonable sized gardens, this would stop further development of the sites, which is the reason given by the group for developing just one site. The view of the village approaching from the Shawell Road will be significantly spoiled by changing from open countryside to a housing estate.	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated. As previously notified smaller allocations across multiple sites would not protect the village from those sites being further developed, and we have been advised not to adopt such an allocation policy. The views of the village will be acknowledged for all sites considered.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	<u>POLICY H1: BUILDING DESIGN PRINCIPLES</u> states that "proposals should clearly show how the general character, scale, mass, density and layout of the site, of the building or extension fits in with the aspect of the surrounding area". Putting 39 houses on the Lutterworth Road site is clearly impossible without massively contradicting Policy H1. The density of building would be many times that of the surrounding area, and more in keeping with a town than a village.	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	<u>POLICY S2: LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT</u> states that "Development proposals within Swinford will only be supported on sites within the Limits to Development as identified in Figure xx where it complies fully with the policies of this Neighbourhood Plan and subject to design and amenity considerations." Building 39 houses on Lutterworth Road does not comply with H1, therefore S2 implies that development of Lutterworth Road will not be supported. It seems farcical to include Policies H1 and S2 and at the same time propose to develop Lutterworth Road.	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	<u>QUESTIONNAIRE IN JANUARY 2016</u> states that the Parish Council want to "deliver a Neighbourhood Plan that truly reflects local need." and "that the Neighbourhood Plan truly reflects the wishes and aspirations of local people."	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.

Parishioner	31/03/2017	The results of the questionnaire show that villagers were of the opinion that Area 3, Rugby Road should be developed and that Lutterworth Road should not, thus: 25% people scored Rugby Rd in the lowest 2 categories i.e. not suitable. 30% people scored Lutterworth Rd in the lowest 2 categories i.e. not suitable. 48% people scored Rugby Rd in the highest 2 categories i.e. suitable. 42% people scored Lutterworth Rd in the highest 2 categories i.e. suitable. Villagers feel that one large estate is unsuitable.	Review	Closed	Statistics can be used to derive a different conclusion. Rugby Road actually scored higher than Lutterworth Rd in the second lowest category (18% vs 15%). We looked at the average score for each site which was 3.38 for Rugby Rd and 3.23 for Lutterworth Rd - we judged these differences and the others which you refer to as marginal, and only contribute to the final decisions around allocation. We believe that other factors, such as the scores from the sustainability reviews carried out independently, as more important. We note that Rugby Rd is big enough for 35 houses, which if chosen would be completely at odds with the last comment.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	The results of the questionnaire show that villagers were very much against the development of just one site, and preferred a number of smaller sites to be developed, thus: 63% people scored one large estate in the lowest 2 categories i.e. unsuitable. Only 14% people scored one large estate in the highest 2 categories i.e. suitable. The Draft Plan agrees with the villagers, stating that "Villagers prefer the development of more than one site." 47% people scored "a number of smaller sites" in the highest 2 categories. Only 21% scored the lowest 2 categories. The buildings section of the draft submission does not reflect "the wishes and aspirations of local people" as the questionnaire stated that it would.	Review	Open	We can only work with the sites available, and we are pleased to report that a further three sites have been put forward for consideration. Landowners cannot be forced to sell their sites to suit the views of the village.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	On page 28 of the Draft it says that residents are concerned that house building: "does not take the form of a single large development or 'housing estate' which would be totally out of character with the village of Swinford". It is incongruous to state this on page 28, and then propose to build a dense housing estate on page 32.	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	CONSULTANT REPORTS - The consultant states that Lutterworth Road is a "redundant site used for stock car racing track." This is clearly wrong, the landowner's children have previously driven old road cars around the field, and to state it is a stock car racing track is nonsense. Why did the NPAC not point this out to the consultant?	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	SHOULD SCORE AMBER - It is pasture, and has frequently been used as such in the last few years. Part of it is currently used to rear pigs. The local badger group is aware that a badger sett is present and that the pig farm has been placed over the sett. It should therefore score amber not green for "current use".	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	The consultant states that - "Lutterworth Road is a key route from the village and this site has open Countryside vistas to three elevations with a large house found on the Southern boundary." He fails to mention the large house on the Northern boundary. Did he fail to see the large house on the Northern boundary or leave it out of his report deliberately? Why did the NPAC not point this out to the consultant?	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	He fails to mention the view to the East from Swinford Lodge, a listed building. This will change from a view of ash trees and open countryside to a view of a housing estate.	Review	Closed	Comment to be noted.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	The consultant states that "the ""width"" of the carriageway will probably need to be expanded. This does not apply to the Rugby Road site, so Lutterworth Road should score RED for Safe Vehicular Access to and from the site.	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	How do you plan to expand the width of Lutterworth Road, <u>and</u> install a footpath? He states that existing trees would need to be retained if the area were developed.	Review	Closed	This is a highways issue.	No action.

Parishioner	31/03/2017	Regarding contamination issues: historically the site has been used as the village tip. We are informed that part of the site may be contaminated, as it was used to tip old batteries, but cannot confirm this.	Review	Closed	Accepted but this is the responsibility of the developer.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	THE OVERALL SCORE FOR LUTTERWORTH ROAD SITE SHOULD BE GREEN 3 NOT GREEN 5	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	The errors in the Consultants' reports are disappointing.	Note	Closed	Noted but disagree there was more than one error.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	Other sites - Sites 5a and 5b seem like good sites to build as this would maintain the existing general shape/layout of the village, and not extend the village out on an arm. Why were they not investigated further? Several members of NPAC have told us that you wish to only develop one site (albeit contrary to the villagers' wishes). Lesley Aspinall at HDC agrees that Lutterworth Road cannot accommodate 39 houses. In light of this, which alternative site do you propose to develop?	Review	Closed	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated. We note that 5a and 5b were considered in exactly the same way as other sites. We have no idea which members you are referring to, but the draft plan has two allocated sites in it, not one as you suggest.	No action.
Parishioner	31/03/2017	With regard to the draft Swinford Neighbourhood Plan, it does seem to appear that the presented plan does not reflect the declared views of the residents, and that new houses divided between more than one site is the 'voted for' option.	Review	Open	We can only work with the sites available, and we are pleased to report that a further three sites have been put forward for consideration. Landowners cannot be forced to sell their sites to suit the views of the village.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	02/04/2017	Dear SPC and Neighborhood Plan Committee, I have read the Final First Draft Draft Neighbourhood Plan Document.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	02/04/2017	I have the following points to make:- Firstly, I notice an anomaly with regard to how many houses are required to be built in Swinford. In the 4 separate Swinford Sustainable Housing Development documents concerning all 4 sites under scrutiny for development it is stated that "The target number of new dwellings to meet the need identified by Harborough District Council in May 2016 is between 33 and 48 units to 2031. Windfall sites will provide about 10 units over the next 15 years based upon past performance. The residual target is therefore to allocate new sites for between 23 and 38 units." And yet in the Parish Plan Draft Document it is stated that "The indicative residential target set for the Swinford Parish for the period 2017- 2031 is 48 additional properties." So, the Parish Plan team, it seems, has already decided that Swinford will accept the larger number of 48 new homes, and not the lower number of 33 homes. My understanding is that the majority of respondents to the questionnaire regarding our Neighbourhood Plan want to keep new development to a minimum. I really object to the plan proposing we accept the higher figure of 48 new homes in the village when it is not strictly necessary in order to meet HDC targets. We should be aiming to allow only 33 new homes in the village. As 9 of that quota are already taken by the development at The Berries on Stanford Road, and an additional 2 homes are to be built by the Mourants on Stanford Road, that leaves an outstanding quota of 22 homes to meet, by my calculation.	Review	Open	HDC are updating their thoughts around targets all the time, but we are pleased to note that they intend to announce this on 10 June 2017. Their allocation must be met in the Plan, or it will be rejected. They had previously indicated 48 (in January 2017), hence that was the number used in the draft plan. We are advised that windfall sites no longer contribute to the target.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	02/04/2017	Secondly, regarding the proposal to develop Site 4 on Lutterworth Road - Quoting from the Swinford Sustainable Housing Development Document concerning - Site Four Lutterworth Road Expansion site 1. "Site capacity: 3 bed houses with garden and in-curtilage parking. 38 - 44 units possible 2.34 HA, developable in years 11-15 in the SHLAA. Current Use: Redundant site, used for stock car racing track." I don't know who did this survey, but (1) I seriously doubt that this site is 2.34 Hectares in size, and it would not be possible to build 39 x 3-bed homes on this site, each with a garden and off-road parking and (2) the site is NOT used for stock car racing, nor has it ever been. It is agricultural land. Currently there are 2 beaten up cars parked on the land, and now there is a number of pigs kept on this piece of land, so it appears to have reverted to agricultural use. To put 39 houses on a site of this size would be constitute a high-density development, completely out of character with the existing settlement pattern and with the character of the surrounding buildings. This type and density of development goes against what the NP Draft Document states and what HDC have also stated in their Policy documents....	Review	Open	HDC and our consultants have admitted that an error was made regarding the size of the site. The assessment is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.

Parishioner	02/04/2017	POLICY H1: BUILDING DESIGN PRINCIPLES ....• "Development should be of a similar density to properties in the immediate surrounding area." This proposed development clearly is nothing of the sort.	Review	Open	This is being reviewed.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	02/04/2017	To quote the Swinford Settlement Profile Doc – quoting from The Housing Needs Survey – 60% of residents made it clear in their response to the questionnaire that they would prefer to meet the target with smaller scale infill developments . How can one high density development of 39 houses be considered small scale infill? HDC itself talks about small scale infill as being developments of 5 houses or less.	Review	Open	We can only work with the sites available, and we are pleased to report that a further three sites have been put forward for consideration. Landowners cannot be forced to sell their sites to suit the views of the village. As noted above HDC have advised that infill no longer counts towards the target	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	02/04/2017	I cannot see how allowing a high-density development of 39 houses on a small field in any way conforms to all these statements made on the Swinford Parish Plan draft document and by Harborough DC regarding the requirement for development to be sensitive to the character and density of nearby homes.	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	02/04/2017	I wish to strongly object to the proposal to include this one large development on Lutterworth Road in the Neighbourhood Plan as a means to fulfil Swinford's entire housing requirement in one place. It is not suitable for that many houses. I strongly urge the team to reconsider this inclusion in this Neighbourhood Plan.	Review	Open	This is being reviewed and the allocation updated.	Awaiting outcome of assessment.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	Housing numbers acceptable to Swinford parishioners - 48 homes is more than the NPAC survey showed Swinford was happy to accept, and the term "minimum" came out of the blue. When I argued against it, several members seemed eager to hear me. Graham Mold asked "But how can we challenge it?" I offered him (and the NPAC) 3 definite approaches:	Review	Closed	It is not out of the blue as we have said many times in public. It is from an HDC latest working document given to us in January 2017 where the target was 48 for all options under consideration except one which was 57. The final allocation will be known on 10 June 2017 and this will be the one we use	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	1. The actual responses from parishioners should be used, since the NPAC is supposed to be evidence-based, and to represent the interests of the Parish – not HDC or some other body. The actual survey showed significant acceptance of some housing, but at a figure much lower than 48. It certainly did not show acceptance of unlimited expansion – which is exactly what a "minimum of 48" translates to and permits.	Review	Closed	We have to use the term minimum or the plan will be rejected (per HDC). This is perfectly logical as using maximum would undermine the achievement of the target.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	2. To refer to – and use - the result of a survey by Midland Rural Housing, which gave more quantified results than our own, even citing individual respondents. It came from Richard Mugglestone (of MRH) via our Parish Clerk, and showed less than 48 homes. Significantly, both JR and TB claimed to have "never seen it", even though it was sent to all Councillors – by our own Parish Clerk. This survey tied actual need to defined households (whilst retaining their anonymity). As an official body it will carry at least as much weight as Swinford PC.	Review	Closed	It is referred to in the draft plan and it has been used.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	3. To refer to the debriefing notes I sent to all Councillors after HU and I had a conversation with HDC's Strategic Planning Development Manager This was at an HDC seminar specifically dealing with this issue. In particular, I quoted reference to the final paragraph in the attached. This indicated a potential acceptance by HDC of a reasonable volume of development if it was mutual agreeable. The 3rd para is also significant. (see attached).	Review	Closed	Their opinion on what is acceptable has probably changed based on higher and ever increasing targets from central government.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	It appears that, even though the removal of "minimum" was the absolutely necessary condition for the draft to proceed to the next stage, such removal was ignored. It still appears in policy H2 of the draft.	Review	Closed	The INCLUSION of the word minimum is a condition for the plan to be accepted by HDC.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	So – where is the evidence showing the true source of the figure of 48? Does it exist?	Review	Closed	It is from an HDC latest working document given to us in January 2017 where the target was 48 for all options under consideration. The final allocation will be known on 10 June 2017 and this will be the one we use.	No action.

Parishioner	11/04/2017	This begs the question – were all of the 3 approaches above simply ignored? If so, who over-ruled them – and why? To do so is against the interests of the parishioners.	Review	Closed	We repeat the 48 came from HDC themselves and for some reason this is persistently ignored.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	Neighbourhood Plan - Housing for the elderly - The results of the village survey showed that there is a perceived need for housing for the elderly, mainly in bungalows, perhaps in apartments. As matters are contained in the Neighbourhood Plan, this is at risk of being mismanaged, giving un-intended consequences that fail to deliver against the needs of Swinford residents.	Review	Closed	The requirement for housing for older people is covered in H5.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	Such a statement needs explanation, so consider a notional situation. Assume that the need is for 15 such homes, and this figure is accepted/acknowledged in Swinford's Neighbourhood Plan. The expectation of the residents would be that up to 15 homes get built for sale to the elderly, or are provided via a housing association. However, interest in building against such requirement has already been stimulated amongst several development companies who do not operate such a straightforward business model. These are companies whose practice is to build a "retirement complex". These are heavily advertised as being a utopia for the retired, with lavish communal facilities more akin to a riviera resort. Of course, such facilities have to be paid for – usually via the management fee or service charge associated with the annual upkeep of each of the homes. This charge has an escalating increment, often hidden in the small print of the contract. Any application for planning consent to build such a complex is likely to be favoured by HDC, since it offers an easy "tick in the box" against the stated need for homes for the elderly. Therein lies the problem – and it is a big one!. The initial purchase cost of such homes is very probably beyond the resources of the elderly residents of Swinford, let alone the annual management charges. Furthermore, such developers often include clauses such that upon disposal of the property at least a share in any capital appreciation is payable to the developer. So – why is this a problem? Just that the HDC-supported provision of homes for the elderly would be "mopped up" by a developer with a business model aimed at optimising on-going revenue from the development that is beyond the pocket of local parishioners. Occupants of the development would be from outside the Parish (not a problem per se) but the locals would not have their needs addressed.	Review	Open	The requirement for housing for older people is covered in H5. We do not necessarily accept that the cost of purchase of a home for an elderly resident of Swinford would be beyond their resources - elderly residents will often be downsizing, which may well mean a lower cost of purchase than proceeds from selling.	BC to source wording.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	Suspect I am 'over-egging the pudding'? Then consider; 1. Sunday Times 2/4/2017 article "My Granny's home was a money pit" A family had to pay £48,160 to sell home of deceased relative – in addition to £23,794 service fees whilst doing so. I have a copy – but will not attach it for copyright reasons. 2. There is a very unhealthy series of court battles over crippling leasehold conditions. See www.leaseholdknowledge.com. 3. There are mainstream housebuilders who only sell the construction as leasehold – but then sell the lease to investment companies, to escape any legal battles. There have been attempts in parliament to outlaw the situation – rebuffed even at the written answer stage. Even if the sale of houses on leasehold conditions is outlawed, reformed or regulated, there is a high risk that retirement 'villages' be excluded. They are a different business model, selling more than just houses/flats, so could be excluded by the vested interests at work.	Review	Closed	The requirement for housing for older people is covered in H5. We do not necessarily accept that the cost of purchase of a home for an elderly resident of Swinford would be beyond their resources - elderly residents will often be downsizing, which may well.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	This has been brought to the attention of the NPAC. However, it has been poorly addressed. This issue does not appear to have been brought to the attention of residents in a pro-active manner. Rather, it has either been ignored by the NPAC, or treated in a manner that leaves the residents unaware of the implications.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.

Parishioner	11/04/2017	Simply waiting to see if any other resident raises the matter leaves the residents ill-served by the NPAC. Simply making this a single entry among many topics on display boards – then waiting to see if anybody questions it – is of little value. It needs to be dealt with by: 1. Identifying it as an issue. 2. Explaining just why it is a problem. 3. Doing this to a collected audience at a public meeting, such that debate is stimulated. 4. Recording – at such a meeting – the agreement or otherwise of those present.	Review	Closed	There are a number of issues and matters that we have raised with residents through questionnaires, public meetings and by answering questions at NPAC meetings. We believe the communication of the plan and the factors behind it will stand up to scrutiny.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	All matters on which public understanding/agreement is important should be dealt with in this manner. Otherwise, the draft of the NP will remain impervious to the local psyche.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	I believe the NP should propose: a) specifically excluding all retirement complexes, with the specific exception of warden attended sheltered accommodation. Even then, conditions need to be set against any management fee structure imposed upon residents. Undue exploitation should be designed out of the situation. b) Specifically excluding construction of house for sale leasehold.	Review	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	Biodiversity and wildlife - Residents and wildlife both deserve respect. That respect for wildlife should not extend to making the living environment of local families subordinate to the conditions of wildlife. To enjoy any involvement with wildlife it is for us to visit it in its natural environment. It is not acceptable that any policy should require us to compromise the quality or enjoyment of our own environment for the sake of any other species – flora or fauna. Diversity it not necessarily worthwhile for its own sake. In some cases the imbalance implied can have detrimental effects. Far better to let nature establish its own balance, and leave it free from unnecessary interference. Too often the persuasive language of the eco warrior is exploited to make any who do not share their views appear to be barbarians with neither sympathy nor interest in nature – a totally unjust position. We must be aware of the dangers of allowing fashionable buzzwords to become the staple of official policy – in all walks of life.	Note	Closed	Noted.	No action.
Parishioner	11/04/2017	There is a further point, which as far as I can ascertain was never in the terms of reference. Why is the NPAC (or one of its members) approaching householders inviting them to have their homes listed – or at least registered as being of "Special interest"? Is it to regain the confidence and trust of the parishioners? If so, it has the opposite effect. I am getting feedback that suggests anger, resentment and suspicion. This feedback is entirely voluntary – I have not sought it! One householder was contemplating asking the PC to underwrite increased insurance costs if his/her home did become listed, and compensation for any drop in value of marketability.	Review	Closed	Noted. It is entirely a matter for householders to decide whether they wish their property to be included.	No action.